House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, February 10, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Vito FosSELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 1-minute speeches on either side.

IRAQ ELECTION

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

Mr. FOLEY, Mr. Speaker, last week the people of Iraq risked life and limb to vote. They showed the world that freedom and self determination were things worth fighting and dying for.

The people of Iraq have spoken and in doing so, have undermined the terrorists who claim to be the true representatives of the Iraqi people.

No one expects the transition to representative government to be easy. After winning independence from Britain, it took our Founding Fathers years to draft and adopt a constitution that brought together the widely different factions that comprised the original 13 colonies.

There is one thing that is beyond dispute. The overwhelming majority of Iraqis want to live in a free and tolerant society. They have no use for the discarded Saddam and his henchmen.

As this editorial cartoon shows, a seed of democracy has been planted in the very heart of the Middle East. As Iraq continues to defeat the terrorists and build a flourishing society, the other oppressed peoples of this troubled region will demand and seize the same freedom for themselves. The mullahs of Iran should take note and realize that their people will throw them out sooner or later.

Again, I wish to congratulate the people of Iraq on their successful election.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE BUDGET

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent his budget dealing a blow to veterans health care, and I would like to share with you what the veterans’ organizations across the country think about it.

Paralyzed American Veterans say the release of the 2006 budget request by the administration demonstrates a callous disregard for the services of America’s veterans.

The VPW says the President has delivered a disappointing funding request for the Department of Veterans Affairs. This budget will cause veterans’ health care to be delayed.

The DAV, the Disabled American Veterans, says the administration has proposed one of the most tight-fisted, miserly budgets for veterans’ programs in recent memory. As a result, VA facilities across the country are cutting staff and limiting services even as the number of veterans seeking care is on the rise.

The American Legion says veterans’ health care is an ongoing expense of war. You do not thank veterans for serving their country and then tell them, Oh, by the way, you had better...
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, I rise today in appreciation of the strong partnership between the United States and Bulgaria.

For over 100 years the United States has enjoyed diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. With its new era of democracy, our two countries now stand together in the war on terrorism and our friendship is stronger than ever. Bulgaria’s democracy which recognizes the importance of furthering freedom throughout the world. By sending over 400 troops to rebuild Iraq and train security forces, the country is playing an important role in helping the Iraqi people. Also, with a contingent in Afghanistan, Bulgaria is protecting the modern world by containing terrorists at the source.

Bulgaria is also a country of great accomplishment. Last year I was honored to meet Prime Minister Siniora and to attend the White House ceremony honoring Bulgaria’s admission into NATO. Under his leadership, the Bulgarian economy is being transformed and EU admission is planned in 2 years.

During my visits to Bulgaria, I have seen firsthand the Bulgarian miracle, the establishment of a dynamic democracy and the restoration of economic freedom.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Bulgaria Caucus with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Tauscher), it is also my privilege to work with Ambassador Elena Poptodorova.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

NO TO PRICE INDEXING AND PRIVATIZATION

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Social Security benefits have steadily increased over the years because they have long been calculated by indexing them to wage increases which on the average go up 3.6 percent a year, so Social Security benefits increase with rising wages.

The administration wants to change that. They want to index Social Security benefits according to price increases, not wages. As a result, millions of seniors will see their future Social Security benefits reduced as much as 40 percent because prices do not increase as fast as wages.

Let me give an example. If you began work in 1959, retired in 2003 at age 65, under wage indexing where benefits rise, you get $1,130 a month. Under price indexing, your benefits would be frozen. You would get only $701 a month. So there would be a 40 percent cut in benefits with price indexing and a person would lose over $100,000 in retirement benefits over a lifetime.

Why the switch to price indexing? Because privatization is going to create an additional shortfall. The administration is going to borrow money to set up private accounts, and the shortfall is going to be for 45 years. They are going to have to borrow up to $15 trillion. They are going to try to get the money off the backs of American retirees. It is wrong. No to privatization and no to price indexing.

WHERE IS REPUBLICAN OUTRAGE?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Now that we are all saying ‘For terrorists, travel documents are as important as weapons,’ these gaps in the system are critical loopholes. With a driver’s license, the wrong person can then go on to purchase a firearm, rent a car, and board a plane.

Mr. Speaker, as a former law enforcement officer of over 33 years, I can speak firsthand to the danger of firearms in the wrong hands. We do not need to make it easier for the terrorists to get weapons. I urge my colleagues to vote for the REAL ID Act today and take another step to a more secure Nation.

WHERE IS REPUBLICAN OUTRAGE?
HONORING SPECIALIST LYLE RYMER, II

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of America's bravest soldiers, Specialist Lyle Rymier, II, who was a lifelong resident of the Fort Smith, Oklahoma, area. Lyle was recently killed in Iraq while honorably serving his country.

A member of Arkansas Army National Guard's 239th Engineering Company, Lyle was killed by an enemy sniper on January 28 while guarding members of his unit who were erecting barricades in preparation for the Iraqi elections. Lyle was a true hero who was on the ground, helping a new democracy prepare for their first free elections in over 50 years.

It seems that universally the members of Lyle's unit have the utmost respect for him. In news reports, they describe him as a go-getter, someone who always strived to achieve more than was asked of him.

Mr. Speaker, Specialist Lyle Rymier, II, at the age of 24, made the ultimate sacrifice for his country. He is a true American hero. I ask my colleagues to keep Lyle's family and friends in their thoughts and prayers during these difficult times.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRANSITION COSTS

(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, President Bush says the transition cost for his Social Security plan will cost about $700 billion in the first year, but other estimates have it at nearly $2 trillion in the first year to transition to his privatization plan.

The President, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, has proven time and time again that he simply cannot estimate the cost of his programs; and we simply cannot afford to buy into his risky Social Security privatization bill. It is going to cost a lot more. It is going to cut benefits, and it is a risky privatization plan.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 418, REAL ID ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 75 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 75
Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 418) to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure effective construction of the San Diego border fence. No further general debate shall be in order. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 'Printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, this rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will complete the work begun yesterday on H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act of 2005. As a number of our colleagues have already made it very clear during the debate yesterday of an hour and 40 minutes, this legislation will continue the efforts of our President, George W. Bush, the 9/11 Commission, and of Congress to ensure that America never suffers another terrorist attack like the tragedy of September 11, 2001.

H.R. 418, authored by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBECKSBERGER), is focused on four main areas: Number one, implementing much-needed driver's license reform, closing asylum loopholes, defending our borders, and strengthening our deportation laws.

Implementing the driver's license reforms included in H.R. 418 will provide for greater security for the American people. Because of lax standards and loopholes in the various current State issuance processes, terrorists have been allowed to obtain driver's licenses, often multiple times, from different States, and abuse these false identities for illegal and harmful purposes. The September 11 hijackers had
within their possession at least 15 valid driver’s licenses and numerous State-issued identification cards listing a wide variety of addresses.

These terrorists were then able to exploit many of the benefits conferred upon them by possession of these cards, such as enabling the bearer to acquire other corroborating identification documents, transfer funds to a United States bank account, obtain access to Federal buildings, purchase a firearm, rent a car, or board a plane, just to name a few.

By establishing minimum document and issuance standards for the Federal acceptance of driver’s licenses, requiring applicants to prove that they have entered the country legally, and requiring identity documents to expire simultaneously with the expiration of lawful entry status, this legislation will ensure that individuals harboring malign intentions or who have illegally entered or who are unlawfully present in the United States cannot have access to these valuable and sensitive documents.

Closing the asylum loopholes identified by H.R. 418 will provide greater security for the American people because, as the 9/11 Commission report noted, “a number of terrorists ... abused the asylum system.” By strengthening judges’ abilities to determine whether asylum seekers are truthful and credible, we will be able to prevent terrorists from gaming the system by applying for asylum as a means to avoid deportation after all other recourse available in the United States have been denied to them. This will prevent abuses of the system like in the case of the “Blind Sheikh” Abdul Rahman, who was able to stay in the United States and force an immigration district to grant him discretion to remain in the United States for 90 days. The asylum claim only weeks before his followers bombed the World Trade Center in 1993.

Defending our physical border, as provided for in the REAL ID bill, will also provide greater security for the American people. We know from the 9/11 Commission that the hijackers had 25 contacts with consular officers and 43 contacts with immigration and customs authorities. As a result, the 9/11 Commission and Congress are recommending to take a number of appropriate actions that would make it more difficult for terrorists to enter the United States through the visa or other immigration process, and this bill will go even further towards attaining that goal. But closing down only the legal means by which they will try to infiltrate this country is not enough.

Because increased vigilance has made entering the country through normal, regular channels more difficult, we must also increasingly prepare for the certainty that terrorists will use illegal, clandestine methods to enter our country. And, we must take steps now to close the gaps in our border security where we feel we are most vulnerable.

Finally, strengthening our deportation laws as provided for by H.R. 418 will provide greater security for the American people. Currently, although it seems unbelievable, not all terrorist-related grounds for keeping an alien out of the United States are also grounds for deportation. It means, that terrorists and their closest advocates can be denied entry to the United States for their actions in support of terrorism, but if they are able to make it to our shores, we cannot deport them legally under those same actions.

The REAL ID Act will bring some common-sense balance to this troubled oversight and make the law consistent by providing that all terrorist-related offenses that make aliens inadmissible would also be grounds for their deportation. It would also provide that any alien contributing funds to a terrorist organization could also be deportable.

This rule makes order five amendments from Members from both sides of the aisle. I have submitted to ensure that aliens and terrorists who are in the United States and ordered deported are actually deported so that they can no longer pose a threat to the security of American citizens.

By supporting this rule, the House can complete its consideration of these five important amendments and the underlying legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this fair and balanced rule.

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

Mr. Hastings of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman Sensesbrtner) for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side, for the balance of these arguments today and during yesterday, said very frequently, and it was repeated again today. Mr. Sensesbrtner has submitted this lapse amendment that made significant changes to the bill’s already controversial asylum sections. Members had never seen this language before, and of course, no subcommittee or committee had a chance to review it or mark it up.

In the short time we have had to review this new language, it appears to be more controversial than the bill’s original provisions. It appears to make it easier for an immigration judge to reverse prior asylum decisions, and it is subjective and factors that are notoriously unreliable indicators of credibility. It also allows a person to be denied asylum based on any inconsistencies or falsehoods in their testimony, whether or not these inconsistencies are relevant to the person’s claim.

I continue to harp on the fact that it does not protect children who are here and in need of asylum consideration. It does not protect women who are in forced slavery and prostitution and are raped. It does not protect them at all with reference to any asylum claims. And it places in the hands of one judge the judging of their credibility.

The other thing ignored is the difficulty that the criteria set forth in H.R. 418 present to asylum seekers, legitimate asylum seekers, to collect information regarding their birth records. In the district that I represent, more than a quarter of the work done in the district offices involves immigration, and one of the things that we find difficult to accomplish is to have the people in a timely manner who are seeking status and naturalization in this country collect their birth records and records of a variety of things in their communities that simply are not there and are unreliable, and then the claims are delayed repeatedly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad amendment, and Members should have more
time to study it. What is worse is that Members today will not even have the opportunity to vote up or down on it. This rule makes it a part of H.R. 418. It is called “self-executing.” It sounds like a cute way of circumventing the democratic process, to me.

Stifling free speech is downright un-American. One cannot fail to see the irony here. Right this minute our troops are in harm’s way to further democracy in a far-off country, while democracy in the halls of Congress is being shoved out the door. When the opportunity for a free debate is squelched, America loses, democracy loses. There is nothing to be gained by limiting ideas; and that is what we have here today, the limiting of the ideas of the majority. They should not and it is wrong for them to shut the American people out.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 418 also allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive all laws necessary for the construction of the Diego Garcia border wall. None of us are of a mind to believe that the completion of the 3-mile gap in that wall should not be undertaken. But giving the Secretary the power to override all Federal laws that interfere with her pursuit of a horrid border wall is just too much. These laws exist for a reason, be it to ensure the safety of the environment or to safeguard important cultural artifacts.

Mr. Speaker, how many more laws will we see waive in the name of homeland security? None of us would argue that we should not do everything to protect the homeland, but rightly we should not argue to ignore the laws that also protect us in this homeland. The data collection envisioned by H.R. 418 troubles me a lot. In this age of diminished personal privacy, this bill throws around terms such as “mandatory facial image capture,” and “electronic storage of identity source documents not fully explained and it is not explained; and I ask anybody to explain it on the majority side, certainly for the American public, explaining fully how all this captured data will be used and by whom.

I represent a district that, like America, is comprised of immigrants. Many of the people of the 23rd Congressional District of Florida came to America as asylum seekers themselves. They came from places where notorious persecution of human rights occurred, like Haiti and Cuba; and they have worked hard, as many immigrants in this country who sought asylum, to create a new life for themselves and their families. Whether they came 5 years ago or 50 years ago, they know others like them will continue to come to our shores fleeing persecution and desperation, seeking hope, protection and the promise of a better future.

We have a moral responsibility to help them make it. It has not lessened since after 9/11 than it was before. The immigrants who founded this country had that moral responsibility, and throughout our history we have waxed and waned with reference to that moral responsibility.

Last night, I watched the so-called “fair and balanced” Fox programming, and on that programming it happened that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) was one of the guests. He made some telling presentation. He did not falter in any of his principles with reference to this matter, and he went forward in a dignified manner to answer the questions asked. He said, I believe, and he has not said that the one thing that he does not think will help secure the homeland, as my colleague from Texas has just said. But let me quote the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) from last night. He said, “The key to protecting our homeland is enforcing the immigration laws.” Let me repeat the quote: “The key to protecting our homeland is enforcing the immigration laws.”

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) knows that President Bush has proposed a budget that, rather than fulfilling what we said would protect our homeland by having 2,000 border patrol persons and an added number, 800, INS, or BICE, that he did not say that if that is what we could enforce the immigration laws, what do we get in the proposed budget? Two hundred border patrol guards and 143 personnel for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. What I am saying is let us put our emphasis where it ought to be, and let us not divert ourselves in this manner, and certainly let us not continue to shut all of those organizations, from the Governors Association all the way back across the board that are opposed to this law, let us not shut them out from having an opportunity to present themselves at a hearing.

Let us not shut out the people here in the House of Representatives, some 41 of which who have no idea what we did with reference to this matter last year and have not had time in order to be able to review it, sufficient to be able to make arguments on behalf of their constituencies in a satisfactory manner. Let us not shut out the American public by continuing to not allow for open debate.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and H.R. 418. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and this ill-conceived legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do understand that not everybody is in agreement about what we are doing today, but for the Members that are paying attention, the 9/11 Terrorist Travel Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, known as the 9/11 Commission, said on page 43, line 19: “I would say this: September 11: As the hijackers boarded four flights, American Airlines Flights 11 and 77, and United Airlines Flights 93 and 175, at least six hijackers used U.S. identification documents obtained and acquired in the previous months, three of which were fraudulently obtained in Northern Virginia.”

Mr. Speaker, we would have to really not respect this 9/11 Commission if we were not going to do the work that they did. That is why we are here today. We are here for the best reason, for the security of this great Nation and the wonderful people who care and entrust upon the United States Congress the ability to make sure we do all that we can to avoid attacks in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I rise also in support of the Sessions amendment. But I also would like to take this time to make a few comments about why I will be voting against the bill.

With the utmost sincerity and a deep conviction, I am quite confident that if you vote for it, you will be voting against a national ID card. I know some will argue against that and they say this is voluntary, but it really cannot be voluntary. If a State opts out, nobody is going to accept their driver’s license. So this is in support of the Sessions amendment.

As a matter of fact, even the House Republican Conference, which sent a statement around with some points about this bill, said “the Federal Government should set standards for the issuance of birth certificates and sources of identification such as driver’s licenses.”

This is nationalization of all identification. It will be the confirmation of the notion that we will be carrying our passports.

As a matter of fact, I think it might be worse than just carrying our papers and showing our papers, because in this bill there are no limitations as to the information that may be placed on this identification card. There are minimum standards, but no maximum limitations.

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security can add anything it wants. So if they would like to put on the driver’s license, for example, that the guest has a radio frequency identification, as far as radio frequency identification. That technology is already available and being used on our passports. This means that you do not have to show your papers. All you have to do is walk by somebody that has a radio frequency identification. That technology is already available and being used on our passports.
This bill also allows the definition of “terrorism” to be re-defined. There are no limitations.

In many ways I understand how well intentioned this is, but to me it is sort of like the gun issue. Conservatives always know that you do not register guns, that is just terrible, because the criminals will not register their guns. But what are we doing with this bill? We are registering all the American people, and your goal is to register the criminals and the thugs and the terrorists.

Well, why does a terrorist need a driver’s license? They can just steal a car or steal an airplane or steal a bus or whatever they want to do. So you are registering all the American people because you are looking for a terrorist, and all the terrorist is going to do is avoid the law. But we all, the American people, will have to obey the law. If we do not, we go to prison.

So I strongly object to this bill. I hope there will be a few that will oppose H.R. 418.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the REAL ID Act is a real travesty. It has little to do with homeland security, and it represents just the latest in a string of anti-immigrant proposals so unfortunately popular with certain of our Republican colleagues.

Instead of putting the safety of our families first, these are the same folks that would have turned our emergency room doctors into border patrol agents; who would have cut the funding to cities that did not conduct immigration raids; and who would interfere with the people that our private banking institutions could serve and encourage instead an underground, black market financial system.

This same anti-immigrant fervor continues to fuel this bad bill. The REAL ID Act is designed to make our roads real unsafe. Undocumented workers will be on our roads. That is why the Austin Police Department believes that Texans would be safer if the law allowed all drivers to obtain licenses.

Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

Contrary to what my very good friend from California (Mr. FARR), my colleague, which calls for the completion of the 3.5 mile gap in the 14-mile fence that goes along the border from the Pacific Ocean to the Otay Mesa in San Diego.

I have to say that it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, to observe that it took a shorter period of time to win the Second World War than it has to complete this fence. It is a fence wherein actually the provision for it was signed into law by President Clinton back in 1997, and that was done with strong bipartisan support.

I worked with my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and our colleague Mr. Ose in the last Congress, who was very involved in this; and I just 10 weeks ago flew with T.J. Bonner, the president of the National Border Patrol Council, over this gap in the fence. It is very clear that people have taken advantage of it.

Now, the argument that is going to be used on the fence issue, and we will bring that up in just a little while, is going to do to the environment. There are people who say that we need to keep all of these environmental constraints in place which have prevented completion of the fence.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened is, we have seen the California Coastal Commission file a case to prevent completion of it because of something known as the Bell’s Verio bird. This bird has chosen to nest on part of the fence, and for that reason, they cannot complete the fence, and it has allowed people to come in.

Now, what has happened is, people have illegally fled across the border.
We have seen that border in what is known as the Tijuana Estuary devastated environmentally. There is all kinds of trash in there, and the environmental vote, Mr. Speaker, is to vote against the Farr amendment in favor of more fence. If we were to complete the fence, we would be able to improve the environmental standard at the border.

Now, this issue is one of the important parts of it, but there is one other issue to mention before I yield back the balance of my time.

I introduced legislation, H.R. 100, to deal with something known as the Saint Cyr decision, that is included in the manager’s amendment, and what that does, basically, the provision that we have in the manager’s amendment will finally get to the point where the appellate courts are the courts of jurisdiction, and we will not see consistent appeals. Not many people are aware of the fact that people who have illegally entered our country here illegally have an additional appellate step over American citizens. In the manager’s amendment, we will be able to rectify that very, very important issue that needs to be addressed.

This is a fair and balanced rule. It will allow us to deal with border security, a very important part of our national security; and I hope this great day will see us, at the end, pass this very important legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before I yield to the gentleman from California, which I will do gladly.

I would say to the chairman that I respect very much, and I am speaking to the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER), I respect very much what my good friend from California has said with reference to the rule, the amendments that are allowed. But I was in that same process as the chairman was in the Committee on Rules. Three-quarters of the amendments that were submitted on time pursuant to the manager’s correct direction to the body are not a part of the debate here.

The Sensenbrenner amendment, which is rather lengthy, came late to the committee. It is not being voted on up or down for the reason that it was a self-executing part of the rule.

Now, the gentleman can call that fair and balanced, but let me just say to the chairman that there is a new section 105, and many of the Members are hearing this for the first time. It eliminates Federal court review in many conventions against torture cases, and it eliminates the power of the Federal appeals court judges to stay the removal of asylum seekers.

I do not think any irony is lost on the chairman about the Ninth Circuit’s ruling.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, there was a lot of discussion as to whether or not we were going to make the Nadler amendment in order, as my friend knows. I know that that addresses the issue of asylum. We are going to have an opportunity for debate on that and an up-or-down vote on that issue.

We clearly had to deal with a wide range of questions about how we fashioned this rule. I will tell the gentleman that I am very proud of the fact that we were able to incorporate many of the ideas that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle offered. I will tell the gentleman that in a way that is consistent and fair to the minority, and six of those 10 amendments were, in fact, withdrawn. Made in order two of the four amendments that remained at the committee level.

We had on our side 10 amendments that were submitted, and we have only made three of our amendments in order of the original 10 that were submitted. That is why I am arguing that we have, in fact, really done the extra mile to ensure that the rights of the minority are respected.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, before the chairman leaves, just one further thought in that regard. I take, and from the many times when the chairman was in the minority, his statement to heart; and that is that if a rule is not open, it is closed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did I actually say that?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Yes, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) said that a lot. He said that a lot.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), my good friend.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, hearing the chairman of the Committee on Rules describe this restricted rule as fair and balanced reinforces the fact that when people on the right in America politically tell you something is fair and balanced, you had better ask for another deck of cards.

The rule not only limits the amendments; and it makes sense, the chairman’s defense makes sense if you start from the perspective that no amendments ought to be allowed. And then when you let in two out of 10, or two out of six, somehow you have been generous.

Ought not the assumption be in favor of openness, especially since the House has not been doing very much? Then the chairman said, well, we do not have to have long debate on these things; after all, we had a hearing in the Committee on Rules, and it was streamed on line. Anyone who thinks that a hearing in the Committee on Rules that is streamed on line is a substitute for the American people, for the United States House of Representatives, or anyone who says that, ought to remember, I would give just one piece of advice. No matter how pressed one feels in a debate, try to avoid saying something that no one is going to believe. It really does not help your cause.

No one thinks that an online hearing in the Committee on Rules with a handful of Members in a room that has 30 seats substitutes for an open debate in the House of Representatives, and particularly when you only give 10 minutes on a particular amendment.

I want to talk about the amendment on asylum. We heard a lot of discussion last year in the election from people complaining that people had been driven from the public square. Well, guess who is ignoring religion this year? The majority.

The provisions on asylum have evoked overwhelming opposition from the various religious communities in America. I noted yesterday that the Commission on Interreligious Freedom set up by this Congress to protect religious freedom in the world put out earlier this week a report saying that our asylum procedures are too restrictive. And what is the response of the majority? It maligned what the Commission on Interreligious Freedom says is a bad situation much worse.

I noted yesterday, in Leviticus it says, and I have looked at various translations, various renderings, and in every one it sometimes says ‘stranger,’ it sometimes says ‘alien.’ It is clear that means people we should describe as immigrants. It says, Treat them as you would treat the native born.

Now, I do not purport to be a religious scholar. I do not purport to be an expert in religious interpretation, but I am puzzled. Can we turn Leviticus on and off that way? I mean, often I have heard Leviticus quoted as justification for measures that are critical of homosexuals. Do you not have to take it as a package? I mean, if you are going to be consistent to homosexuals, do you not have to use it to be nice to immigrants? Is it not true that what is Leviticus for the goose is Leviticus for the gander?

Again, I acknowledge I am not a theological expert, so I will turn to some who are. I got a copy yesterday from the Interfaith Statement on Interreligious Freedom says is a bad act,” it says, “threatens the ability of victims of persecution to find safe haven in the United States,” signed by a variety of Jewish and Catholic and Protestant groups, the Jesuit Religious Service, the Episcopal Migration Ministries, the Church World Service, the Jubilee Campaign, the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

Mr. Speaker, because I do not think that religion ought to be driven from the public square on an issue on which there is such an overwhelming religious consensus, I will offer a statement condemning this bill and its asylum provisions be inserted here.
REAL ID ACT THREATENS ABILITY OF VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION TO FIND SAFE HAVEN IN THE UNITED STATES

As representatives of various faith traditions, we are deeply concerned that the REAL ID Act, legislation proposed by Representative Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI), would make asylum a more remote possibility for hundreds of persons who need protection because safeguarding our national security is an urgent issue, and we support measures that honor that concern. We also subscribe to core beliefs which require us to guarantee safety to victims of persecution, particularly those who have no recourse to the projection that democratic societies traditionally provide. Restricting access to asylum is a current practice and does not serve the cause of national security and, moreover, erodes a sacred and legal responsibility to give safety to those whose only protection comes from asylum.

Each of our traditions has witnessed the suffering of persons whose beliefs often place them in jeopardy and possibly in mortal danger. As American-based faith communities, we have cherished the ability of asylum seekers to find safety in communities around our nation, and we are therefore, saddened by a further erosion of our asylum system under the pretext of national security. We urge Members of Congress to reject the notion that the current asylum process is victimizing asylum seekers to convince re- viewers of the key motivation of their accusations, and that the current system needs to be made more restrictive.

The belief that we must receive persons who have been persecuted and persecuted because of their ideas and religious practices is anchored in both our histories and sacred texts. We have contributed over the years to supporting and nurturing practices which embrace hospitality as not only a religious but an American value. We also appreciate the need to prevent terrorism from violating both our safety. We believe that hospitality to the stranger—particularly one who has been persecuted—and security are compatible national goals. We, therefore, reject legislation that subverts hospitality in the name of security.

The current asylum system includes rigorous safeguards against terrorists abusing the asylum provisions. However, the changes proposed by the REAL ID Act raise a false issue in further victimizing legitimate asylum seekers. Requiring unreasonable levels of evidence to prove eligibility, placing a heavier burden on asylum seekers to convince reviewers of the key motivation of their accusers, and allowing subjective considerations to guide the process all send a chilling message to those who desperately seek the safety and protection which they have a right to expect of our great nation.

We have all seen how fear can pervert justice. We believe that the religious traditions which we embrace calls us to oppose a narrowing of the door to asylum by some of the world’s most at-risk persons. We are committed to resisting a fear-driven agenda which violates our faith-based principles.

Anti-Defamation League
Episcopal Migration Ministries
HIAS and Council Migration Service of PJM
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society
Institute on Religion and Public Policy
Jesuit Refugee Service
Jewish Council for Public Affairs
Jewish Labor Committee
Jubilee Campaign
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
Midland Alliance
Midland Association of Churches
Midland Ministerial Alliance

Mr. Speaker, the asylum provisions make it much harder for people to get asylum. We will have 20 minutes to debate this issue. It would take me half of that time to read the full list of signers

Last week, we were visited, those of us on the Democratic side, by a representative of the Catholic bishops, who asked us specifically to oppose this bill and particularly to condemn the asylum provisions. I do not think there has been any showing that asylum cases have been terrorists.

But, in any case, I do want to stress, those of you who have said we have insufficiently paid attention to religious values, Mr. Speaker, I urge them not to turn their back on the religious community now and not to give the religious communities, a broad range of them, 10 minutes in which we can make the case that this bill violates biblical injunctions about aliens and underruns our mission to be a haven for the religiously persecuted.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBERNRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SENSENBERNRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule for consideration of amendments to H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act.

The manager’s amendment, which will self-execute upon adoption of this resolution, makes technical changes to the bill as well as making a number of substantive improvements. One such modification will be to remove the annual cap on so-called quota-asylum seekers who are citizens of a country that has been determined to be a safe country for that individual. The current cap of 10,000 has resulted in a multi-year backlog that has caused unnecessary hardship to aliens already found to have been fleeing persecution. Hardly an anti-refugee provision.

The manager’s amendment also extends the bill’s provisions regarding the credibility determinations of immigration judges in asylum proceedings to apply to other requests for relief from removal before immigration judges.

Lastly, it includes the text of H.R. 100, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), to limit criminal aliens to one bite of the apple in contesting their removal orders. I strongly support all these changes and believe they improve the underlying legislation.

Regrettably, at the request of the Committee on Government Reform, the manager’s amendment also removes two provisions that I believe address important issues with regard to temporary licenses. One provision clarified the need to clearly mark temporary driver’s licenses that States remain authorized to issue people who cannot meet the identity standards as set by this bill.

The other provision provided the Secretary of DHS with the ability to intervene, but only in the interest of national security, to order the incredible diversity in form and appearance of driver’s licenses issued by the States. Today there are over 350 valid driver’s license designs issued by the 50 States. And we all know it is very difficult for security officials at airports to tell the real ID cards from the counterfeit ones.

I understand why the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform believes these two provisions should not be included at this time, however, it is my hope that as this legislation continues to move through the legislative process, we may revisit these two provisions. Both are widely supported and improve the overall bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman talks about section 102 of the bill, which gives the Secretary of Homeland Security the ability to waive all laws that might get in the way of building the fence; and he talks about environmental laws, and he talks about endangered species. Well, that is all well and good, but the radicalism and the irrepressibility of the majority is shown by how this is drafted.

This does not refer to environmental laws. This does not refer to endangered species. This says the Secretary of Homeland Security shall have the authority to waive all laws in his sole discretion that he determines necessary.

The Secretary of Homeland Security can tell the contractors, if anybody gets in your way, shoot them. Shoot them. The laws against men are waived. Laws about things are waived. It makes him a total dictator. Then to make sure that the Secretary can be a total dictator in contravention of the Constitution, in contravention of all our laws, it then says, no court shall have jurisdiction to hear a claim arising from any decision the Secretary takes or to order any compensatory declarative injunctive, equitable or any other relief for damages alleged to have been suffered.

So someone can be shot because the Secretary says shoot anybody that gets in the way by accident or deliberately and the courts cannot review whether
the Secretary had the authority, whether this is constitutional.

Last year we had certain court-strip-ping legislation before us to say that the court shall have no jurisdiction to hear a claim against the constitutionality of the Defense of Marriage Act.

One other thing, I got up on this floor and I said, this is going to become boiler plate language in bills, and here it is. It did not even mention it. Boiler plate language.

"No court shall review any action the Secretary may take." I thought the Republican Party stood for limited government. This says the Secretary is absolute dictator, as absolute as Stalin. What kind of language is this?

Regardless of the merits of this bill, regardless of the merits of this provision in general, this is disgraceful.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank a friend from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule, and I rise in favor of the Sessions amendment. The amendment makes certain that before an alien is released from Detained detention on his own recognizance pending withdrawal of asylum application, the immigration judge first certify that the alien is not a flight risk and, more importantly, that he does not pose a security risk to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the different views that we hear in the well of this House. I understand full well Dr. Franklin’s admonition about the challenge confronting those who seek security and yet also wish to preserve liberty.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we are here on the floor visiting this issue today is, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules pointed out, while our founders believed that all men were created equal, now we have the arcanae and absurdities of certain judicial procedures that allow illegal aliens to enjoy more legal privacy in some cases than do American citizens, We need redress.

I think with great interest to my friends who came to the floor recently discovering States rights with reference to this legislation, and I believe that to be a hopeful sign. I listened with great interest to other friends who came to offer scriptural and spiritual entreaties in this debate, and I welcome that as well. But, Mr. Speaker, here is the fundamental question we confront. In the wake of 9/11, in the wake of clear and demonstrable evidence that there are those who come to this Nation with the intent of harming and killing Americans, who are bent on the destruction of our Nation and our system of government, at long last this body should take the steps necessary to preserve our security and our liberty. Border security is national security.

There has been lament expressed from the other side that we are moving too quickly. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress lamenting the fact that at the behest of the other body we remove these important provisions from a piece of legislation passed at the end of the last session of Congress. Incrementalism in wartime is unacceptable. There is a clear and present danger. We must respond.

Pass the rule. Pass the Sessions amendment. Pass the underlying legislation. Let us preserve and protect our Union and our way of life.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, section 101, the asylum provisions, are flawed. Existing law exempts and prohibits terrorists or threats to national security or those who the government can prove through secret evidence are threats to national security from getting asylum. That is existing law. This self-executing rule, which allows amendments which have never been considered by any committee or heard through hearing or markup, do several dangerous things.

Section 101 encourages asylum officers and immigration judges to deny an asylum claim simply because the applicant was able to recall or recount information later in the process that she did not mention when she was initially encountered by immigration officers. The amendment included in the rule would expand that to include consistency on matters that are entirely relevant to the basis of the claim for asylum.

It would mean that a woman who has been subjected to gang rape by government armed forces in her country who is too afraid or ashamed to tell the story later on in the process, be denied asylum simply because she was too afraid or too ashamed to tell the story to the first person she encountered.

Now, under the amendment, this woman could get asylum because she cannot recall facts that are irrelevant to establishing her need from protection, her high school graduation date, for example.

In a system where we rely on translations and statements taken from people in crisis, this is a very change in the law.

It is a fundamental challenge to the whole concept of the immigration judge considering all things coming into the record. The one thing I know is section 101 becomes law, people with a well-founded fear of persecution, as a result of these changes, will be denied asylum, there will be no effort whatsoever to enhance our efforts to protect this country against terrorism, but we will have struck a fundamental blow against a tradition which I think is very important to maintain in this country and that is that we are a haven for refugees from persecution for political, ethnic, religious or gender reasons.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

Even more troubling is a fact discussed in a report released this week by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. Often Immigration Judges determine that an applicant is not credible because their statement at the airport was inconsistent with later statements because later statements included their names. The problem with that logic is that when an asylum applicant is interviewed in inspections, the interview stops at the moment that the person establishes a fear of persecution. They are not invited to provide more detail until a later credible fear interview. In other words, the applicant isn’t the reason the decision is made, the applicant is the reason the decision is made.

Furthermore, it is quite common for torture survivors suffering from post-traumatic stress to exhibit characteristics in their demeanor such as lack of eye contact. The problem with that logic is to recall simple details that to an untrained person may appear to be symptoms of lying. For example, Fauyiza Kassindja, a young Togolese woman who fled female genital mutilation (FGM), would have been denied asylum under this standard with little chance of getting that determination reversed on appeal. Under current law, the Board of Immigration Appeals rightly reversed the Immigration Judge’s credibility finding in her case, and that decision has helped protect other women fleeing FGM.

Section 101 would encourage asylum officers and immigration judges to deny an asylum claim when the applicant cannot provide corroborating evidence of their claims if the officer, in his unrestrained discretion, believes that the applicant should be able to provide such evidence.

This disproportionately harms applicants who are detained and/or lack counsel. Relatedly, H.R. 418 would constrain judicial review of a denial of asylum based on an applicant’s failure to provide corroborating evidence.

Section 101 would require some asylum applicants to prove not only that they are refugees, but also prove their persecutors’ central reason.

The additional burden on asylum applicants created by this provision is impermissible under the international law, including the U.N. Convention on Refugees to which the United States is a signatory. To meet the standard set forth in the Convention, it is sufficient to prove persecution is motivated, in part by one of the prohibited grounds. Asking a refugee or asylum applicant to parse his persecutor’s motivations so finely as to distill the “central reason” or “central reason” is asking asylum
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the rule and in support of the underlying bill, the REAL ID Act.

This is probably one of the most important bills that we will have to vote on this week. The bill obviously will strengthen our borders, improve the rule of law, and protect our national security. It builds upon the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. These are things they have talked about and had recommended, and it begins to respond to the pleas of the many families who lost loved ones on that terrible day.

It implements much needed driver's license reform. Now, driver's licenses have become the primary ID in the United States. It enables individuals to go other identity documents, to transfer funds to U.S. bank accounts, to obtain access to Federal buildings and other vulnerable facilities, purchase a firearm, rent a car, go on a plane, etcetera. So lax standards and loopholes in the current issuance process allow terrorists to obtain driver's licenses, often multiple licenses from different States, and abuse the license for identification purposes. The REAL ID Act corrects this.

Identification documents are the last opportunity to ensure that the people are who they say they are and to check whether they have a terrorist history.

The REAL ID Act would require applicants to provide proof that they are in this country legally. Currently, 11 States do not have such a requirement, meaning the majority of States have already recognized the need for tighter requirements and standards, but unnecessary and dangerous gaps still exist in this system. So that is why we need this. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions) has cited the 9/11 Commission. After 9/11, shortly thereafter, I wrote to President Bush and introduced legislation that would set the precursor to what ultimately became the Department of Homeland Security of this House of Representatives.

During that period of time, I did not have the opportunity to respond from the White House, and the White House opposed setting up inside the administration a Cabinet-level homeland security official. Ultimately, they came around. Tim Roemer, a former colleague of mine on the 9/11 Commission, and myself and others filed the original legislation leading to the development of the 9/11 independent commission.

And my colleague has cited that commission frequently, but I defy him on the subject of border security, page 186, to tell me anywhere where it says anything about driver's licenses.

They talk about creating an inter-agency center to target illegal entry and human traffickers; imposing tighter controls on student visas; taking legal action to prohibit terrorists from coming into the United States and to remove those already here; further increasing the number of immigration agents to F.B.I. joint terrorism task forces; activating a special court to enable the use of classified evidence. And I could go on and on and on in the Clark working group and the 9/11 report, and not one word, not one word regarding any driver's licenses.

People that are going to do harm in this Nation are not going to do any other thing other than everything that is fraudulent. But what we need to know is that there are a variety of people who are significantly opposed to this legislation. The AFL-CIO, the American Jewish Committee, the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Catholic Charities USA, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Irish American Unity conference, Gun Owners of America, the American Conservation Association, the National Right to Life, the Hispanic Elected Officials, the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of La Raza, the Federation of Filipino American Association, the Service Employees Union; and there is a list that goes up. Several organizations that have been shut out because there were no hearings and no opportunity for them to have been heard, other than through the limited debate.

We should stop this business of closing our opportunities and open up the rules. I oppose this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a number of numbers here. This is a little bit about numbers, and one of them is that 121 organizations that we heard about, as if they were the ones that should obstruct the safety of 292 million Americans whose lives are at risk.

Another number, 19 terrorist hijackers. 19. Nineteen of them with 63, another number, 63 valid driver's licenses in their possession. Any one of those driver's licenses got them another thing they needed to do in America, full rights of citizenship for that matter, and get on board any airplane.

And another number, 3,000 dead Americans. And what have we done to close the door? Anything?

Have we even said "no" to the 121 organizations that say, Leave the door wide open, keep us at risk because somehow or another there is some kind of tone here that we object to?

We think something of your heart. We need to close this door.

And what have we done? We have made it harder for terrorists to get on
airplanes with razor blades. We spent millions of dollars on metal detectors and millions of dollars expanding TSA and putting Federal employees in place, and we put millions of people in long lines waiting to get through.

So it is a little harder for them; they have a little more difficulty with the rest of us. Stand in line with the rest of us where I stand, where I see a 75-year-old lady going through a spread-eagle search while the young Middle Eastern male waits through with a smirk on his face and we cannot close that door.

This bill does some of that, not all of that, but it will be the first thing that will keep the 19-type terrorist hijackers off our airplanes, keep them off our airplanes, out of our automobiles and provide a measure of safety and security for the American people.

It is not enough, but it is the best of common sense, and it must move through this Congress, and it must move through this Congress right now, today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) that I do not have additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA, a Gentleman from Florida) said the Gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore makes in order five amendments for Members of both sides of the aisle, including one that I have submitted to ensure that aliens and terrorists are not in the United States illegally, and if they are, we are going to deport them.

I think that this is a good bill, a good rule; and I support H.R. 418. We need to implement much-needed driver’s license reform. We need to close asylum loopholes. We need to defend our borders, and we are going to strengthen our deportation laws. And I encourage all of my colleagues to support the underlying legislation in this rule.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor today to speak in favor of reforming our system for asylum and against the move to strike the necessary reforms incorporated in H.R. 418. It has been suggested throughout this debate yesterday and today that because there is no specific recommendation made by the 9-11 commission to reform our asylum system that we in Congress would do nothing to fix it.

That in my opinion is insane. My colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle suggest we stick our heads in the sand and ignore one of the tools used by terrorists to gain access to and remain in our country.

Make no mistake, the 9-11 commission report does specifically state that our asylum system was and is used by terrorists to carry out their schemes to kill Americans.

Let me quote from the report and its accompanying statements:

'The report states, speaking of the first Trade Center bombing, "... Ramaziy Yousef, who had also entered with fraudulent documents but claimed political asylum and was admitted. It quickly became clear that Yousef had been a central player in the attack. He had fled to Pakistan immediately after the bombing and would remain at large for nearly two years."

Later in the report it talks about the outdated immigration benefits system, "... when Douglas A. Kinnamon became Assistant Commissioner in September 1993, she found... the asylum and other benefits systems did not effectively deter fraudulent applicants.

Finally, "Terrorists in the 1990s, as well as the September 11 hijackers, needed to find a way to stay in or embed themselves in the United States if their operational plans were to come to fruition. "This could be accomplished... by applying for asylum after entering. In many cases, the act of filing for an immigration benefit (such as claiming asylum) sufficed to permit the alien to remain in the country until the petition was adjudicated. Terrorists were free to conduct surveillance, coordinate operations, obtain and receive funding, go to school and learn English, make contacts in the United States, acquire necessary materials, and execute an attack."

So, if I am to understand my friends on the other side, we are to ignore the problem of asylum abuse and do nothing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The Speaker pro tempore. The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

The previous question was ordered. The Sergeant at Arms will notify abjournment. The Sergeant at Arms will notify abjournment. The Sergeant at Arms will notify abjournment.
REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO REAL ID ACT OF 2005

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 418 pursuant to House Resolution 75, it may be in order to consider amendment No. 4 in House Report 109-181 as modified form I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 418 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

Strike section 101 of the bill (and redesignate the succeeding sections of title I accordingly).

Insert, Section 101:

(a) REMOVAL OF CAPS.—Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended—

(1) by striking "Department of Homeland Security"; and

(2) by striking "Attorney General" each place such term appears and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General";

(b) C ONDITIONS FOR GRANTING ASYLUM.

(1) by striking "Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, in the Secretary's or the Attorney General's discretion", and

(2) by striking "and" and all that follows through "government"—inserting "The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, in the Secretary's or the Attorney General's discretion and under such regulations as the Secretary or the Attorney General may prescribe, may adjust to the status of any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence the status of any alien granted asylum who..."; and

(c) by striking the conforming amendments in section 101, and

(b) by striking "Attorney General" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General";

and inserting

(2) by striking "Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, in the Secretary's or the Attorney General's discretion and under such regulations as the Secretary or the Attorney General may prescribe, may adjust to the status of any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence the status of any alien granted asylum who..."; and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking "Attorney General" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General";

and inserting

(3) by adding at the end the following:

(b) BURDEN OF PROOF.

(i) In general.—The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish that the applicant is a refugee, within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A). To establish that the applicant is a refugee within the meaning of such section, the applicant must establish that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion was or will be a central reason for persecuting the applicant.

(ii) Sustaining burden.—The testimony of the applicant may be sufficient to sustain the applicant's burden without corroboration, but only if the applicant satisfies the trier of fact that the applicant's testimony is credible, is persuasive, and refers to specific facts sufficient to demonstrate that the applicant is a refugee. In determining whether the applicant has met the applicant's burden, the trier of fact may weigh the credible testimony along with other evidence of record. Where the trier of fact determines, in the trier of fact's discretion, that the applicant should provide additional corroboration otherwise credible testimony, such evidence must be provided unless the applicant does not have the evidence and cannot reasonably obtain the evidence without departing from the United States. The inability to obtain corroboration evidence does not excuse regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure and to encourage the construction of the San Diego border fence, with Mr. URTON (the Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, February 9, 2005, all time for general debate pursuant to House Resolution 71 had expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, no further general debate shall be in order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 109-4 is adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered read.

The text of H.R. 418, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 418

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 “REAL ID Act of 2005.”

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL LAWS TO PROTECT AGAINST TERRORIST ENTRY

SECTION 101. PREVENTING TERRORISTS FROM OBTAINING RELIEF FROM REMOVAL

(a) CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING ASYLUM.—Section 208(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The Attorney General" the first place such term appears and inserting the following:

(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General; and

(2) by striking "The Attorney General" the second and third place such term appears and inserting "the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General";

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish that the applicant is a refugee, within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A). To establish that the applicant is a refugee within the meaning of such section, the applicant must establish that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion was or will be a central reason for persecuting the applicant.

(2) SUSTAINING BURDEN.—The testimony of the applicant may be sufficient to sustain the applicant's burden without corroboration, but only if the applicant satisfies the trier of fact that the applicant's testimony is credible, is persuasive, and refers to specific facts sufficient to demonstrate that the applicant is a refugee. In determining whether the applicant has met the applicant's burden, the trier of fact may weigh the credible testimony along with other evidence of record. Where the trier of fact determines, in the trier of fact's discretion, that the applicant should provide additional corroboration otherwise credible testimony, such evidence must be provided unless the applicant does not have the evidence and cannot reasonably obtain the evidence without departing from the United States. The inability to obtain corroboration evidence does not excuse
the applicant from meeting the applicant’s burden of proof.

(ii) **Credibility Determination.**—The trier of fact should consider all relevant factors and may, in the trier of fact’s discretion, base the trier of fact’s credibility determination on any such factor, including the demeanor, candor, or responsiveness of the applicant or witness, the inherent plausibility of the applicant’s or witness’s account, the consistency between the applicant’s or witness’s written and oral statements (whenever under oath or not made under oath), the internal consistency of each such statement, the consistency of such statements with other evidence of record (including the reports of the Department of State on country conditions), and any inaccuracies or falsehoods in such statements, without regard to whether an inconsistency, inaccuracy, or falsehood goes to the heart of the applicant’s claim. There is no presumption of credibility.

(b) **Withholding of Removal.**—Section 241(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

> **(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:—**
> **(A) In General.—An alien applying for relief from removal has the burden of proof to establish that the alien—**
> **(i) satisfies the applicable eligibility requirements; and**
> **(ii) with respect to any form of relief that is granted in the exercise of discretion, that the alien merits a favorable exercise of discretion.**
> **(B) Sustaining Burden.—The applicant must comply with the applicable requirements to submit information or documentation in support of the applicant’s application for relief or protection as provided by law or regulation or in the instructions for the application form. In evaluating the testimony of the applicant or other witness in support of the applicant’s claim, the immigration judge will determine whether or not the testimony is credible, is persuasive, and refers to specific facts sufficient to demonstrate that the alien has met the burden of proof. In determining whether the applicant has met such burden, the immigration judge shall weigh the credibility testimony along with other evidence of record.**

> **(1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on March 1, 2003.**

(b) **Removal of Caps.**—Section 209 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1159) is amended—

> **(A) by striking the words “Secretary of Homeland Security” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General”; and**

> **(B) by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General”;**

(c) **Waiver.**—Section 240(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(c)) is amended by adding at the end, after sub-paragraph (D), the following:—“No court shall reverse a determination made by a trier of fact with respect to the availability of corroborating evidence, as described in section 208(b)(1)(B), 245(c)(4)(B), or 245(b)(3)(C), unless the court finds that a reasonable trier of fact is compelled to conclude that such corroborating evidence is unavailable.”

(d) **Standard of Review for Orders of Removal.**—Section 242(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end, after sub-paragraph (D), the following:—“No court shall reverse a determination made by a trier of fact with respect to the availability of corroborating evidence, as described in section 208(b)(1)(B), 245(c)(4)(B), or 245(b)(3)(C), unless the court finds that a reasonable trier of fact is compelled to conclude that such corroborating evidence is unavailable.”

(e) **Classification of Aliens.**—Section 102(c) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1106 note) is amended to read as follows:

> **(c) Waiver.—**
> **(1) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall have the authority to waive, and shall waive, all laws such Secretary, in such Secretary’s sole discretion, determines necessary to ensure expeditious construction of the barriers and roads under this section.**

> **(2) No Judicial Review.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or non-statutory) or Executive Order, no court or other entity shall have jurisdiction—**
> **(A) to hear any case or claim arising from any decision made by the Secretary of Homeland Security pursuant to paragraph (1); or**
> **(B) to order compensatory, declaratory, injunctive, or any other relief for damage alleged to arise from any such action or decision.”**

**SEC. 103. INADMISSIBILITY DUE TO TERRORIST AND TERRORIST-RELATED ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **In General.**—So much of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(i)) as precedes the last sentence is amended to read as follows:

> **(i) In General.—**

> **(1) has engaged in a terrorist activity;**

> **(II) a consular officer, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security knows, or has reasonable ground to believe, is engaged in or is likely to engage after any terrorist activity;**

> **(III) has, under circumstances indicating an intention to cause death or seriously bodily harm, incited terrorism activity;**

> **(IV) is a representative (as defined in clause (v) of—**

> **(aa) a terrorist organization (as defined in clause (vi)); or**

> **(bb) a political, social, or other group that endorses or espouses terrorist activity;**

> **(V) is a member of a terrorist organization described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (vi);**

> **(VI) is a member of a terrorist organization described in clause (vi)(III), unless the alien can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the alien did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization;**

> **(VII) endorses or espouses terrorist activity or persuades others to endorse or espouse terrorist activity or support a terrorist organization;**

> **(VIII) has received military-type training (as defined in section 2339A(c)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from or on behalf of any organization that, at the time the training was received, was a terrorist organization (as defined in clause (vi)); or**

> **(IX) is the spouse or child of an alien who is inadmissible under this subsection, if the activity causing the alien to be found inadmissible occurred within the last 5 years, is inadmissible.”**
(b) ENGAGE IN TERRORIST ACTIVITY DEFINED.—Section 212(a)(3)(B)(iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

“(iv) ENGAGE IN TERRORIST ACTIVITY DEFINED.—As used in this Act, the term ‘engage in terrorist activity’ means, in an individual capacity and as a member of an organization, the willful and deliberate conduct of an organization for the purpose of causing death or serious bodily injury, a terrorist activity;

“(I) to commit or to incite to commit, under circumstances indicating an intention to cause death or serious bodily injury, a terrorist activity;

“(II) to prepare or plan a terrorist activity;

“(III) to gather information on potential targets of terrorist activity;

“(IV) to soliciting or cause others to solicit funds or other things of value for—

“(aa) a terrorist activity;

“(bb) a terrorist organization described in clause (vi)(I) or (vi)(II); or

“(cc) a terrorist organization described in clause (vi)(III), unless the solicitor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization;

“(V) to solicit any individual—

“(aa) to engage in conduct otherwise described in this subsection;

“(bb) to engage in membership in a terrorist organization described in clause (vi)(I) or (vi)(II); or

“(cc) to membership in a terrorist organization or to any member of such an organization, unless the solicitor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization; or

“(VI) to commit an act that the actor knows, or reasonably should know, affords material support, including a safe house, transportation, communications, funds, transfer of funds or other material financial benefit, false documentation or identification, weapons (including chemical, biological, or radiological weapons), explosives, or training—

“(a) to the commission of a terrorist activity;

“(bb) to any individual who the actor knows, or reasonably should know, has committed or plans to commit a terrorist activity;

“(cc) to a terrorist organization described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (vi); or

“(dd) to a terrorist organization described in clause (vi)(III), unless the actor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the actor did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization, or

“(VII) to solicit the organization, after consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, or to the Attorney General, with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, concludes in his sole unreviewable discretion, that this clause should not apply.

(c) TERRORIST ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—Section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182a(3)(B)(vi)) is amended to read as follows:

“(VI) TERRORIST ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term ‘terrorist organization’ means an organization—

“(I) designated under section 219;

“(II) otherwise designated, upon publication in the Federal Register, by the Secretary of State in consultation with or upon the request of the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security, as a terrorist organization, after finding that the organization engages in the activities described in subsections (I) through (VI) of clause (iv).

“(III) that is a group of two or more individuals, whether organized or not, which engages in, or has a subgroup which engages in, the activities described in subclauses (I) through (VI) of clause (iv).

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and their amendments, and section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182a(3)(B)), as amended by this section, shall apply to—

“(1) removal proceedings instituted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

“(2) acts and conditions constituting a ground for inadmissibility, inadmissibility, deportation, or removal occurring or existing before, on, or after such date.

SEC. 104. REMOVAL OF TERRORISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 237(a)(4)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)(B)) is amended as follows:

“(B) TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.—Any alien who is described in subparagraph (B) or (F) of section 212(a)(3) is deportable.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and the amendment, and section 237(a)(4)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)(B)), as amended by such paragraph, shall apply to—

“(A) removal proceedings instituted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

“(B) acts and conditions constituting a ground for inadmissibility, inadmissibility, deportability, or removal occurring or existing before, on, or after such date.

SEC. 105. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF REMOVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting ‘statutory or nonstatutory’, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, and review pursuant to any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory),’;

“(B) in paragraph (9), by adding at the end the following: ‘Except as otherwise provided in this section, no court shall have jurisdiction of habeas corpus cases under title 28 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, by habeas corpus provision, sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, or by any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), in such an order or such questions of law or fact:’; and

“(3) in subsection (g), by inserting ‘statutory or nonstatutory’, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, after ‘notwithstanding any other provision of law’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to cases in which the final administrative order of removal, deportation, or exclusion was issued before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TRANSFER OF CASES.—If an alien’s case, brought under section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, and challenging a final administrative order of removal, deportation, or exclusion, is pending in a district court on the date of the enactment of this Act, then the district court shall transfer the part of the case that challenges the order of removal, deportation, or exclusion to the court of appeals for the circuit in which a petition for review could have been properly filed under section 242(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252), as amended by this section, or under section 309(c)(4)(D) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note). The court of appeals shall treat the transferred case as if it had been brought under section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, and review pursuant to any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, as provided in subsection (e).

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF LEGAL CLAIMS.—Nothing in subparagraph (B) or (C), or in any other provision of this Act which limits or eliminates judicial review, shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or pure questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section.

(e) CLAUSES UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of any cause or claim under the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, except as provided in subsec—
TITLE II—IMPROVED SECURITY FOR DRIVING LICENSES AND PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARDS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.
In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) DRIVER'S LICENSE.—The term ‘‘driver’s license’’ means a motor vehicle operator’s license, as defined in section 30001 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—The term ‘‘identification card’’ means a personal identification card, as defined in section 1028(d) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(4) STATE.—The term ‘‘State’’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 202. MINIMUM DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS AND SECURITY STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, a Federal agency may not accept, for any official purpose, a driver’s license or identification card issued by a State unless the State is meeting the requirements of this section.

(b) DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS.—To meet the requirements of this section, a State shall require, at a minimum, the following information and features on each driver’s license and identification card issued to a person by the State:

(1) The person’s full legal name.

(2) The person’s date of birth.

(3) The person’s gender.

(4) The person’s driver’s license or identification card number or identifier.

(5) A digital photograph of the person.

(6) The person’s address of principle residence.

(7) The person’s signature.

(8) Physical security features designed to prevent tampering, counterfeiting, or duplication of the document for fraudulent purposes.

(9) A common machine-readable technology, with defined minimum data elements.

(c) MINIMUM ISSUANCE STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To meet the requirements of this section, a State shall require, at a minimum, presentation and verification of the following information before issuing a driver’s license or identification card to a person:

(A) A photo identity document, except that a non-photo identity document is acceptable if it includes both the person’s full legal name and date of birth.

(B) Documentation showing the person’s date of birth.

(C) Proof of the person’s social security account number or verification that the person is not eligible for a social security account number.

(D) Documentation showing the person’s name and address of principal residence.

(2) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To meet the requirements of this section, a State shall comply with the minimum standards of this paragraph.

(B) EVIDENCE OF LAWFUL STATUS.—A State shall require, before issuing a driver’s license or identification card to a person, valid documentation evidence that the status by which the applicant is qualified for the temporary protected status in the United States is:

(i) a citizen of the United States;

(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent or temporary residence in the United States;

(iii) has conditional permanent resident status in the United States;

(iv) has an approved application for asylum in the United States; has entered into the United States in refugee status;

(v) has a valid, unexpired nonimmigrant visa or nonimmigrant visa status for entry into the United States;

(vi) has a pending application for asylum in the United States;

(vii) has a pending or approved application for temporary protected status in the United States;

(viii) has approved deferred action status; or

(ix) has a pending application for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States or conditional permanent resident status in the United States.

(3)DISPLAY OF EXPIRATION DATE.—A temporary driver’s license or temporary identification card issued pursuant to this subparagraph shall clearly indicate that it is temporary and shall state the date on which it expires.

(4) RENEWAL.—A temporary driver’s license or temporary identification card issued pursuant to this subparagraph shall be valid only during the period of time of the applicant’s authorized stay in the United States or, if there is no definite end to the period of authorized stay, a period of one year.

(5) VERIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS.—To meet the requirements of this section, a State shall implement the following procedures:

(A) Before issuing a driver’s license or identification card to a person, the State agency shall verify, with the issuing agency, the issuance, validity, and completeness of each document required to be presented by the person under paragraph (1) or (2).

(B) The State agency shall not accept any foreign document, other than an official passport, to satisfy a requirement of paragraph (1) or (2).

(6) Not later than September 11, 2005, the automated system known as the ‘‘Driver License Agreement’’, shall electronically exchange driver’s licenses and identification cards between States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR INFORMATION.—A State motor vehicle database shall contain, at a minimum, the following information:

(1) All data fields printed on drivers’ licenses and identification cards issued by the State.

(2) Motor vehicle drivers’ histories, including motor vehicle violations, suspensions, and points on licenses.

SEC. 203. LINKING OF DATABASES.

To be eligible to receive any grant or other type of financial assistance made available under this title, a State shall participate in the interstate compact for sharing of driver’s license data, known as the ‘‘Driver License Agreement’’, in order to provide electronic access by a State to information contained in the motor vehicle database of all other States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR INFORMATION.—A State motor vehicle database shall contain, at a minimum, the following information:

(1) All data fields printed on drivers’ licenses and identification cards issued by the State.

(2) Motor vehicle drivers’ histories, including motor vehicle violations, suspensions, and points on licenses.

SEC. 204. TRAFFICKING IN AUTHENTICATION FEATURES FOR FALSE IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENTS.

Section 1028(a)(8) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘‘false authentication features’’ and inserting ‘‘false or actual authentication features’’.

SEC. 205. GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to a State to assist the State in conforming to the minimum standards set forth in this title.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $10,000 for fiscal years 2005 through 2009 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.
delivery bonds in connection with any matter gov-
erned by the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended (8 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.), and who receives a premium for executing or countersigning a bond.

5. SURETY.—The term “surety” means an entity, as defined by, and that is in compliance with, sections 9304 through 9308 of title 31, United States Code, and the surety as required by subparagraph (III), and the surety as required by subparagraph (III).

6. SURRENDER OF PRINCIPAL; FORFEITURE OF BOND PREMIUM.—

(A) SURRENDER.—At any time, before a breach of any of the bond conditions, if in the opinion of the surety or bonding agent, the principal becomes a flight risk, the principal may be surrendered without the return of any bond premium if the principal—

(i) is charged by an enforcement agency with committing the crime for which the bond was posted;

(ii) hides or is concealed from a surety, a bonding agent, or the Secretary;

(iii) fails to report to the Secretary as required at least annually; or

(iv) violates the contract with the bonding agent or surety, commits any act that may lead to a breach of the bond, or otherwise violates any other obligation or condition of the bond established by the Secretary.

(B) CERTIFIED COPY OF ARREST WARRANT TO ACCOMPANY SURRENDER.—

(i) shall have the right to petition the Secretary of Homeland Security or any Federal court, without having to pay any fees or costs, for an arrest warrant for the arrest of the principal; and

(ii) shall forthwith be provided 2 certified copies each of the arrest warrant and the bond undertaking, without having to pay any fees or costs; and

(iii) shall have the right to pursue, apprehend, detain, and surrender the principal, together with certified copies of the arrest warrant and the bond undertaking, to any Department of Homeland Security detention official or Detention detention facility or any detention facility authorized to hold Federal detainees.

(B) EFFECTS OF DELIVERY.—Upon surrender of a principal under subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) the official to whom the principal is surrendered shall detain the principal in custody and issue a written certificate of surrender; and

(ii) the Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately exonerate the surety from any further liability on the bond.

8. FORM OF BOND.—Delivery bonds shall in all cases be given as a penalty for failure to perform the undertaking in accordance with, sections 9304 through 9308 of title 31, United States Code, and the surety as required by subparagraph (III), and the surety as required by subparagraph (III).

“(A) Breach of bond; procedure, forfeiture, notice.—

(i) If a principal violates any condition of the delivery bond, or the principal is or becomes subject to a final administrative order of deportation or removal, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately issue a warrant for the arrest of the principal and enter that order into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) computerized information database.

“(ii) The order the bonding agent and surety to take the principal into custody and surrender the principal to any one of 10 Department of Homeland Security ‘turn-in’ centers located nationwide in the areas of greatest need, at any time of day during 15 months after mailing the arrest warrant and the order to the bonding agent and the surety as required by subclause (III), and immediately enter that order into the
The mailing of the arrest warrant and order to the bonding agent and the surety required under clause (i)(III), an amount equal to 25 percent of the face amount of the bond shall be assessed as a penalty against the surety.

(ii) If compliance occurs more than 21 months but no more than 24 months after the mailing of the arrest warrant and order to the bonding agent and the surety required under clause (i)(III), an amount equal to 75 percent of the face amount of the bond shall be assessed as a penalty against the surety.

(iii) If compliance occurs 24 months or more after the mailing of the arrest warrant and order to the bonding agent and the surety required under clause (i)(III), and the surety would otherwise receive shall be offset by and applied as a credit against the amount of penalties on bonds it owes the United States Government or any State or local government or any subsidiary or police agency thereof regarding the principal that the Secretary of Homeland Security, by regulations subject to approval by Congress, determines to have substantially performed all conditions imposed by the terms of the bond, and shall be released from liability on the bond, if the alien is deported, detained, or otherwise released before, on, or after such date.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in August 2004, the bipartisan chairman of the 9/11 Commission testified at the Select Committee on Homeland Security that border security combined with the routine and effective enforcement of immigration laws must be a top priority for Congress and the administration if our country can expect to secure the homeland and prevent another tragedy like what happened on 9/11 from happening again here in America.

The 9/11 Commission report states on page 384 that "looking back, we can also see that the routine operations of our immigration laws, that is, aspects of the laws not specifically aimed at immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) subject to such reasonable regulations as the Secretary of Homeland Security may prescribe, shall permit statements, servants, and employees of corporate sureties to visit in person with individuals detained by the Secretary and, subject to section 241(a)(b), may be required to deliver a bond of at least $10,000, with surety approved by the Secretary, and containing conditions and procedures prescribed by section 105 of the Real ID Act of 2005 that the Secretary, but the Secretary shall not release the alien on or to his own recognizance unless an order of an immigration judge expressly finds and states in a signed order to release the alien to his own recognition that the alien is not a flight risk and is not a threat to national security combined with the routine and effective enforcement of immigration laws must be a top priority for Congress and the administration if our country can expect to secure the homeland and prevent another tragedy like what happened on 9/11 from happening again here in America.

There is no more basic homeland security function of our legal system than deporting aliens who have been afforded due process and who have subsequently been ordered deported by a Federal judge. Sadly, according to our government's best statistics, only 13 percent of the aliens arrested entering the country illegally and ordered deported are actually removed.

As a result, people entering the country illegally or terrorist intent have quickly learned that, if arrested, they can be quickly released on their own word, and that they can be deported.
This amendment has had no hearings, and here we are talking about giving extraordinary powers to bondsmen. This means if you are an immigrant undocumented in removal proceedings working with a lawyer, working with family members, you are then dispatching bondspersons with no direct immigration training to round you up and immediately bring you to a point of deportation where you are in the middle of a legal process. If that is not a threat, and I believe that is the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, I would severely and strongly disagree. Yes, individuals who are in line to be deported is an issue. We need more detention beds and more security at our borders, but we do not need to outsource to bondspersons, however financially opportunistic it may be, and as a former judge and someone who deals with these issues in my private practice before coming to Congress, I realize bondspersons have their role, but not to contract out to deal with this issue.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) mentions, but may I give a historical perspective, and that is of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act. The truly frightening part of this legislation is that it smacks of that kind of effort. The Fugitive Slave Act gave virtual unfettered power to bounty hunters to seize slaves in the free States and return or send them to slavery in the slave States, obviously with little regard for their legal status in free States with no due process and no right to defend themselves. That was 1850.

If we randomly give the opportunity to bondsmen who have no understanding of immigration laws, we can be assured that in a discriminatory fashion they will be rounding up people who look different and speak different languages, and we will be impacted in a very negative way.

I close by saying all of us in our congressional districts hear the hardship cases of immigrants who are seeking legal status who have been in line for long times who have had terrible things happen to them because of the complexity of the immigration system. That speaks for comprehensive immigration reform, but those are the very victims, those sad cases, that are going to be impacted by this amendment. I rise in opposition to the amendment that my colleague Congressman SESSIONS has offered. This amendment would empower bail bondsmen to enforce immigration laws by summarily rounding up and deporting people. It would outsource an important government immigration enforcement responsibility to the bail bonds industry, eliminating the few procedural safeguards that we have when challenging deportation. This would be a dramatic change in how we arrest and detain people in removal proceedings. Many people rounded up in this manner would turn out not to be deportable after all. They may be U.S. citizens; they may not be removable under current law. This is nothing new. They require aliens to post a cash deposit and provide a written commitment they will appear in court. If the alien who posts bond violates any conditions of the bond, the bonding agent can take the alien into custody and surrender him to the Department of Homeland Security.

The Sessions amendment helps correct this problem by giving the Department of Homeland Security guidance on the use of delivery bonds. Delivery bonds are already authorized under current law. This is nothing new. They require aliens to post a cash deposit and provide a written commitment they will appear in court. If the alien who posts bond violates any conditions of the bond, the bonding agent can take the alien into custody and surrender him to the Department of Homeland Security.

I am particularly disturbed by the fact that these dramatic policy changes have never been reviewed or examined by a Congressional committee. There were no hearings. No debate occurred. No scrutiny at all. In fact, the language of this amendment was only recently made available. Without Committee scrutiny, we would be giving bondsmen vast, unfettered authority to apprehend, detain and surrender immigrants—even when the bond is not breached. This is a certain recipe for mistake, mistakes, and the tampering of civil, due process and human rights. Without Committee scrutiny, we would be allowing bonding agents to decide when people are flight risks and to round them up and hand them over to DHS for deportation. Without Committee scrutiny we would be permitting bonding agents to be forfeited and people deported for not notifying DHS of changes of address prior to a move—even though DHS regulations give immigrants 10 days after a move to notify the agency of the change. Without Committee scrutiny, we would be encouraging bonding agents to have access to all information held by the U.S. Government or any State or local government that may be helpful in locating or surrendering the person who is the subject of the bond. Without Committee scrutiny, we would be encouraging the disclosure of sensitive or confidential information to a bonding agent, such as: medical history; criminal investigation notes, location of witnesses, and information on victims of domestic violence. I urge you to vote against this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Sessions amendment. This amendment helps ensure that deportable aliens are actually removed from the United States. Incredibly, by 13 percent of illegal aliens arrested and ordered deported are actually removed from the country. Illegal aliens trying to sneak across the borders realize that, even if they get caught, they likely will never be required to leave. Of course, that only encourages illegal immigration.

The Sessions amendment helps correct this problem by giving the Department of Homeland Security guidance on the use of delivery bonds. Delivery bonds are already authorized under current law. This is nothing new. They require aliens to post a cash deposit and provide a written commitment they will appear in court. If the alien who posts bond violates any conditions of the bond, the bonding agent can take the alien into custody and surrender him to the Department of Homeland Security.

The Sessions amendment improves the use of delivery bonds by setting up 10 turn-in centers around the country to help bonding agents turn over deportable aliens to the Department of Homeland Security. It also sets up a system to encourage bonding agents to...
Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me make a point that I think should be very clear. This legislation will not just impact those who are undocumented. This legislation will impact those immigrants who have legal status. In the process of reviewing or revising that status, they too become part of the large webbed fishnet of hauling people in by people who are inexperienced in this area.

So I would offer to my colleagues that this is random, it is reckless, and it needs a bipartisan look and oversight committee assessment.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment that I have comes as a result of my paying attention to not only the 9/11 Commission, but also my service to the Select Committee on Homeland Security in the prior Congress. It was very obvious to members of the committee, as we heard testimony from the Immigration and Naturalization Service’s Inspector General report from the Department of Justice where they recognized the deficiencies that they had, where a person who had gone through an entire process in front of a Federal judge was ordered removed and yet only 13 percent of those were removed from the country.

We have a problem. We have a problem that was enumerated in the 9/11 Commission report. We are utilizing the techniques that are not only available in the law, but also that many courts utilize today. Federal courts as well as city and State courts across the United States. We need to make sure that people who have gone through a hearing have been given the opportunity to make sure that they can present their case, but then have been ordered deported do so.

The United States needs to make sure that the tools which we do, we give the tools to implement those necessary ways to enforce the laws of the United States to be done; for those who have been ordered to be deported and have not done so, we are giving them a better tool kit. That is why the Sessions amendment is being offered.

I support this, and I hope the members will vote “aye” on the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, let me also refer my colleagues to the 9/11 Commission report. What it said is that there were certain systems that needed improving or were broken. They suggested no such solution that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions) has offered.

We need to strengthen the Department of Homeland Security to be able to do its job, but more importantly, we need to be able to build those detention beds, thousands, if we will, to be able to have those that might be dangerous placed in detention locations.

This amendment does not solve that problem at all. The arresting and gathering up of those who might be deported, clearly with no place to go, makes a bigger and worse problem than we might have.

I would ask my colleagues to consider this not well directed and ask them to vote “no.”

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the manager on the Democratic side for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was brought to our attention yesterday evening, and at first blush, this is a shocking correlative point to be made and a comparison to the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, in which agents were given the broad powers to return freed slaves in free States and return them back to slavery.

What we are doing here with bail bondsmen is giving them the ability to enforce immigration laws by summarily rounding up and deporting people and also gaining access to incredible private and secret material in data files.

And I just wanted to briefly ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions) what inspired him to add this to a bill that we already had a considerable number of problems about and have never had any hearings on a provision such as this.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for asking.

The impetus behind this is, these are aliens who have been ordered deported by a Federal judge as a result of a hearing. They have had their day in court. The process is through. They have been ordered deported, and only 13 percent actually are deported.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I need my friend to know that they are in the process of having the claim heard. It has not been terminated or it is not all over. But we are arguing the substance.

What I was trying to figure out is, what inspired the gentleman at this late point in the proceedings, since we had hearings last year, we had no hearings this year, and we just found out about this yesterday.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. UPTON). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 109–4.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CASTLE:

In section 204 of the bill, before “Section” insert “(a) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—"

At the end of section 204 of the bill, insert the following:

(b) USE OF FALSE DRIVER’S LICENSE AT AIRPORTS

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter, into the appropriate aviation security screening database, appropriate information regarding any person convicted of using a false driver’s license at an airport (as such term is defined in section 49012 of title 49, United States Code).

(2) FALSE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “false” has the same meaning such term has under section 1028(d) of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment to the very thorough legislation before us today. The gentleman from Wisconsin’s (Chairman Sensenbrenner) dedication to fixing gaps in our security is commendable, and I am proud to join him in strengthening Federal requirements, protecting those who need political asylum, and improving our border security.

The 9/11 Commission identified gates for boarding airplanes is the last opportunity for our screeners to use sources of identification to ensure that people are who they say they are, and frankly, obviously, to check whether they are terrorists. The impetus for this process, Congress tasked the Department of Homeland Security with the goal of developing and building upon the aviation watch list. That is the impact that will occur? Do these details have been worked out as to how we utilize the database or who gets into the database if, by chance, the utilization was a mistake even though they violated the law?

So you create this enormous database that has those who potentially would do us harm, but others, unfortunately, that got themselves into the criminal justice system. My amendment would do us harm, but others, unfortunately, that got themselves into the criminal justice system. My amendment would send notice to those who might try to use any false document in trying to get on an airplane for the potential damage it may do.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that my colleague Congressman CASTLE has offered. This amendment would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to enter into an aviation security database the terrorists are not getting on these planes. Congress should do everything in our power to make their job easier.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may do.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, clearly this amendment has good intentions, and I think it is important to note that the amendment would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to enter into an aviation security database the name and other information about people who have been convicted of using a false driver’s license for the purpose of boarding an airplane. The objective of this amendment is to enhance our ability to track and detect potential security threats, and as I indicated, I support the objective. I think it is important to require the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to have information in his database about people who have been convicted of using a false driver’s license.

But as they all say, the devil is in the details. Again, the same predicament or afflication that impacted the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) impacts this. Where is the hearing? Where is the oversight? Where is the impact that will occur? Do these amendments also include individuals who mistakenly have such a driver’s license, if that may be the case, and where is the basis for it?

I was just looking at a letter from Commissioner Hamilton, who talked about controversial provisions that everyone suggests came out of the 9/11 Commission, and what he said very carefully was that these are, in fact, recommendations. As the intelligence bill did in the last session with enormous vetting, hearings, oversight, conference committees at the later stage, it almost became a hearing. None of these amendments have been given the kind of vetting that one would know that these are valuable and that the details have been worked out as to how we utilize the database or who gets into the database if, by chance, the utilization was a mistake even though they violated the law.
name and other information about people who have been convicted of using a false driver's license for the purpose of boarding an airplane.

The objective of this amendment is to enhance our ability to track and detect potential security threats. I support this objective, and I think it makes good sense to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to have information in his database about people who have been convicted of using a false driver's license. As they say, however, "the devil is in the details." I would like a hearing and a markup on this amendment before it is considered further. I urge you to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, because I think the gentlewoman from Texas has made some very valid points that need to be discussed.

One thing that is important and what we have done here is to understand that there has to be a conviction in this situation by a court of law before it can be entered into a database of the Transportation Security Administration. That is very important. It gives all the protection of what could happen there and a lot about that because it was a matter of some concern. So a mere allegation or something that proves not to be true would never be entered into the database. I wanted to make that point.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the Castle amendment is a sensible amendment to the base bill, and I thank the gentleman from Delaware for offering it. People who present a false driver's license to the Transportation Security Administration are turned over to the proper authorities for some reason that is beyond me we do not add these people to our flight watch list. It blows me away that we do not already utilize this commonsense practice.

Improving the information contained in passenger screening databases will enhance our ability to identify potential terrorists from gaining access to airplanes. We have taken some important steps to improve our security at airports, but we need to do more.

This amendment enhances our last line of defense by tracking potential high-risk passengers without interfering with the rights of everyday travelers. It just makes so much good sense, and I hope that we adopt it quickly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the clarification offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE). I would inquire of the author of the amendment, one question: In your research, did we determine that DHS, new as it is, is not doing that? That is the first question.

On the second, let me have the gentleman restate it again. Because one of the concerns I have is that DHS, new as it is, is not doing that. That is the first question.

One of the concerns I have is that we do not know whether DHS is doing this or what TSA is doing and hearings would have been appropriate. This is a valid issue, let us not doubt that; and, of course, I would hope that we would want a database to do this.

I would like to raise red flags on making sure it is not random, making sure there is a conviction, and in knowing what happens with DHS. I would have wanted to have hearings, but I thank the gentlewoman for his answers.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the author of the amendment, would he have objected to having hearings on his amendment?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield further, no, I would not have objected to having hearings. It is relatively simple. I do not want to go through it. It needs panels of hearings, but I never object to having a hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has the right to close.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has the right to close.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I really do not have anything new to add to this, except that I think it is very important that this be done. We tried to make it as simple as possible with all the judicial support behind it which would make it clearly fair to everybody who might be involved in this.

My sense is that if I were running TSA, which I am not and do not want to, but if I were doing so, this is certainly something that I would want to do; and I would hope that by passing this legislation we will make sure it happens now and into the future.

Part of my motivation for this, by the way, and some other amendments I introduced which were not allowed on this, is I am still convinced that a lot of 9/11, if not the entire procedure, could have been avoided if we had better security measures in place on some of these things.

So I think this is a very important area. While everything else in the 9/11 report is of huge importance, I have always felt that this particular area of making sure who is in this country and who is boarding planes or other transportation systems is vitally important.

So I would hope we would be able to join together and pass an amendment like this and hopefully later the legislation.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just close by raising these points. It looks like we are moving quite quickly. It is the
question of having the answers. This has good intentions, but the answers of what DHS is doing, the training of TSA, what kind of standards are used in different airports. Some TSA person might say it is a mistake, go back. Others might make it in essence a Federal crime that a person is prosecuted. So some you get in the database, others you do not. It is just a question of concern as to how this will work.

Again, it is a good idea. Before I yield back my time, I would simply say that I would suggest that this amendment be addressed again in our hearings, to be able to detail out what would ultimately happen.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my colleague from Delaware. This amendment takes a common sense approach in saying that those who want to board our Nation’s airplanes must show documentation showing their full legal identity. The REAL ID Act, which I strongly support, requires that driver’s licenses must meet tough federal standards, chief among them are the requirements that applicants must demonstrate their legal presence. As a member of the Aviation Subcommittee and as a member from the great state of Texas, I strongly feel we need to put just as much of an emphasis on protecting the skies as we do our land borders. This amendment would simply require the Homeland Security Department to better track those attempting to conceal their identities before boarding airplanes and allow those officials greater authority to screen those passengers and detect threats before they may occur. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The amendment is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 109–4.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KOLBE:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

TITLES III—BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE AND TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION

SEC. 301. VULNERABILITY AND THREAT ASSESSMENT.

(a) STUDY.—The Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Border and Transportation Security, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Science and Technology and the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, shall study the technology, equipment, and personnel needed to address security vulnerabilities within and between each field office of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection that has responsibility for any portion of the United States borders with Canada and Mexico. The Under Secretary shall conduct follow-up studies at least once every 5 years.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Under Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the Under Secretary’s findings and conclude each study conducted under subsection (a) together with legislative recommendations, as appropriate, for addressing any security vulnerabilities found by the study.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2006 through 2011 to carry out any such recommendations from the first study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 302. USE OF GROUND SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES FOR BORDER SECURITY.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Science and Technology, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Border and Transportation Security, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, the Secretary of Defense, shall develop a pilot program to utilize, or increase the utilization of, ground surveillance technologies to enhance the border security of the United States. In developing the program, the Under Secretary shall—

(1) consider various current and proposed ground surveillance technologies that could be utilized to enhance the border security of the United States;

(2) assess the threats to the border security of the United States that will be addressed by the utilization of such technologies; and

(3) assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing such technologies to address such threats, including an assessment of the technologies considered best suited to address such threats.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall include the utilization of a variety of ground surveillance technologies in a variety of topographies and areas (including both populated and unpopulated areas) on both the northern and southern borders of the United States in order to evaluate, for a range of circumstances:

(A) the significance of previous experiences with such technologies in homeland security or critical infrastructure protection, for the utilization of such technologies for border security;

(B) the cost, utility, and effectiveness of such technologies for border security; and

(C) liability, safety, and privacy concerns relating to the employment of such technologies for border security.

(2) TECHNOLOGIES.—The ground surveillance technologies utilized in the pilot program shall include—

(A) Video camera technology.

(B) Sensor technology.

(C) Motion detection technology.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Border and Transportation Security shall implement the pilot program, and a report on the pilot program may be made to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the House of Representatives Committees on Science, the House of Representatives Committees on Homeland Security, and the House of Representatives Committees on the Judiciary.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself of such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for indulging me with this amendment. This amendment was legislation which was introduced by several of us that represent border districts last year as a freestanding bill. It is now incorporated here in this bill, or parts of it at least are incorporated in this bill.

Think it is entirely consistent with the goals of H.R. 418, because a key component of securing our borders is increasing technology and communication along the border regions. H.R. 418 is a bill about securing our homeland, and this amendment is a perfect complement to the vision of this very important legislation offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Arizona has become a doormat for illegal immigrants. They pour across our porous border every day. In fact, there are more apprehensions of illegal immigrants in Arizona than the entire rest of the border combined. Many portions of the Arizona border are large
and unpopulated desolate desert areas. They are hard to patrol and difficult to monitor. In these areas and all along the border it is essential to advance ground technologies in order to officially understand and stop those who come through this back door to our Nation.

My amendment to H.R. 418 requires the Department of Homeland Security, working through the field offices of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, to adopt the technology, the equipment and the personnel needed to address security of our borders. Furthermore, the amendment requires that the Department of Homeland Security carry out ground surveillance programs that will improve border security.

While the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 designed a plan to enhance ground surveillance on the northern border, a similar program was not put in place for the southern border. Improvements to ground technologies are absolutely essential in the large expanses of desert and unpopulated lands along the southern border. Finally, this amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to improve communications and information sharing with Federal, State and Tribal government agencies. The various agencies with jurisdiction over the southern border must be able to communicate.

This is particularly a problem in Arizona, because more than half of the entire border is covered by Tribal organizations. Tribal units, sovereign Tribal nations who are not generally covered by most of the Federal legislation we have on telecommunication sharing.

Having customs agents unable to communicate with border patrol agents or with the policemen from the Tohono O’odham Nation around the same port of entry is really quite ridiculous. This portion of the amendment addresses problems with the use of incompatible communications technologies and requires that the Department of Homeland Security rectify this situation.

The amendment builds on the sentiment, it builds on the intention of H.R. 418, and through its enhancement of homeland security helps to ensure the safety and defense of our Nation. I think it will be a step, perhaps a small step, but one of the very important steps along our southern border to helping improve the technology and our ability to secure that southern border.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member that is opposed to the amendment, seeking time in opposition to the amendment?

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe amendment. I am very glad to see my friend and colleague finding a good and worthy way to retool 21st-century technology to complement the way we police and protect our borders. Like many other Democrats, I have long supported monitoring our borders 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I feel strongly that border security should include a comprehensive technology assessment, an analysis of high-altitude monitoring technologies for use with land-based systems and, importantly, full funding of the plan.

Even with the border fence, like we have in San Diego, technology is still needed to assist with monitoring and the effective placement of human resources. There are many companies in the private sector which offer all kinds of ways to enhance our ability to secure the border. Congress has passed laws increasing personnel and technology. So what we need most now is an evaluation of what it will take to secure our borders. An assessment of technology equipment and personnel would be extremely helpful to all of us in making future decisions about additional increases.

As we know, sensors and cameras are being used in many locations, including San Diego. But the Kolbe amendment represents a thoughtful approach; let us not just deploy equipment; let us ensure that the equipment works to address the gaps at our land borders.

Simply deploying equipment is not the answer. The solution must match the need. A ground surveillance program, in partnership with the remote aerial surveillance program, would go a long way towards achieving real border security.

Unfortunately, technologies have been employed on an ad hoc basis in the past and are not part of an overall technology deployment plan. The Kolbe amendment gives us a realistic hope for an overall plan for smarter border security.

Technology and information-sharing is critical if our frontline personnel are to effectively secure our Nation’s borders.

Importantly, I remind my colleagues that these surveillance systems still require Border Patrol agents to apprehend illegal border crossers and contraband. Border Patrol agents repeatedly tell me that they are inadequately staffed to do their job. Funding the 9/11 bill to authorize levels is a critical component of securing America’s borders. If the President will not do it, Mr. Chairman, let us make sure that Congress does.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my good friend, for introducing this amendment, but I would like to touch on another area that is also very, very important.

Let me say that the Border Patrol need all the help that they can get. We have another serious problem that I hope that we can touch on, and that is what is known as the OTMs, or Other Than Mexicans.

My district includes a portion of the McAllen Border Patrol sector. Last year, in the fiscal year, almost 17,000 OTMs came across through that Border Patrol sector, representing at least anywhere from 76 to 80 countries coming across into the United States. This is a serious problem about the security of this country.

As I talk to the Border Patrol officials, they know one thing, that we do not have sufficient detention facilities. So what happens to them? They come across, they do not have to be picked up by the Border Patrol. They surrender themselves to the Border Patrol and say, I am from Colombia, I am from Egypt, I am from any other country; and they know that they do not have sufficient facilities.

So what happens? They go and process these individuals, and they come in clusters from Mexico. When they come across, it takes 10, 12, 15 Border Patrol people to come and bring them to the facilities to process them. It takes 2½ hours to do that. When this happens, in the meantime, the border is completely open, because those Border Patrol people were removed to process these individuals.

What happens next? After the 2½ hours, they go and take them to the bus station, and they give them a little piece of paper that says, you are supposed to appear on the 15th of whatever month, 60 to 90 days from now. One of these guys just finished paying $900 to be brought across. Do my colleagues think he is going to come in?

This is another issue that we need to study about.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

And I appreciate it. They do not have to be picked up by the Border Patrol. They surrender themselves to the Border Patrol and say, I am from Colombia, I am from Egypt, I am from any other country; and they know that they do not have sufficient facilities.

So what happens? They go and process these individuals, and they come in clusters from Mexico. When they come across, it takes 10, 12, 15 Border Patrol people to come and bring them to the facilities to process them. It takes 2½ hours to do that. They do not have to be picked up by the Border Patrol. They surrender themselves to the Border Patrol and say, I am from Colombia, I am from Egypt, I am from any other country; and they know that they do not have sufficient facilities.

What happens next? After the 2½ hours, they go and take them to the bus station, and they give them a little piece of paper that says, you are supposed to appear on the 15th of whatever month, 60 to 90 days from now. One of these guys just finished paying $900 to be brought across. Do my colleagues think he is going to come in?

This is another issue that we need to study about.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

And I appreciate it. They do not have to be picked up by the Border Patrol. They surrender themselves to the Border Patrol and say, I am from Colombia, I am from Egypt, I am from any other country; and they know that they do not have sufficient facilities.

So what happens? They go and process these individuals, and they come in clusters from Mexico. When they come across, it takes 10, 12, 15 Border Patrol people to come and bring them to the facilities to process them. It takes 2½ hours to do that. When this happens, in the meantime, the border is completely open, because those Border Patrol people were removed to process these individuals.

What happens next? After the 2½ hours, they go and take them to the bus station, and they give them a little piece of paper that says, you are supposed to appear on the 15th of whatever month, 60 to 90 days from now. One of these guys just finished paying $900 to be brought across. Do my colleagues think he is going to come in?

This is another issue that we need to study about.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

And I appreciate it. They do not have to be picked up by the Border Patrol. They surrender themselves to the Border Patrol and say, I am from Colombia, I am from Egypt, I am from any other country; and they know that they do not have sufficient facilities.

So what happens? They go and process these individuals, and they come in clusters from Mexico. When they come across, it takes 10, 12, 15 Border Patrol people to come and bring them to the facilities to process them. It takes 2½ hours to do that. When this happens, in the meantime, the border is completely open, because those Border Patrol people were removed to process these individuals.

What happens next? After the 2½ hours, they go and take them to the bus station, and they give them a little piece of paper that says, you are supposed to appear on the 15th of whatever month, 60 to 90 days from now. One of these guys just finished paying $900 to be brought across. Do my colleagues think he is going to come in?

This is another issue that we need to study about.
Now, I happen to believe, along with my colleague, that we need comprehensive immigration reform that has to be part of our long-term plan. But in the interim, we certainly need to do some things, and this amendment goes a long way toward doing them. We need to address vulnerability and threat assessments. DHS needs to see what kind of technology, what kind of personnel and equipment is going to be needed.

All of us have viewed over the past couple of years the new technologies in land and surface surveillance, and they are promising. They are things that can be done that are not being done. We need a good assessment and recommendations made for us to follow through on.

We have aerial work that is being done; not enough, more surveillance is needed there. Also, this amendment calls for increased communications, better communications between those on the ground and those of us here as policymakers and those who implement the policy. We simply need better information to be able to have recommendations that we can follow up on.

We have, obviously, limited resources at our disposal. We need to make sure that they are employed in the best way possible, and this amendment will go a long way toward ensuring that.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this forward, and the chairman for insisting that this bill be brought forward.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe amendment. I also thank my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from California, for yielding me this time and, as well, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) is absolutely right. The southern border now lends itself to the doorway of terrorism because of this concept of OTMs, and the idea that they are given just a piece of paper, as he said, that says, Show up, and no one is required to show up; or when I say, Required, there is no pressure, no enforcement, of their showing up.

So technology is certainly what we need, and I hope, as we move forward in the Select Committee on Homeland Security, we will, if you will, author bills that will give those resources to the northern and southern border.

But we do need to understand what the gentleman is saying. This is a crisis as it relates to OTMs, particularly dealing with the potential of using that border for terrorists to come across. Technology is one thing, but human participation is another; not what has been offered by the President's budget of 200 Border Patrol agents, but the 2,000 that really will help us secure the borders as necessary. This amendment will go a long way.

I rise in support of the Kolbe amendment. The Kolbe amendment is one of the few ideas that have been proposed on the floor of the House during debate on HR 418 that would help secure our borders.

We must secure our land borders and putting 21st century technology to work for us is the heart of the solution. Homeland Security Democrats support monitoring our borders 24 hours a day—7 days a week.

While the Kolbe amendment falls short of asking for an interagency border security strategy, as Democrats did in the SECURE Border Act, it does get at the key issues of assessing technology and staffing. Now that Congress has passed laws increasing personnel and technology, what we need most is an evaluation of what it will take to secure out borders.

Additionally, while sensors and cameras are currently being used, simple deployment isn't always the answer. The solution must address the problem and take into consideration the terrain. A ground surveillance program in partnership with the remote aerial surveillance program which was mandated as part of the 9/11 bill will go a long way towards achieving real border security. One missing areaelenumber of our personnel going to be in the field, in between the air and ground surveillance programs. I hope that that's addressed. We cannot afford to build systems in isolation.

Lastly, while this amendment does add to the debate on border security, these surveillance systems still require border patrol agents to apprehend illegal border crossings and contraband. When Homeland Security Committee staff visited the southern border last year during a six month investigation, they found and heard Border Patrol agents tell them that they are inadequately staffed to monitor the expansive southern border.

One border patrol support staff member explained that staffing shortages meant that he was responsible for simultaneously viewing 26 cameras for illegal crossings and notifying agents when he saw any crossings. This same employee was also responsible for notifying agents about buried sensor activations numbering from 100–150 an hour, and running computer checks on all detainees. It is clear that despite the fact that we have increased Border Patrol numbers, Border Patrol still lacks critical support staff.

Funding Border Security is a critical component of securing America's borders. If the President won't do it—let's make sure that Congress does.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to close, if there are no further speakers, and acknowledge that we have important work to be done here. We have highly professional personnel at the border, and they are doing their job, but they need more of them. We need to fund the border security proposals that have been put forward for some time. We need to be sure that we fund those.

But the other piece of that, and I am delighted that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has brought that forward, is to be certain that the most sophisticated applications of that technology are used on the border.

I speak to many companies in San Diego. I know that they have a great interest in this. They have been a part of some of these solutions in the past. Let us employ them; let us be sure that we are doing this in a comprehensive fashion.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). We must move forward in this area. We can do a far better job on the border than we have done before.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in Part B of House report 109–4.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. NADLER:

Strike section 101 of the bill (and redesignate the succeeding sections of title I accordingly).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member who opposes each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to strike section 101 of the bill relating to asylum seekers. Under the excuse of protecting national security, the asylum provisions in this bill make it much more difficult for legitimate victims to be granted asylum. The logic seems to be, if you keep out every
asylum seeker, including legitimate victims, they the system cannot be abused.

Proponents of this section make inaccurate, dramatic claims about terrorists who abuse the asylum system to get into the country, but the facts they cite are mostly pre-1996 when the law was changed. Since that 1996 change, asylum seekers are jailed, put in custody until a finding of reasonable fear of persecution is made, so they cannot pose a threat while they are in custody.

Because current law already places the burden of proof on the asylum applicant and places the applicant in custody until he or she meets the initial burden of proof, a terrorist who wishes to enter the United States would most likely attempt to do so by a tourist visa or on fraudulent papers. They are not going to claim political asylum and then be put in jail until they can show a credible fear of persecution.

But this bill seeks to raise the bar when people finally do get into court. If we pass this bill in its current form, if we pass this bill in its current form, mothers, fathers, children with legitimate asylum claims will be sent back to their persecutors with no benefit to national security.

Current law provides that an asylum seeker must prove a reasonable fear of persecution by reason of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or political opposition. The new provision in this bill would place the burden of proof on the applicant and the witnesses that the applicant for asylum has the burden of proof to prove that he or she is eligible to receive asylum in our country. The Nadler amendment strikes it. But every petitioner, whether it is a plaintiff in a lawsuit or someone who is applying for Social Security disability benefits, has got the burden of proof to show that they are entitled to the relief that they are seeking.

This bill makes it clear that asylum applicants have to prove the same burden of proof as others, and the Nadler amendment strikes that.

The other thing that the Nadler amendment strikes is a detailed explanation of how the immigration judge is to determine the credibility of the applicant and the witnesses that the applicant and the government put before the judge. Every trier of fact in court makes the determination based on the credibility of witnesses. Criminal juries can send someone to their death or to prison on the determination of the credibility of the witnesses, and immigration judges should do so also.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) says that 100 percent of the people who show up at the airport claiming asylum are detained. That is not right. Ninety percent of those people are released. Only 10 percent are detained. But this bill would require proof that one of these factors, race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or political opposition, is the central reason the system cannot be viewed it properly. It did not go before me in voting for the Nadler-Meeck-Jackson-Lee amendment to strike these provisions and keep our law humane and American.

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

Mr. SENSENBERNENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Nadler amendment. It is, I wish those that were arguing against the amendment read it and see what it says, and then I think they will be convinced that this is a commonsense change.

First of all, let me say that the asylum law was designed to provide safe haven to those who are fleeing persecution in their homeland. It is not to be used as a crutch for economic migrants who are coming to the United States because the grass is greener on our side of the border.

Now, the bill as it is currently before us takes away the cap of 10,000 approved asylum applicants who are admitted to permanent residency every year. The Nadler amendment strikes that. The bill as it is currently before us takes away the cap of 10,000 approved asylum applicants who are admitted to permanent residency every year.

Now, the bill as it is currently before us takes away the cap of 10,000 approved asylum applicants who are admitted to permanent residency every year. The Nadler amendment strikes that.

The Nadler amendment strikes it. But every petitioner, whether it is a plaintiff in a lawsuit or someone who is applying for Social Security disability benefits, has got the burden of proof to show that they are entitled to the relief that they are seeking.

This bill makes it clear that asylum applicants have to prove the same burden of proof as others, and the Nadler amendment strikes that.

The other thing that the Nadler amendment strikes is a detailed explanation of how the immigration judge is to determine the credibility of the applicant and the witnesses that the applicant and the government put before the judge. Every trier of fact in court makes the determination based on the credibility of witnesses. Criminal juries can send someone to their death or to prison on the determination of the credibility of the witnesses, and immigration judges should do so also.
Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEEK) for his work on this. It is credibly important.

This is perhaps the most objectionable aspect of this bill. I rise in support of the Nadler/Meeks/Jackson-Lee Amendment to strike section 101 of H.R. 418 which imposes evidentiary requirements on asylum-seekers fleeing persecution and all immigrants who seek withholding of removal.

Without a doubt, if this section passes into law, genuine bona fide refugees who have fled horrible persecution that qualifies them for protection from our government will be returned to face more terror, torture and death at the hands of their persecutors. Chairmen SENSENBRENNER is using the public’s fear of terrorism to radically change asylum law for all asylees, not just those with some connection to terrorism.

Section 101 will not make us one bit safer. Without a doubt, if this section passes into law, genuine bona fide refugees who have fled horrible persecution that qualifies them for protection from our government will be returned to face more terror, torture and death at the hands of their persecutors. Chairmen SENSENBRENNER is using the public’s fear of terrorism to radically change asylum law for all asylees, not just those with some connection to terrorism.

Second, the bill requires asylum-seekers to show evidence corroborating their testimony, and it would bar judicial review of decisions regarding that evidence. Yet many refugees have made to a U.S. official, or inconsistently in witness and documentary evidence that is provided. In addition, it allows denials of on the basis of subjective assessments of an applicant’s demeanor, a factor that is frequently misinterpreted by U.S. judges due to cultural differences. Thus, a person could be denied asylum due to an immaterial inconsistency in the evidence they present.

Finally, the bill strips courts from the power to review immigration judge’s discretionary judgments in asylum and removal cases. Unfortunately, this bill takes a significant step in turning our country away from its proud history as a nation of refuge for those fleeing persecution.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler/Meeks/Jackson-Lee amendment to strike section 101 of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEEK).

(Mr. MEEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEEK of Florida, Mr. Chairman, it is very hard for me to respond to what the chairman just shared with us because basically if we do not pass this amendment of striking this 101 section, we might as well just take all the language in 101 and say, if you are being persecuted or if you are being raped as a woman or you are being abused as a child, do not come to America because that is basically what this amendment is saying.

They were raising the bar beyond the capabilities of the individuals that are fleeing persecution. They are running for their lives literally, and many of these individuals are incarcerated. And those are the media reports of how lax our asylum laws are here in the United States. Because they are not. Where are the law enforcement agencies? Why are they not knocking down the doors in the halls of Congress saying, we really have to tighten up those asylum laws because they are too weak now? Where are they?

We are following the people who have focused on this the most, the 9/11 Commission, and what they are asking for is for us to review and make sure we have good asylum laws in place. We are not saying it is bad. We are not saying it is good. I commend the refugees who are looking at this, but moving in haste and having this manager’s amendment before the Congress and no one has seen it. All of the agencies, all of the religious organizations that are helping these individuals that we are trying to deal with now are saying that they support the Nadler/Meek/Jackson-Lee amendment.

I urge the Members to please support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your comments and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for his leadership.
Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The asylum provisions in H.R. 418 are vitally important to protect our constituents from child molesters, rapists, murderers, and other criminals, as well as terrorists seeking asylum in our country.

I believe that we must keep the asylum open and honest for those who have a good-faith claim to asylum. However, we must also protect our constituents from aliens who seek to abuse our asylum processes and do harm to our citizens. For instance, because he was free after applying for asylum, Mir Aimal Kansi was able to murder two CIA agents at CIA headquarters. Ramzi Yousef took advantage of the freedom he gained by applying for asylum to mastermind the first World Trade Center attack which killed six and injured 1,000 in the amendment author's district.

The asylum provisions in H.R. 418 do not prevent aliens from seeking asylum. Those who truly have been persecuted for religious or political grounds will be allowed to present their case. One of the goals of this bill is to ensure that our asylum system is consistent with our judicial system. If a judge or criminal jury can sentence a criminal defendant to life in prison or even execution because they did not believe the defendant's story, certainly an immigration judge can deny an asylum claim to an alien for the same basis.

When an American goes to court to settle a dispute, he bears the burden of proof. Persecution. Requiring the asylum claimant to bear the burden of proof is consistent, both with our justice system and with international law.

Permitting the judge to require an asylum claimant to produce corroborating evidence he has or can obtain without leaving the United States is just common sense. If a claimant says, for example, that he fled his country because he received a threatening letter, the government officer or the judge would be remiss if he failed to ask to see the letter or at least inquire about what happened to the letter.

The asylum protections in the REAL ID Act are vitally important to ensuring the integrity of the asylum system, as well as the security of our Nation and its citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill, H.R. 418, and oppose this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a co-sponsor of the amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER). I thank him for protecting so many of our constitutional rights.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the asylum laws, as amended by my good friend, colleague from Florida, started in World War II when we were reminded of the ugly scene of turning away the St. Louis, the 1,000 Jews who were fleeing persecution.

Let me just protect that we do have an opportunity to review this issue and make it right, but I can tell you that Commissioner Kean and Commissioner Hamilton indicated that in advocating that these are recommendations of the 9/11 Commission; these are not recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. There is no proof or facts that terrorists have been able to pull one over on us in large numbers.

It is very important to let the Commissioner General's study go forward that we evaluated which weaknesses in the United States' asylum system have been or could be exploited by terrorists. We need to understand this.

I do not expect that the report will show that that is happening. It is extremely important that we realize that the 9/11 hijackers entered and remained in the United States as nonimmigrant visitors. They were not individuals who sought asylum.

Let me correct my good friends about the 1993 bombing. These individuals sought asylum, but they were denied asylum. There is not a crisis here; but what is a crisis is when you turn people away from our shores who have come here downtrodden, who are seeking asylum because of religious persecution, because of mutilation of women, because of enormous child abuse or potentially child soldiers, and you turn them away because they do not look like you and, quite, in fact, they cannot make their case.

I would ask my colleagues to consider opposing this amendment.

I rise in support of the amendment that I have offered with my colleagues Representatives NADLER and MEeks. It would strike section 101 of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act, which is entitled, "Preventing Terrorists From Obtaining Relief From Removal." Notwithstanding that title, the provisions in section 101 codify evidentiary standards for asylum proceedings. The supporting evidence that terrorists are gaming our asylum system to enter and remain in the United States.

It is not clear that terrorists actually are gaming our asylum system. Section 5403 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act requires the Comptroller General to conduct a study to evaluate the extent to which weaknesses in the United States asylum system have been or could be exploited by terrorists. We need to wait until this study is completed before we rewrite our asylum laws. We cannot act without weaknesses that have not been identified yet.

I do not expect that report to show that terrorists are gaming our asylum system. The 9/11 hijackers entered and remained in the United States as nonimmigrant visitors. Visitors' visas are easy to get. It only requires a 2-minute interview with an American Consulate Officer to get a visitor's visa. The applicant just has to establish that he will return to his country at the end of the authorized period of stay. Moreover, it would be naı֊ve to think that terrorist organizations do not have ready access to fraudulent entry documents. In contrast, it is difficult and time consuming to enter the United States as an asylum applicant. The terrorist choosing this method would have to present himself at a border and then prove in expedited removal proceedings that he has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The section 101 provisions would not come into play during expedited removal proceedings in any event. They would not apply until the alien is before an immigration judge at an asylum hearing, and by then he has already entered the country.

The approach taken by the REAL ID Act is to raise the bar on the burden of proof for evids are easy to get. It only requires a 2-minute interview with an American Consulate Officer to get a visitor's visa. The applicant just has to establish that he will return to his country at the end of the authorized period of stay. Moreover, it would be naı֊ve to think that terrorist organizations do not have ready access to fraudulent entry documents. In contrast, it is difficult and time consuming to enter the United States as an asylum applicant. The terrorist choosing this method would have to present himself at a border and then prove in expedited removal proceedings that he has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The section 101 provisions would not come into play during expedited removal proceedings in any event. They would not apply until the alien is before an immigration judge at an asylum hearing, and by then he has already entered the country.

The approach taken by the REAL ID Act is to raise the bar on the burden of proof for evids are easy to get. It only requires a 2-minute interview with an American Consulate Officer to get a visitor's visa. The applicant just has to establish that he will return to his country at the end of the authorized period of stay. Moreover, it would be naı֊ve to think that terrorist organizations do not have ready access to fraudulent entry documents. In contrast, it is difficult and time consuming to enter the United States as an asylum applicant. The terrorist choosing this method would have to present himself at a border and then prove in expedited removal proceedings that he has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The section 101 provisions would not come into play during expedited removal proceedings in any event. They would not apply until the alien is before an immigration judge at an asylum hearing, and by then he has already entered the country.

The approach taken by the REAL ID Act is to raise the bar on the burden of proof for evids are easy to get. It only requires a 2-minute interview with an American Consulate Officer to get a visitor's visa. The applicant just has to establish that he will return to his country at the end of the authorized period of stay. Moreover, it would be naı֊ve to think that terrorist organizations do not have ready access to fraudulent entry documents. In contrast, it is difficult and time consuming to enter the United States as an asylum applicant. The terrorist choosing this method would have to present himself at a border and then prove in expedited removal proceedings that he has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The section 101 provisions would not come into play during expedited removal proceedings in any event. They would not apply until the alien is before an immigration judge at an asylum hearing, and by then he has already entered the country.

The approach taken by the REAL ID Act is to raise the bar on the burden of proof for evids are easy to get. It only requires a 2-minute interview with an American Consulate Officer to get a visitor's visa. The applicant just has to establish that he will return to his country at the end of the authorized period of stay. Moreover, it would be naı֊ve to think that terrorist organizations do not have ready access to fraudulent entry documents. In contrast, it is difficult and time consuming to enter the United States as an asylum applicant. The terrorist choosing this method would have to present himself at a border and then prove in expedited removal proceedings that he has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The section 101 provisions would not come into play during expedited removal proceedings in any event. They would not apply until the alien is before an immigration judge at an asylum hearing, and by then he has already entered the country.

The approach taken by the REAL ID Act is to raise the bar on the burden of proof for evi
Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Nadler amendment and ask Members, especially on my side of the aisle, to join us in striking section 101.

Section 101 purports to reform asylum—but it does not. Under the pretext that it mitigates terrorists’ access to the United States, the provision actually does a grave injustice and disservice to the persecuted, such as religious believers, and all others who have a well-founded fear of persecution and who seek asylum in our country.

Section 101 imposes onerous new requirements on the persecuted, including those who have been traumatized by rape, torture, trafficking, and religious hate and persecution, to prove the persecutor’s motive. Read the language. You have got to prove that persecution was a central reason you left and why you are seeking asylum.

I would remind my colleagues that I have been in Congress 25 years. Dictatorships and authoritarian regimes never persecute. It is always some other pretext, whether it be the People’s Republic of China, Vietnam, Cuba. When it was Romania many years back, there was always a false reason. Slander against the Soviet state was back, there was always a false reason.

When it was Romania many years back, there was always a false reason. Slander against the Soviet state was a central reason you left and why you are seeking asylum.

I would remind my colleagues that I have been in Congress 25 years. Dictatorships and authoritarian regimes never persecute. It is always some other pretext, whether it be the People’s Republic of China, Vietnam, Cuba. When it was Romania many years back, there was always a false reason. Slander against the Soviet state was back, there was always a false reason.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to what my distinguished friend from New Jersey says, there are no onerous new requirements to meet the standard for asylum. Page 2 of the managers amendment incorporated in the bill says the applicant has to establish that he is a refugee within the meaning of this section. The applicant must establish that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular cultural group or political opinion was or will be a central reason for persecuting the applicant.

Now, that means that all of the Jewish people who have any degree of ancestry, even if it is not germane to the issue at hand, if they get a date wrong, how many Members have forgotten their wife’s birthday, date or year? We all make mistakes. Get one of those things wrong and the trier of facts can exclude you based on that single situation.

This is an ugly provision. I say with respect to my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, I am against terrorism. 9/11 hurt people in my district. They were hurt big time.

This is an ugly provision, Mr. Speaker. It has led, in my view, the kind of hearing needed in terms of the consequences that it will impose upon true asylum seekers. I hope Members will vote against this.

I have authored 3 Torture Victims Relief laws to help torture victims. I meet with a lot of torture victims. They forget; they have been traumatized. You forget something pursuant to these new requirements and you are a goner. You are being deported back to that country of origin where you have been persecuted.

Vote down the amendment. All of these arguments are a red herring.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, during the debate of the REAL ID Act of 2005, of which I am a co-sponsor, I was unavoidably detained and unfortunately missed the opportunity to ask the proponents of this amendment offered by Representative JERROLD NADLER. If I would have been present, I would have voted a resounding “no” against this amendment. The Nadler amendment would have stricken the provision in the REAL ID Act that tightens and improves our asylum system, which has been abused by terrorists and those who harbor terrorists.

The REAL ID Act will protect the American people by allowing immigration judges to determine witness credibility in asylum cases and ensuring that all terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility are also grounds for deportation. In summary, as a co-sponsor of this bill, I believe that all of the provisions in the REAL ID Act are essential in protecting our citizens from future terrorist plots and I would have voted “no” on the Nadler Amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the Nadler amendment, which would strip the asylum reforms from the “REAL ID Act.”

The asylum provisions in the REAL ID Act are essential. The 9/11 Commission specifically noted that “a number of terrorists...alleged asylum claimants.”

Just last year, a Pakistani national who had applied for asylum was caught while planning to blow up a subway station during the Republican Convention in New York City.

Under a 9th Circuit decision, a judge can determine whether an asylum applicant is lying and still be required to grant the applicant admission.

The DOJ Inspector General reported that it was common for asylum applicants to make claims that they were falsely accused of being terrorists. In this situation, even if the judge believes that the applicant is lying and is a terrorist, the judge may still be required to approve the application.

The REAL ID Act reverses this 9th Circuit decision and makes it harder for terrorists to use a legitimate asylum system. It allows immigration judges—who are judges in most other courts—to determine whether the asylum seeker is telling the truth.

Judges in ordinary criminal courts of law are routinely allowed to determine whether they believe a defendant is lying. Yet, under current law, immigration judges cannot make this common sense determination.

The REAL ID Act is essential in stopping asylum abuse. This amendment would strike the asylum reform provisions and make it easier for suspected terrorists to receive asylum.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by
the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment Number 5 printed in part B the House report 109–4.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B. Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109–4 offered by Mr. FARR.

Strike section 102 of the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I offer myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is simple and straightforward. It strikes Section 102, which is entitled the “Waiver of Laws Necessary for the Improvement of Barriers and Borders” from the bill. I think the provision is trying to fix a process that is not broken.

I order this amendment to strike Section 102, to stop the construction of the remaining 3 miles of the border fence, but to preserve the rule of law that this country was founded on.

I want my colleagues to listen. I want to make this very clear. The breadth of this provision is unprecedented. The border fence in San Diego is under construction right now. Of the 14 miles authorized to be constructed, more than 9 miles of triple fence have been completed. Only two sections have failed. In order to finish the fence, the Customs and Border Patrol has proposed to fill a canyon known as Smugglers Gulch with over 2 million cubic yards of dirt. The triple fence would then be extended across the filled gulch.

In February 2004, the Coastal Commission of California determined that the Customs and Border Patrol had not demonstrated, among other things, that the project was consistent with the “maximized endangered species program” with the policies of the California Coastal Management program, the State program approved under the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act.

The Coastal Zone Management Act requires Federal agency activity within and outside the coastal zone to be carried out in a manner that is consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the policies of an approved State management program.

However, as stringent as these requirements are, if a Federal court finds a Federal activity to be inconsistent with an improved State program, the Secretary determines that the compliance is unlikely to be achieved through mediation, the President may exempt from compliance the activity if the President determines that the activity is in the paramount interest of the United States.

All the authority needed to build the barrier fence already exists in law. We can use laws and process that we have to get this fence built. There is no need for a blanket waiver to get any barrier constructed.

On October 26 of 2004 the Coastal Commission staff met with the Customs and Border Patrol/Homeland Security. In that meeting the Customs and Border Patrol explained why they did not believe additional comments, other than those that had already been agreed upon, were necessary to bring the project into compliance with the applicable coastal policies. Customs and Border Patrol maintained that it still wanted to continue to work with the Coastal Commission on measures they had agreed to, and the Coastal Commission indicated their continued willingness to work with them, despite the overall disagreement with some of the project components such as the Smugglers Gulch fill.

Coastal Commission informed Customs that in order to complete the Federal consistency review process, they would have to write a letter outlining their position. However, the Coastal Commission has not received any letter.

So why are we trying to fix something that is working through the established process of law? I ask because the reach of this amendment is actually the border fence in San Diego.

The proposed section 102 gives an unprecedented waiver and power to the Secretary of Homeland Security, not only for the border fence in San Diego but also for any other barrier. In order to finish the fence, the Customs and Border Patrol proposed to fill a canyon known as Smugglers Gulch with over 2 million cubic yards of dirt. The triple fence would then be extended across the filled gulch.

As I mentioned, there is no evidence that such an extraordinary rejection of the rule of law is necessary in the first instance. Current law already allows the DHS Secretary to waive the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act for the fence construction, the same exemption authorization that was allowed the Attorney General prior to creation of DHS. I look forward to the debate on my amendment.

Today I will offer an amendment. My amendment is simple and straightforward. It strikes Section 102 from Title II of the “H.R. 418, Homeland Security Act of 2005”. The proposed provision is trying to fix a process that is not broken. Section 102 gives an unprecedented waiver and power to the Secretary of Homeland Security. If passed, the Secretary has the sole discretion to waive all laws in order to expedite the construction of barriers and roads. There is no evidence that such an extraordinary rejection of the rule of law is necessary in the first instance. Current law already allows the DHS Secretary to waive the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act for the fence construction, the same exemption authorization that was allowed the Attorney General prior to creation of DHS. I look forward to the debate on my amendment.

As I stated before, H.R. 418 is not a good bill and even more troubling is that we had no hearings or committee debate on it. We need frank and productive dialogue about the state of our immigration system and this bill does nothing to open up the discussion that this country needs to have. I do not support illegal immigration, but I do support the people who are motivated by the desire to obey the rules in order to obtain their citizenship status.

Not only do we have a responsibility and a proud history of protecting those who seek
asylum in our country, which this bill is trying to thwart, we have a responsibility to legal immigrants who are contributing to our society to reduce the lengthy backlog to citizenship. Just earlier this week in meeting with some Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services employees, I was surprised to learn that permanent workers who were hired to help eliminate the backlog four years ago have been asked to stay on for another year. I do not often hear of temporary employees that are necessary for five years. I also learned that one of the reasons is due to the antiquated state of the bureaucracy that legal immigrants experience is due to the antiquated state of technology the Bureau uses. As you can see, these are legitimate concerns about our immigration system that H.R. 418 does not address because it is a bill that has been brought up for political reasons, not legitimate policy reasons. The Republican Leadership of this Congress would do well to heed the President’s comments to begin a dialogue on how to improve our immigration processes, and strengthen our national security, unlike the current legislation brought before us today.

The effects of the REAL ID Act are not only bad for domestic politics, they are destructive for the peace process in the Middle East. The Act strips away an officer, official, representative, or spokesman of the Palestine Liberation Organization is considered, for purposes of this Act, to be engaged in a terrorist activity. In the first place, the United States already has a formal, congressionally approved mechanism for designating foreign terrorist organizations and imposing sanctions on them. The PLO is not on the U.S. list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations. This sneaky, backdoor attempt to override the responsibility of the State Department and the will of Congress is an incredibly stupid way to execute U.S. diplomacy.

Second, we are now on the cusp of a historic moment in the Middle East peace process. The administration has promised that they will be actively engaged in the Middle East peace process. I find it hard to believe that they can be “actively” engaged in the peace process if the President will not be able to invite newly elected President Mahmoud Abbas to his Texas ranch, Camp David or any other venue in the United States. President Abbas appears to be making considerable efforts in brokering peace, and the United States should be supporting his efforts. The effects of this provision will be a diplomatic nightmare and damage the United States’s ability to be a fair broker in the peace process. This provision is an embarrassment to United States diplomacy—it is highly counterproductive to peace negotiations.

Furthermore, I have concerns with the national driver’s license standards in this bill. Currently addresses this issue, but the regulations have been implemented since this bill was passed only 10 weeks ago. National driver’s license standards in this bill create an unfunded mandate for States. Under this bill, at least 10 States would be forced to make dramatic changes to their systems despite the fact that security standards can be attained without the interference this bill creates. State control of the licensing and identification process is crucial to maintaining public safety, bolstering security, reducing fraud, keeping insurance costs down and protecting privacy and Federal standards for such documents should be limited to those enumerated in the intelligence Reform Act of 2004.

Additionally, the proponents of this bill do not want you to know that H.R. 418 would not have prevented 9/11 hijackers from obtaining a driver’s license or ID. The breach of our security was a result of the hijackers having been issued legal visas to come to the United States, which many of them used to apply for driver’s licenses in California. Does H.R. 418 seek to address the root of the problem here? No, obviously not. Again, this bill is political posturing under the guise of national security.

Instead of debating H.R. 418, the House of Representatives should be focused on ensuring the successful enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 and working on comprehensively reforming our immigration system so that immigration is legal, safe, orderly, and reflective of the needs of American families, businesses, and national security.

Leadership should be ashamed to have brought a bill like this that will affect our environment, our citizens, and people from all around the world to the Floor in such a manner. I cannot support the process nor the content policy this bill proposes and I urge my colleagues vote no on H.R. 418.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to find out, if the gentleman knows, has this ever occurred in the history of Federal legislation before that for a given instance all laws, local, State, national, will be waived all at one time for one specific purpose?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, it has never been done before, waiving all labor laws, all contract laws, all small business laws, all laws relating to sacred places. It is a broad sweep, just a total repeal of all of those laws or a waiver of all those laws.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENIBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which continues to have endless litigation against pluging the hole in the fence south of San Diego. We were able to win World War II quicker than we were able to complete this fence. I think that shows why this amendment is a bad one.

I want to get membership the short story that illustrates why the fence has to be completed.

In early January, I sent two of my staff personally to inspect this area. On the day they visited the Imperial Beach Station at the Border Patrol, they conducted an audit of the APIS fingerprint system used to identify criminal aliens among those caught across the border. A man picked at random from a holding area of high-risk detainees, who had been apprehended the night before, was selected for fingerprint check.

Within 15 minutes the system returned a rap sheet that was 17 pages long because he had crossed three different States included abusing his spouse, raping his daughter and multiple counts of theft. This man was apprehended not far from Smuggler’s Gulch and came through the area the fence is not complete. The Border Patrol says he is typical of the one in three aliens they apprehend coming through the 3-mile unfenced area along the beach.

This person is a criminal, and members of the California delegation complained about the cost of California incarcerating criminal aliens. We can cut down that cost and incarcerate fewer criminal aliens by plugging the hole in the fence and keeping them off of the border.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). (Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, many on this side of the aisle also support strong border protection. I certainly do, and I support the fence. This is not an argument, however, about whether to build a fence. It is about what process should be used, and this process is definitely wrong.

Rather than reaching out to the governor of California, a leader in the party on the other side of the aisle, to reach compromise on this issue, the author of this bill has drafted language that will usurp all of Governor Schwarzenegger’s power regarding the border fence. To take the radical steps of eliminating all State and local powers, let alone Federal, and rolling back all judicial review is the height of irresponsible legislating.

Mr. Chairman, this bill sets the dangerous precedent of policing a single Federal official, elected by no one, above all laws, and shields him from accountability, and the reach is beyond the San Diego border. According to the language in this legislation, it is all areas along and in the vicinity of our international borders with both Mexico and Canada.

This is the wrong way to do it. We need to do the right thing.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. SENSENIBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and one of the biggest supporters of Governor Schwarzenegger.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

We started this fence about 20 years ago. We started it by building the first
We had about 10 people being murdered each year, along with numerous robberies and rapes, to such a high degree that the best-selling book, "Lines and Shadows" by Joseph Wambaugh, was written depicting this "no man's land," where nobody wanted to be after dark. So we built that first line, which was the steel fence right on the border. We then built the second fence, that is, the second tier of the so-called triple fence, after we passed a law signed by President Bill Clinton in 1996. And it was President Clinton who signed the bill waiving the Endangered Species Act and waiving NEPA because he thought it was so important that we have security at this, the most porous borders of the United States of America.

Now, I can just tell you, as a guy who has worked on this thing from the start, we went out and found those 79,000 steel landing mats to build this fence. If the extremists had discovered this fence before we got the first 12 miles built, that would not be built. We stopped those 300 drug trucks a month, stopped them dead. We eliminated the 10 murders a year, mostly of undocumented workers. We eliminated the hundreds of rapes of the people who were coming through there because we built that fence.

If the extremists had had their way, they would have gone to a sympathetic Federal court, tied us up in lawsuits, and we would not have had the fence. The Secretary of the Navy has written us a letter saying that completion of this project will enhance the security of our naval installations by reducing the potential threat environment created by an unsecured border. A few miles north of this gap in the fence is the biggest naval installation on the West Coast. Through this gap between the coastal hills of San Diego and Mexico, we had truckloads of drugs coming across in a 100-mile sector that we could not stop. In 1 year, there were a number of rapes and a number of murders by the coyotes and people on the U.S. side of people trying to get across. When my colleague arranged to put up that fence, it stopped all of it.

Why? Why would we do that? Take this floor, if this was a farmer's field and you had a single strand of wire that was lying on the ground, that is what we did on the United States and Mexico. We had truckloads of drugs crossing coming across in a 100-mile sector that we could not stop. In 1 year, there were a number of rapes and a number of murders by the coyotes and people on the U.S. side of people trying to getacross. When my colleague arranged to put up that fence, it stopped all of it.

Now, there are all kinds of ways in which you can stop something here in this body. We can have hearings and say we are going to do this or that, but with the fence area, these 7 miles, another way is to waive the environmental things.

President Clinton recognized that and gave an unprecedented waiver. We need to complete the border fence. Mr. FARR, Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSBRENNER) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to repond, first, to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). He is right, there is in existing law the authorization to waive those issues. It has never been used. It has never been used. This waives all laws, labor laws, every kind of law. This is a draconian approach to try to get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Farr amendment. This bill gives the Secretary unprecedented authority to waive all laws to finish the construction of the security barrier. This bill denies due process to anyone challenging the Secretary's decision by prohibiting judicial review of the Secretary's waivers.

These provisions would undermine the Federal trust responsibility to Indian nations by allowing waivers of Federal law without even providing tribal notification that are specifically designed to protect Native American burial grounds, religious shrines, and cultural and historical sites.

I urge my colleagues to support the Farr amendment.

Mr. SENSBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), another big supporter of Governor Schwarzenegger.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) talked about, in 1990, when he came to me while I was still in the military asking me about landing mats to put up for the border. He and I have actually been down there welding to get that up.

Why? Why would we do that? Take this floor, if this was a farmer's field and you had a single strand of wire that was lying on the ground, that is what we did on the United States and Mexico. We had truckloads of drugs coming across in a 100-mile sector that we could not stop. In 1 year, there were a number of rapes and a number of murders by the coyotes and people on the U.S. side of people trying to getacross. When my colleague arranged to put up that fence, it stopped all of it.

Now, there are all kinds of ways in which you can stop something here in this body. We can have hearings and say we are going to do this or that, but with the fence area, these 7 miles, another way is to waive the environmental things.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) also showed that President Clinton did this. If we do not do this, my colleagues, we will not get it done. And it will help security. Documents that we have captured from al Qaeda show that they consider the border vulnerable with California itself. And so it is not just sealing off the border for security, but it is other things too.

In San Diego, in California, we have about $2 billion a year out of California. That does not account for the $1.5 million a day for the school lunch. Now, I cannot stop those kids. I have been in those schools. There is no way I would take that lunch away from those critters. But we need to secure our border to stop the flow coming in.

If we know, with the bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSBRENNER), who is there legally, it is much easier to tell who is illelgy. So I ask my colleagues to give this support because we really need to complete this.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank you. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 2½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSBRENNER) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to nobody my concern that this bill has regarding the environment, but that is not the point. We have already had our colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. DUNCAN), talk about how we passed specific legislation signed by President Clinton that susemped the Endangered Species Act. What we are talking about here is far beyond that. It is a total suspension of all laws, all laws, health, safety, immigration, payment for private property. All laws, not the environment.

My colleagues would be creating not a couple of miles of exception to finish a fence, but you would be creating a zone 7,514 miles long under the terms of this bill, 5,500 in Canada, almost 2,000 with the border of Mexico, where all laws are suspended in the vicinity of the barrier. My colleagues have no idea how this would happen. They are exempting from compensation.

Mr. Chairman, there are only 11,751 people who have been privileged to serve in this Chamber. I do not think any of them have ever been asked to vote on anything more irresponsible. It is a terrible precedent, unnecessary, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. SENSBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), a close adviser of Governor Schwarzenegger and the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time,
and let me just say what it is that got us here. I have listened to the arguments propounded by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We are here because, as the chairman of the Judiciary said, it has taken longer for this fence than it did to win the Second World War. The problem that we have is, there needs to be recognition that the environmentally sound vote is to complete this fence.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter) held up a poster. If you look at where the fence has been completed, it is pristine, it is clean, it looks great, and it is securing our borders. If you look at that 3½-mile gap, you see all kinds of trash and devastation and you, of course, exacerbate the pressure with the flow of people coming into this country illegally, creating a wide range of problems.

We came this close, when we had strong support, 237 Members of this body in the last Congress who would give the Ose amendment that should have been included in the 9/11 Committee’s recommendation in the conference agreement that we had. The other body prevented us when we were working in the conference on bringing it back. We had indications from Democrats and Republicans alike that if we brought this measure up we could have strong support of it.

It is imperative, it is imperative that we complete this fence. Smugglers Gulch is an area which is, I believe, posing a very serious threat to our stability in this country and in California. So I urge my colleagues to oppose the Farr amendment and cast the environmentally sound vote, which is a “no” vote.

Mr. Farr. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar).

Mr. Oberstar. Mr. Chairman, no person in the last Congress would be given unfettered authority, unfettered discretion to waive any or all laws, for whatever the purpose.

Take this situation. In order to expedite construction of this fence, the Department of Homeland Security could select a contractor without competitive bidding, use undocumented workers, violate child labor laws, pay the workers less than the minimum wage, exempt contractors from Federal and State withholding; workers could be forced to work 18-hour days without overtime pay, in unsafe conditions, and be transported in trucks used for hazardous cargo; and allow the Secretary discretion to have these workers construct fences and roads through private property.

That is wrong. You can build a fence, but you do not have to violate all those laws.

Mr. Farr. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot of talk here today, and I submit that this is not the answer, to emasculate all the laws. I would bet that if the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter), the gentleman from California (Mr. Cunningham), myself and any other interested party sat down, one meeting with all the interested parties, we could resolve this. But that is not the way they want to proceed.

This was not a recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. This is essentially emasculating all laws to get an environmentally project completed. And emasculating all laws is not the way to do it.

This amendment is a good amendment because it does not allow my colleagues to emasculate all laws. What it allows us to do is to let this process work. And with the pressure that has been brought here today, we can get overtime pay, in unsafe conditions, and forced to put in 18-hour-days without State withholding; workers could be violators, violate child labor laws, pay the Secretary of Homeland Security must have the authority to waive all laws he deems necessary for expeditious construction of the barriers and roads under §102 of IIRIRA, but the requirement that the Secretary do so. This provision could provide the Secretary with broader waiver authority than what is currently under §102 of IIRIRA.

This authority would apparently include laws other than the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, but may not include a waiver of protections established in the Constitution. All laws waived, however, must be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to ensure expeditious construction of the barriers and roads. The waiver authority provided by this amendment would also seem to apply to all the barriers that may be constructed under the authority of §102 of IIRIRA. The barrier constructed in the vicinity of the border and the barrier that is to be constructed near the San Diego area.

Congress commonly waives preexisting laws, though the process necessary to complete the waiver and the number of laws waived vary considerably from provision to provision. Even more common is the use of the phrase, “notwithstanding any other provision of law.” While the use of a broad “notwithstanding any other provision of law” in American government, such directives seem facially preclusive, and some courts have determined that “notwithstanding” language may serve to explicitly preempt the application of other laws. Other courts, however, have held that such provisions are generally not dispositive in determining the preemptive effect of a statute.

After a review of federal law, primarily through electronic database searches and consultations with various CRS experts, we were unable to locate a provision identical to that of §102 of H.R. 418—i.e., a provision that contains “notwithstanding any other provision of law.” While the use of a broad “notwithstanding any other provision of law” in American government, such directives seem facially preclusive, and some courts have determined that “notwithstanding” language may serve to explicitly preempt the application of other laws. Other courts, however, have held that such provisions are generally not dispositive in determining the preemptive effect of a statute.

After a review of federal law, primarily through electronic database searches and consultations with various CRS experts, we were unable to locate a provision identical to that of §102 of H.R. 418—i.e., a provision that contains “notwithstanding any other provision of law.” While the use of a broad “notwithstanding any other provision of law” in American government, such directives seem facially preclusive, and some courts have determined that “notwithstanding” language may serve to explicitly preempt the application of other laws. Other courts, however, have held that such provisions are generally not dispositive in determining the preemptive effect of a statute.

A provision that contains “notwithstanding any other provision of law” in American government, such directives seem facially preclusive, and some courts have determined that “notwithstanding” language may serve to explicitly preempt the application of other laws. Other courts, however, have held that such provisions are generally not dispositive in determining the preemptive effect of a statute.
Judicial review provisions

By including the language “no court,” §102(c)(2) of H.R. 418 appears to preclude judicial review of a Secretary’s decision to waive provisions of law by both federal and state courts. The preclusion of judicial review in state court and of state claims appears buttressed by §102(c)(1), which is explicitly intended to preclude judicial review of non-statutory laws—a term which would seem to imply the inclusion of state constitutional and common law claims. It is generally accepted that Article III of the United States Constitution grants Congress the authority to regulate the jurisdiction, procedures, and remedies available in federal courts. However, what remains uncertain is whether Congress’s authority, pursuant to Article III, extends to the jurisdiction, procedures, and remedies of state courts. In addition, it remains uncertain to what extent Congress has Article III authority to prevent courts, state or federal, from addressing and remediating issues arising under the United States Constitution.

With respect to Congress’s ability to control the jurisdiction of state courts, the Supreme Court has ruled that subject to a congressional provision to the contrary, state courts have concurrent jurisdiction over all the claims and controversies demonstrated in Article III, except for suits between States, suits in which either the United States or a foreign state is a party, and controversies within the traditional jurisdiction of admiralty law. Thus, it appears possible to argue that Congress has a plenary power to allocate jurisdiction between federal and state courts. In other words, if, for example, Congress can make jurisdiction over an area of law exclusively federal, thereby depriving state courts of any ability to hear such claims, it appears that Congress may also be able to remove a cause of action from state courts without concurrently granting jurisdiction to the federal courts.

State courts, however, are often considered to be independent and autonomous from the federal court system. This independent status has led some scholars to argue that because the Constitution appears to reserve to the states the authority to control the jurisdiction of their own courts, Congress’s ‘only meaningful constitutionally permissible task’ seems to limit control of the federal court’s jurisdiction.”

The argument that state courts are autonomous can be derived, in part, from the Supreme Court’s decision in United States v. taxpayers. The ability to review decisions from state courts. While the Court has the authority to review a decision of a state’s highest court, it has repeatedly emphasized the importance of respecting its ability to review decisions from state courts. The Court has the authority to review a decision of a state’s highest court, it has repeatedly emphasized the importance of respecting its ability to review decisions from state courts. The ability to review decisions from state courts. While the Court has the authority to review a decision of a state’s highest court, it has repeatedly emphasized the importance of respecting its ability to review decisions from state courts.
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The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 4 printed in part B, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), and Amendment No. 5 printed in part B, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 109-4, offered by the gentleman New York (Mr. NADLER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 185, noes 236, not voting 12, as follows: (Roll No. 28)

AYES—185

Acker
Achorn
Acken
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Belkin
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boesch
Boucher
Bouyer
Brown (OH)
Brown, Treece (FL)
Butterfield
Cardin
Cardozo
Carbacho
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Clyburn (AL)
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuban
Custodio
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IN)
DeFazio
DeGette

AYES—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Bartlett (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Belkin
Berman
Bouyer
Brown (OH)
Brown, Treece (FL)
Butterfield
Cardin
Cardozo
Carbacho
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Clyburn (AL)
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuban
Custodio
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IN)
DeFazio
DeGette

NOT VOTING—12

Bass
Card
Ehlers
Feeney
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

Mr. BLACKBURN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. REYNOLDS, SODREL, NEUGEBAUER, TAYLOR of Virginia, FORD, BACHUS, TANNER, MURPHY, and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FAIR

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 109-4 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 179, noes 243, not voting 11, as follows: (Roll No. 29)

AYES—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Bartlett (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Belkin
Berman
Bouyer
Brown (OH)
Brown, Treece (FL)
Butterfield
Cardin
Cardozo
Carbacho
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Clyburn (AL)
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuban
Custodio
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IN)
DeFazio
DeGette

NOT VOTING—12

Bass
Card
Ehlers
Feeney
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

Mr. BLACKBURN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. REYNOLDS, SODREL, NEUGEBAUER, TAYLOR of Virginia, FORD, BACHUS, TANNER, MURPHY, and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FAIR

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 109-4 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 179, noes 243, not voting 11, as follows: (Roll No. 29)
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Mr. MURTHA and Mr. SHAYS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the importance of having standardized drivers’ licenses and identification cards. This should be done on a bipartisan basis, however. The REAL ID Act was not bipartisan, and it was moved too quickly through the legislative process. It was passed without any Committee hearings or markups.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I can not support the provisions for the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418 because, despite the intention of the bill’s sponsors to strengthen our borders, it has the opposite effect, by making homeland security and an effective war against terrorism more difficult with unnecessary provisions aimed at legitimate asylum seekers. Moreover, I am guided in my judgment about this bill by the opposition of the National Governors Association and the National Council of State Legislatures.

This bill tightens asylum laws in a way that inhibits, rather than enhances our national security. Currently individuals who participate in terrorist activity are not allowed to gain asylum status in this country. Terrorists have not been able to use the current asylum system to gain entry into the country, thus the tightening of these laws only makes gaining asylum status more difficult for those legitimately seeking asylum. Provisions such as requiring applicants to prove the “central reason” for their persecution or allowing judges to require applicants to produce corroborating evidence are unnecessary.

While national security must be our top priority, immigration policy should not create unnecessary requirements for legitimate asylum seekers who are arguably our best allies in the fight against international terrorism. The asylum provisions of this bill will not enhance our security or our standing in the world.

I also have concerns that the bill allows and directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive all laws which he or she deems necessary to complete the construction of barriers along any and all U.S. borders. Some have argued that this provision is needed to ensure the construction of a fence along the U.S.-Mexico border and further secures our Nation in a post 9/11 world. H.R. 418 requires States to implement new minimum regulations for State drivers’ license...
and identification document security standards that must be met within 3 years. It also establishes a process to enable States to use an existing Department of Transportation communication system to confirm that drivers’ licenses presented are genuine and validly issued to the person who is carrying them. The 19 terrorists who attacked America on 9/11 had obtained over 63 valid forms of identification between them to breach our homeland security. Improving document security is necessary to counter threats from foreign terrorism.

This legislation also takes important steps regarding asylum reform. It prevents terrorists and scam artists from abusing our asylum system and gives immigration judges the tools they need to undercut asylum fraud before it happens.

Most importantly, H.R. 418 is critical to the continued construction of the Southwest border fence in San Diego. Despite efforts by the Federal Government and the border patrol, California’s Coastal Commission has objected to and stopped the final phase of fence construction. This fence, known as Smugglers Gulch, would be a strong barrier securing our border.

Mr. Chairman, I made a promise to my constituents to continue to fight for security enhancements to curb illegal immigration and secure our borders. This legislation is essential to national security and I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 418.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, today’s bill would not be nearly as flawed or controversial if it had the benefit of going through the committee process. Unfortunately, we are faced with costly legislation that overrules States rights and does little to address the problems of our immigration system or to protect Americans from another terrorist attack.

Instead, this bill places enormous regulatory and financial burdens on State governments and makes Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) employees de facto immigration officials. This policy promises to be ineffective as there are approximately 70 different kinds of immigration-related documents issued by the Federal Government. This bill will not deter illegal immigration; it will probably make illegal immigrants drive without licenses.

In addition, in order to complete three miles of a border fence near San Diego, Section 102 of this bill suspends all laws, from public health and labor to the environment and property compensation. In fact, all barriers and roads along 7,514 miles of the U.S. borders would be exempt from all laws. One person who the Department of Homeland Security would be above the law without any judicial appeal or remedy. This is unprecedented. Some of the environmental laws waived would include the Noise Control Act, the Clean Water Act, the Farmland Protection Policy Act, and the Bald Eagle Act. In addition to being bad public policy, this exemption is unnecessary, as most of these laws have security exemptions already written into them.

This legislation will not make us safer or reduce illegal immigration. In the end, it is hard to imagine a more dangerous precedent.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 418 the REAL ID Act, because, contrary to its sponsors’ claims, this bill will not improve our country’s security. Instead, it will weaken law enforcement’s ability to do its job, and make driving on our roads more dangerous. In addition, this bill eliminates critical provisions in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act passed by Congress in 2004. Finally, the REAL ID Act makes it much more difficult for immigrants who are fleeing persecution to gain refuge in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, while there are many good reasons to oppose this bill, as I previously outlined, I will focus on the director’s license provision and the asylum provision.

Barring undocumented immigrants from accessing driver’s licenses is a dangerous proposal. Withholding driver’s licenses from these individuals will not fix our broken immigration system. It will only make us less safe by having unlicensed and uninsured drivers on our roads. The American Automobile Association (AAA) Foundation for Traffic Safety report entitled, “Unlicensed to Kill” found that uninsured drivers are almost five times more likely to be in fatal car accidents than are licensed drivers. Clearly, our goal should be to have more, not fewer, licensed drivers.

Denying licenses to undocumented immigrants will also hurt our national security by depriving law enforcement of critical information on millions of adults who are in the United States. Licensed individuals are registered, photographed and in some states fingerprinted. This information is then entered into a database accessible to local and state law enforcement. The border patrol, immigration officers, helping law enforcement to separate otherwise law abiding individuals from terrorists or criminals. In fact, because many of the 9/11 hijackers did have a driver’s license, the records kept by state departments of motor vehicles were invaluable after 9/11 in tracking where the terrorist had been and with whom they had associated. This information was used to prosecute many individuals who would not have been discovered otherwise. Passage of the REAL ID Act will mean that law enforcement will be less able to find people who are terrorist threats, and will have less information with which to prevent and solve crimes.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that we must be proactive in the defense of our nation by identifying weaknesses in our security systems and making appropriate changes that will protect us from a terrorist attack. For this reason, Congress and the President charged the 9/11 Commission to study our intelligence failures and make recommendations that would improve our systems. Those recommendations would make it more difficult for those of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 just three months ago. The intelligence reform bill required states to establish stringent standards for the issuance of driver’s licenses and identification cards. Among the new standards are requirements that licenses contain digital photographs, employ machine readable technology and contain security features to prevent tampering, counterfeiting or duplication. Currently, effective and workable federal standards that will strengthen driver’s license security are in the process of being implemented. The REAL ID Act dismantles the safeguards Congress just enacted. Congress and the President should instead be focused on implementing the provisions of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act such as, adding 10,000 new border patrol agents, 40,000 new detention beds, and 4,000 immigration and customs investigators.

Furthermore, the asylum provisions in the REAL ID Act do nothing to enhance our national security. Instead, the REAL ID Act serves only to deny people who are fleeing religious persecution, torture and other horrors the ability to escape into safety. Given the fact that an asylum seeker is immediately held in detention before his claim is processed, a terrorist would not risk claiming asylum to enter our country.

Mr. Chairman, REAL ID Act is a real bad idea for America. This bill will make our roads more dangerous, inhibit the work of law enforcement, and undermine the homeland security measures enacted in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and instead focus on implementing the counter-terrorism provisions enacted into law just a few months ago.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the REAL ID Act. It is clear that in order to secure our country from terrorists we need to reform the requirements and standards for driver’s licenses. A valid driver’s license is like a hall pass that allows terrorists to easily roam throughout the United States.

Indeed 19 terrorists did just that with dozens of legal driver’s licenses and identification cards. The hijackers used these IDs to rent cars and apartments, open bank accounts, take flying lessons, and otherwise blend into American society while they planned their attacks. Those terrorists murdered 3,000 Americans and yet this gap still remains open.

In every State, the driver’s license (and its counterpart, the State ID card) is the primary document used to establish identity and proof of legal residence. Making driver’s licenses accessible to illegal aliens gives them the means to pass themselves off as legal residents of the United States. Additionally, the REAL ID Act does not create a national ID card.

In addition to establishing standards for the issuance of licenses, the REAL ID Act includes provisions to prevent terrorists from gaming our asylum system. Court decisions in recent years have so distorted the asylum process that terrorists are now able to claim asylum specifically because they are terrorists. This legislation represents a critical first step toward gaining control over our borders and protecting American lives. These are commonsense measures that should be implemented immediately.

Terrorism may have no borders, but we can certainly make it more difficult for terrorists to cross ours. Having a uniform policy that relies on common sense will do more to keep America open and free than having a policy that relies on hope.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 418.

Although I support the goals of this legislation, H.R. 418 unfortunately contains too many misguided provisions. Last year, I voted to pass the 9/11 Commission’s bipartisan recommendations to reform identification standards and beef up security on our nation’s border. This legislation would repeal that new law before it has a chance to work. Had the provisions of H.R. 418 been in place prior to September 11, 2001, they would not have stopped
a single one of the 19 terrorists. H.R. 418 would force virtually every adult in the United States to go to the DMV to get a new driver’s license, and with 14,000 local jurisdictions in this country currently issuing identification, it would be impossible to impose a single standard within the three-year limit in the bill. I will also oppose provisions on targeting groups, allowing the DHS Secretary to waive laws currently on the books. Finally, many of my constituents have expressed concerns to me that H.R. 418 would create a national ID system that would lead to intrusive government action like a national database, including identifying information, drivers’ histories, and motor vehicle violations.

We all know how the 9/11 terrorists manipulated our asylum laws to stay in our country, and utilized lax drivers’ license standards to help them carry out their plans. We know that humanitarians continue to take advantage of the gaps in our borders, helping terrorist and criminal aliens gain entry into our country. Yet some still question the need to turn this invaluable knowledge into meaningful action.

As an original cosponsor of the REAL ID Act, I strongly support the changes to the asylum process in this bill to strengthen our border security and increase our ability to remove illegal aliens from our country. There are numerous other provisions within this bill that work toward those goals as well. I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me today in voting in support of this important border security legislation because it will help better defend our homeland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. Not only has the House failed to consider the sweeping changes in this bill through the thoughtful and deliberative committee process, we have allowed the majority of the American people to ensure that this bill will not have unintended consequences.

You may ask, Dingell, what unintended consequences? Doesn’t this bill just keep the bad guys from harming us again? I wonder if my friends read the fine print.

Look at Section 102 of the bill. That section allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive ANY and ALL federal, state, or local law that the Secretary determines should be waived to ensure the construction of physical barriers and roads to deter illegal border crossings.

It would also allow waiver of laws to knock down existing structures or other obstacles. It would give power to the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive any public health law such as the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, as well as transportation safety, hazardous materials transportation and road construction standards.

In addition, it would grant DHS unchecked authority to abrogate criminal law, child labor laws, laws that protect workers, civil rights laws, ethics laws for federal contractors and procurement policy.

It goes even further. No procedures for using this authority are established, and judicial review by federal or state courts is expressly prohibited. It even appears there would be NO judicial review concerning the taking of private property.

The breadth of this provision is unprecedented and must not stand.

Now let’s look at Section 101. This section requires that in certain asylum claims, applicants must prove that their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion “was or will be a central reason” for their persecution.

In effect, this will bar many legitimate refugees who have fled brutal human rights abuses, including torture, rape, and other horrific violence, from receiving asylum.

This section creates new burdens on those seeking asylum, including a corroborating evidence test, empowering an immigration officer or immigration judge to deny asylum to a refugee because he believes, in his discretion, that the refugee should have somehow been able to obtain a particular document when fleeing her country.
Mr. Chairman, I understand that we must protect our borders, but we must still allow those decent freedom loving people fleeing their countries to be able to continue to seek asylum.

I would also note that Sec. 103 specifically identifies officers, officials, representatives or spokesmen of the Palestinian Liberation Organization as terrorists, thus not to enter the United States. Mr. Speaker, this would mean that Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas would be barred from the United States. Given the great progress we have seen in the Middle East in the past week and that the Bush Administration is in the process of setting up meetings with Dr. Abbas in Washington, it hardly seems wise to pass a bill barring the newly elected President of the Palestinian Authority from the country.

Finally, I note that I have concerns about this bill and its unintended consequences on the Second Amendment rights of gun owning Americans like myself. Second owners now the linking of databases and creates a floor for the requirements of what can be included in the database. However, this legislation fails to create a ceiling. What could stop a State from requiring databases to contain information about gun licenses and gun ownership records? Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this broad overreaching legislation. Let’s have hearings. Let’s have real deliberation and debate. I will vote against this legislation.

Mr. HOLT, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. This legislation was crafted under the guise of protecting our borders and improving homeland security. However, it would make it more difficult for victims of persecution to obtain asylum, impose expensive and burdensome requirements on the States, and authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive any and all laws to construct barriers at our international borders—none of which will make this country any safer from terrorists. This legislation would also effectively undo the important immigration and security reforms passed by the 108th Congress, putting us at greater risk for future attacks.

The 9/11 Commission’s immigration-related recommendations focused on targeting terrorist travel, through reliable identification systems and effective, integrated information sharing. Instead, this legislation seeks to change immigration laws broadly and in ways unrelated to essential intelligence reform. This legislation would expand the authority for expedited alien removal without further hearing or review, impose stringent restrictions on asylum seekers hoping to be given an interview with an asylum officer, and require unreasonable standards of proof for aliens seeking asylum. None of the 9/11 hijackers sought asylum; rather, they were granted legal visas to enter the United States using fraudulent documents overseas. Furthermore, current law explicitly bars terrorists or members of terrorist organizations from gaining asylum, and asylum-seekers already under ground checks with the FBI, CIA, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of State databases. The onerous restrictions offered by H.R. 418 would keep highly-vulnerable victims of heinous crimes from escaping their persecutors, and they do not address the real vulnerabilities in our immigration system.

A report released this week by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom underscores the dangerous impact these so-called reforms would have on our asylum process. According to the commission, the current expedited removal process in the U.S. places victims of persecution at great risk for further trauma, while the severity of conditions and deprivation imposed on asylum seekers was "shocking." But instead of addressing this serious situation in the ways recommended by the commission, today this Congress would force even more innocent asylum seekers into expedited removal or send them back to their persecutors without an opportunity to appeal their case to an immigration judge.

H.R. 418 would also impose statutory requirements for State-issued driver’s licenses and repeal the important identification security measures enacted by the bipartisan Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. Rather than permit local, State, and Federal officials to work together to create minimum security standards for driver’s licenses and identification cards as authorized by Congress last year, H.R. 418 would mandate statutory standards requiring them to share personal information on all licensed drivers in a massive national database.

H.R. 418 would dismantle the carefully crafted immigration and security reforms enacted by Congress last year in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. That law will begin by strengthening our border security by adding 10,000 new border patrol agents over the next 5 years, strengthening visa application requirements, and adding 4,000 new immigration and customs investigators. It fortifies identification security while allowing the State officials charged with making these changes to pass on a process.

Mr. Chairman, this law implemented key 9/11 Commission recommendations without jeopardizing our legal immigration system or the ability of legitimate asylum seekers to escape persecution. Our country was founded by those who sought or were granted asylum; rather, they sought or were granted asylum to escape persecution. None of the 9/11 hijackers, their whereabouts, and their connections to others, is because we could track information from driver’s license databases. Shutting off this flow of information is not a smart or effective way to combat terrorism. This bill is only the latest example of how Congress has ignored regular order to rush a partisan bill to the floor with little deliberation or debate. I oppose this process and this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. As a member of the Homeland Security and Immigration Reform Caucus, I join with my colleagues to raise attention to the serious flaws in our immigration system which leave our Nation exposed to potential threats.

The 9/11 Commission made several recommendations which were not enacted as part of the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458), including provisions to strengthen identification document standards and to secure our borders. The commission specifically recommended that the Federal government should set standards for the issuance of birth certificates and sources of identification such as driver’s licenses. In addition, the commission recommended the Department of Homeland Security’s, DHS, completion of a biometric entry-exit screening system and the improvement of U.S. border security standards for travel and border crossing.

I was disappointed that the conference committee on the intelligence reform bill opted to remove the immigration-related provisions approved by the House during its consideration of H.R. 10 last fall. I commend House leadership for honoring the commitment made to Chairman SENSENBRENNER to allow the consideration of the bill we have before us today.

We have a real opportunity to adopt meaningful reforms to improve our immigration system. H.R. 418 establishes strict proof of identity for all applicants for State-issued driver’s licenses and identification documents. This bill serves to protect the integrity of our immigration laws by requiring States, in effect, to confirm lawful immigration status or disclose the lack of confirming identification on the face of cards issued.

H.R. 418 also makes aliens deportable for terrorism-related offenses to the same extent that they would be inadmissible for the same grounds. If nothing else, our immigration system should prevent potential terrorists from entering the United States. We would not be exercising our responsibility to protect national security if we were to allow our immigration
Mr. Chairman, there are many flaws in our immigration system which need to be fixed. H.R. 418 does not address them all, but it does mark a good step forward in discouraging lawbreaking by those who would choose to exploit our welcoming nature. As a cosponsor of the REAL ID Act, I urge my colleagues to improve our Nation's security and strengthen our immigration laws by voting for H.R. 418.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. I supported the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act last December. That legislation has helped to streamline the intelligence community and tightened some asylum rules that allowed potential terrorists to remain in our country. That was a good bill, but it did not go far enough. So I am pleased that the House is debating H.R. 418—a bill that I believe will help to keep our homeland secure.

We know that Mohamed Atta and his gang of terrorists exploited weak identification rules, and, as detailed in the 9/11 Commission Report, "All but one of the 9/11 hijackers acquired some form of identification document, some by fraud." H.R. 418 will require that Federal agencies only accept licenses and State-issued ID cards when States have determined that the holder is lawfully present in the country. The bill will also require that temporary visitors to our country receive only temporary identification, and that this identification expire when the terms of the visit expire. Mr. Chairman, this only makes sense.

Indeed, it gives authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to regulate State-issued driver's licenses and issue ID cards when States have determined that holders are lawfully present. This new program is implemented, every time we change our location. It is a waste of money and resources. People will go over it, under it and around it to enter our country.

Our immigration system is a broken system that needs to be fixed. We need reform that provides hardworking people of good character with a real path towards citizenship. But this bill is simply a Band-Aid on the problem that will not provide lasting reform.

Mr. Chairman, on September 11, we were attacked by terrorists who took advantage of weaknesses in our border security. After infiltrating our country, the terrorists were able to conceal their real identities, and thereby plot their attacks without fear of being apprehended. If we, as a Congress, want to seriously address the problem of terrorism, then we must address the issue of border security.

For this reason, I rise to express my support for the REAL ID Act. This bill contains urgent border security reforms that were not included in the Intelligence Reform Act that President Bush signed into law in December. Foremost in this bill are provisions that would prevent terrorists from obtaining a United States driver's license. Without a license, potential terrorists will have a much harder time obtaining a bank account, traveling, and conducting other business necessary to plot an attack.

I think we all understand that preserving freedom is not an easy process. Freedom is a difficult journey filled with enemies who will try to destroy it if left unchecked. For this reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the REAL ID Act.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. This bill purports to make us safer from terrorists who may sneak into the United States, and from other illegal immigrants. While I agree that these issues are of vital importance, this bill will do very little to make us more secure. It will not address our real vulnerabilities. It will, however, make us much less free. In reality, this bill is a thinly veiled attempt to offer desperately needed border control in order to stampede Americans into sacrificing what is uniquely American: our constitutionally protected liberty.

What is wrong with this bill?

The REAL ID Act establishes a national ID card by mandating that States include certain minimum identification standards on driver’s licenses. It contains no limits on the government’s power to impose additional standards. Indeed, it gives authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to unilaterally add requirements as he sees fit.

Supporters claim it is not a national ID because it is voluntary. However, any State that opts out will automatically make non-persons out of its citizens. The citizens of that State will be unable to have any dealings with the Federal Government because their ID will not be accepted. They will not be able to fly or to take a train. In essence, in the eyes of the Federal Government they will cease to exist. It is absurd to call this voluntary.

Republicans Party talking points on this bill, which claim that this is not a national ID card, nevertheless endorse the idea that “the Federal Government should set standards for the issuance of birth certificates and sources of identification such as driver’s licenses.” So they admit that they want a national ID but at the same time pretend that this is not a national ID.

This bill establishes a massive, centrally coordinated database of highly personal information. The American people have no minimum their name, date of birth, place of residence, Social Security number, and physical and possibly other characteristics. What is even more disturbing is that, by mandating that states participate in the Drivers License Agreement, this bill creates a massive database of sensitive information on American citizens that will be shared with Canada and Mexico.

This bill could have a chilling effect on the exercise of our constitutionally guaranteed rights. It re-defines “terrorism” in broad new terms that could well include members of firearms rights and anti-abortion groups, or other such groups as determined by whoever is in power at the time. There are no provisions against including such information in the database as information about a person’s exercise of constitutional rights. It could impose a database that would have a chilling effect on freedom of association. This bill does nothing to enhance homeland security. It punishes law abiding citizens. Criminals will ignore it. H.R. 418 fire at the cost of taking a gigantic step toward making us into a police state.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the REAL ID Act of 2005.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 418. The proponents of this dangerous and divisive bill
have mischaracterized and misrepresented it as a measure that focuses on national security. This could not be further from the truth. I would urge my colleagues today to listen beyond the harsh rhetoric and to closely examine this legislation. Because further study will reveal that H.R. 418 is really nothing more than a bill designed to bash immigrants and punish refugees.

H.R. 418 ignores the Nation's proud history of protecting those fleeing brutal human rights abuses, torture and persecution. It would force our country to look the other way on women, children, and victims of religious persecution. The bill would create insurmountable hurdles for legitimate asylum-seekers and slam the door shut on refugees who have fled brutal human rights abuses. That is not America.

H.R. 418 also ignores the reality that there are an estimated 10 million or more undocumented immigrants living in our country. This bill would do nothing to prevent undocumented migration to the United States. If anything, this bill will only further compound the flaws in our Nation’s immigration laws. And it would make the job of protecting our homeland even more challenging.

H.R. 418 will make the vital job of law enforcement to arrest criminals and root out potential terrorists almost impossible. In short, immigration enforcement will continue to expend our already limited, resources and energy in pursuing hardworking busboys and nannies, instead of bad actors who mean us real harm. Immigration officers represent our frontline forces in protecting our homeland. Let’s not make their jobs even more demanding. Let’s give them the policies, the resources and the tools they need to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, imagine your neighbors, the families who live across the street, the men and women who join us at church—all of the hard working people who share the roads with us. Now imagine these hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of people, driving without a license, without car insurance or registration. Such a policy will wreak havoc on our streets and highways. It also will do nothing to address our broken immigration system. It will just force hard working people, flush into the shadows and create an increased demand for the black market of fake identity documents.

I agree that Congress must examine how to improve enforcement of immigration law, but we first must create laws that are enforceable and in step with reality.

Let me close by saying this. I am not alone in my strong opposition to this misguided and mean-spirited legislation. Also opposing the bill are the National Governor’s Association, the National State Legislatures, many other national, State and local organizations, security and immigration policy experts, immigration attorneys, more than 100 religious organizations, Hispanic and Asian organizations, the U.N. Commissioner for Refugees, the AFL-CIO, the Service Employees International Union and other labor unions. The list goes on and on, and I consider myself very good company.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. The only thing “real” about the REAL ID Act is that it is real bad for America.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act. This bill merely recycles the anti-immigrant and refugee provisions that did not make it into the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 passed and signed into law late last year. H.R. 418 does not improve our national security. H.R. 418 would repeal some of the bipartisan provisions in the Intelligence Reform Act, including increasing the number of new border patrol agents, strengthening visa application requirements, and allowing security experts at Department of Homeland Security to establish strict minimum standards for driver’s licenses. I am particularly concerned with section 101, which would have the effect of preventing legitimate asylum seekers from obtaining relief in the United States. The REAL ID Act would require applicants to prove that their persecutors “central motive” for harming or wishing to harm them was race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. Applicants may be denied based on any inconsistencies or inaccuracies in their stories.

We must remember those who flee brutal human rights abuses. Asylum seekers, however, often escape from situations that do not allow them to gather any of the documentation necessary to present “corroborating evidence.” An escapee from the Darfur region cannot go back and “track” evidence of their persecution without facing more torture and violence and hiding from their persecutors. Moreover, the REAL ID Act would implement a national standard for driver’s licenses, requiring all States to overhaul their procedures and to meet Federal standards within 3 years. Setting a national standard for driver’s licenses infringes on States’ rights and sends another unfunded mandate to the States.

The border and fence security provision in this bill will neither deter nor detect the many non-citizens who continue to enter the U.S., while granting the Secretary of Department of Homeland Security power to waive any law upon determining that a waiver is “necessary for the expeditious construction” of the border barriers. Under this waiver, the DHS would be free to construct anywhere along our borders without legal limitation, liability, or oversight. This provision will allow the DHS to destroy endangered habitats and species, as well as archaeological sites containing 7,000-year-old Native American artifacts when constructing the additional fencing.

H.R. 418 does not address the greater problems of our current broken immigration system. In order to fix our immigration problems, we need a comprehensive immigration reform. The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). There being no further amendments, the Committee rises. The SPEAKER pro tem (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the House of the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 418) to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify temporary protection, to prevent inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, pursuant to House Resolution 75, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that rule, back to the House with further sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered to be taken up.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REYES. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Reyes of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 418 to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Judiciary to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 203, add the following:

(c) RESTRICTIONS ON INFORMATION CONTAINED IN DATABASE.—A State motor vehicle database may not include any information about a person’s former address or personal information guaranteed under the first, second, or fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (REYES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit provides for restrictions on the information contained in the national database. This bill as it stands requires that the database shall contain at a minimum all information contained on the driver’s licenses as well as driving history. This would create no limit as to what other information may eventually be incorporated in the database. This motion would simply protect the privacy rights of Americans from a national ID database in this bill.

In particular, this amendment guarantees that the database cannot become a centralized storage place for sensitive personal information on nearly every American about whether they own guns, what guns they own and whether they have purchased any guns. This could be the national gun registry that we have all feared for years.

This motion to recommit would also bar information on the exercise of first
amendment and fourteenth amendment rights from being included in the driver’s license database. We should not have a government database of political activities of law-abiding citizens.

As Bob Barr, our former colleague, said in the Washington Times last year in opposition to early identical provisions, “You know something is askew when we second amendment conservatives keep finding common cause with the American Civil Liberties Union. Can both be correct? Of course not! We have come to the conclusion that the Drive America database is an obvious violation of the Fourth Amendment rights of all Americans.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thegentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Sensenbrenner) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit does not require the States to do anything, or not do anything. It has been very clear from the beginning of this debate on this legislation that the bill does it is that a driver’s license has to meet certain standards if it is to be acceptable for Federal ID purposes, such as getting on an airplane.

What the motion to recommit does is force the States to do something, or not do something; and that goes directly against the notion of federalism that is contained in this bill and which was drafted by the Committee on Government Reform.

The final vote that we had yesterday on this legislation was on whether we should waive the law relative to unfunded mandates. The vote on that was 228 “aye” to 191 “no.” The author of this motion to recommit, as well as the 190 who joined him in saying that we should not waive the unfunded mandate law, is now asking the States to have another unfunded mandate.

I would urge all of the 191 who voted “no” on the Jackson-Lee objection to consideration of the rule to bring this up to join me in voting “no” on this motion to recommit, together with the 228 who voted the right way yesterday.

Vote “no” on the motion to recommit; vote “aye” on passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit does not require the States to do anything, or not do anything. It has been very clear from the beginning of this debate on this legislation that the bill does it is that a driver’s license has to meet certain standards if it is to be acceptable for Federal ID purposes, such as getting on an airplane.

The final vote that we had yesterday on this legislation was on whether we should waive the law relative to unfunded mandates. The vote on that was
**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The Acting SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays were ordered.
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   as above recorded.

   Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 2005, during rollcall votes 28, 29, 30 and 31, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 28, 29, 30 and "yea" on rollcall vote 31, final passage.

   Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes Nos. 28, 29, 30 and 31, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 28, the Nadler/Meeck Amendment, which would strike section 101 of the bill which imposes new burdens on persons seeking asylum; "yea" on rollcall No. 29, the Amendment, which would strike section 102 of the bill regarding waivers to expedite construction of physical barriers and roads along the border; "yea" on rollcall No. 30, the motion to recommit; and "no" on rollcall No. 31, final passage of H.R. 418—REAL ID Act of 2005.

   **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

   Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), for the purposes of informing us of the schedule.

   Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

   Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. The final list of those bills will be sent to Members’ offices at the end of the week and any votes called for on these will be rolled to 6:30 p.m.

   On Wednesday and Thursday the House will convene at 10 a.m. We will likely consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 310, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act. In addition, we are working on the continuity of government legislation. It is anticipated to be similar to H.R. 2841, the Continuity in Representation Act, which passed the House last year. We hope to move quickly and bring that legislation to the floor next week.
Finally, assuming the other body passes S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, in a form identical to what the Senate Committee on the Judiciary passed last week, we expect to consider that legislation next week as well.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for that information. With respect to the class action, the gentleman indicated, as I understand it, that that bill has passed the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I know in the past the gentleman has been very reluctant to simply take the Senate's work product, and I am somewhat shocked that the gentleman apparently suggests that process now. I do not know whether that is going to be a precedent for the future. But may I ask the gentleman, is it his contemplation that it would come directly to the floor and not go to committee for consideration?

Mr. DELAY. It is a new Congress and a new Senate, and the work that they are doing over there, at least the beginning of the work that they are doing over there, is pretty impressive, particularly the work they have done on this very important bill.

We have gone through regular order on this side of the House in many different steps on this class action issue; and if the Senate does what I think it is going to do, yes, we would bring it straight to the floor and consider it without committee action.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I know in the event that that is done, would the gentleman bring that to the floor with the expectation that that Senate sends over, bring it directly to the floor without committee consideration, that not only in a sense of fairness but in a sense of getting the input of the 125 to 130 million people that this side of the aisle represents, that we give us the opportunity to offer such amendments as we think to be appropriate with respect to that legislation?

Mr. Leader, with respect to the continuing of Congress, this has been an issue we tried to deal with in the past. It is a very important issue with which we should deal. I know at times I have talked to the gentleman and the Speaker and particularly to my friend, the majority whip, with reference to having a bipartisan proposal so that both parties, on an issue of great magnitude to this institution in terms of continuity and how do we form a majority to take action, has this been to the gentleman's knowledge, and I do not have that knowledge. I have not talked to anybody on the Committee on Rules or any other committee out of which this might have come. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have bipartisan agreement with respect to the legislation the gentleman intends to put on the floor next week?

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. There are ongoing discussions about this bill with the minority and particularly with the minority leader's office. We are continuing those discussions.

I remind the gentleman that this bill got 306 votes last year. I think that is pretty bipartisan.

So as we work through this, we will continue to discuss and work with the minority to make it even more bipartisan than it is.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that.

And reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, I understand what you are saying in terms of the number of folks who voted for it. There were a very substantial number who voted for it.

This is not a partisan issue. It should not be a partisan issue. This is a practical judgment as to how constitutionally and appropriately within the framework of our democracy and representation that we frame or have legislation framed so that does reflect the interests of our democracy as well as the interest of ensuring continuity.

From that perspective of not just having a number of votes for it, but having the leadership on both sides, I do not mean necessarily the gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier) or the gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi) or the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) or the gentleman from California (Mr. Sensenbrenner) or the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Lowden) or the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Bereuter), but the leadership on both sides, whether it is the Committee on Rules, Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee that might consider it somewhat in agreement.

Mr. DELAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I hope the gentleman is not raising a standard that is even higher than given to the Constitution, in that when two-thirds of this House has voted for a measure, in order for it to be bipartisan, we have to go even higher than two-thirds.

We are continuing to work with the minority leader. We understand her concerns and your concerns. But when you have well over two-thirds of the House voting for a bill, it gets more and more difficult to write a bill that requires unanimity.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, no one is suggesting unanimity. I understand that. We are suggesting, though, that we work together on this issue. And the mere fact that we have the ability to get a large number of votes for a bill is critically important. Your observation is correct in terms of numbers necessary to pass the constitutional amendment or to pass other legislation by two-thirds. It is obviously important.

But it is equally important, it seems to me, and might facilitate passage of this through the entire Congress, not just through the House of Representatives, to have input from the leadership of both parties to try to come to grips with what I perceive not to be a partisan issue, but a difficult issue on which constitutional scholars have differed as to how we can do this, on which Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have differed.

But we do not need to pursue it. I understand the gentleman's point. But I would hope that we could have significant discussions about this and hopefully come to agreement of the minds.

Mr. Leader, we are not going to have a scheduling colloquy next week because it will be the Presidents' Day recess. But can you indicate what we might have on the floor the week that we return from the Presidents' Day recess?

Mr. DELAY. Frankly, I do not know. We will just have to get back to you on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, thank you for that.

I understand we may receive the President's tsunami supplemental appropriations next week. Do you anticipate we may also receive the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental request as well?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The White House has indicated to us that they will submit, as the gentleman said, the supplemental request on the tsunami next week. But we also expect the supplemen-tal request on the war on terror, and I would expect the House to consider some supplemental sometime in the month of March.
Mr. HOYER. Thank you for that. And you answered my second question. The energy bill you had brought up in our previous colloquy, can you tell us where that might stand at this point this time?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. The energy bill, we are continuing to work on that bill, just working on putting it together in order to introduce it. It is not ready, and I do not know, frankly, when it will be ready to even introduce, much less think about committee action and when the House might consider it.

Mr. HOYER. It would be fair to assume, then, that certainly it is not going to be in the next 2 or 3 weeks?

Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, I think that is fair to assume.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2005 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn at noon at Monday next; and further, when the House adjourns on that day it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 15, 2005 for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 310, BROADCAST DECENCY ENFORCEMENT ACT 2005

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement.

The Committee on Rules may meet the week of February 14 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 310, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, February 15, 2005.

Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on February 9, 2005, which is expected to be reported on or before January 14. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web site of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules by Friday, February 11, 2005.

Members should also contact the Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate form and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(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, we have heard the President over the last 3 or 4 days present to the American people the idea of the crisis nature of revising, reforming, or altering completely the Social Security system. I go home and look forward to holding one of the first town hall meetings with my constituents to really lay out how we can work in a bipartisan manner and save Social Security.

It is important for the American people to realize that $1.5 trillion will be needed to take away from Social Security to establish what one would call “private accounts,” private accounts that could be separate and apart from Social Security. Many Americans do not realize it is not just a retirement benefit, it is a survivor benefit. It helps children of those who are deceased.

More importantly, we forged a bipartisan response to Social Security in 1983 with O’Neill and Ronald Reagan that caused this to be solvent for at least 60 years.

This proposal will not only undermine, but it will destroy Social Security as we know it. Does it need reforming and fixing? Absolutely, and we can do that with a number of suggestions, but the plan that has now been proposed by the administration is one that will undermine and eliminate Social Security.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUSTANY). 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.

WHY WE NEED THE OMNIBUS NON-PROLIFERATION AND ANTI-NUCLEAR TERRORISM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this morning the North Korean Government acknowledged publicly for the first time that it has nuclear weapons. In a statement issued by the North Korean Foreign Ministry, Pyongyang also said that it will boycott the six-party talks designed to end its nuclear program.

North Korea’s surprising declaration has again reminded us of the most pressing national security challenge that we face: the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility that a terrorist group will acquire a nuclear bomb and use it against the United States.

Earlier this week, my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I introduced the Omnibus Nuclear Nonproliferation and Anti-Nuclear Terrorism Act of 2005 to better enable the United States to prevent what Graham Allison of Harvard University has termed “the ultimate preventable catastrophe.” I am pleased that we were joined as original cosponsors by 11 of our colleagues.

Over the past several months, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I have consulted with a range of experts to produce a set of policies that we believe will be effective and which can be implemented quickly. Our bill will do the following:

It creates an Office of Nonproliferation Programs in the White House to centralize budgetary and policy authority. Since nonproliferation programs are spread across the U.S. Government, it makes sense to have one office overseeing all of it, signing off on budgets and developing a coordinated strategy.

The bill enhances the Cooperative Threat Reduction, CTR, program by streamlining and accelerating Nunn-Lugar implementation and granting more flexibility to the President and the Secretary of Defense to undertake nonproliferation projects outside the former Soviet Union. Our bill does this by removing conditions on Nunn-Lugar assistance that in the past have forced the suspension of time-sensitive efforts.

In 2002, President Bush was unable for the first time to certify that Russia had met all of its program-wide conditions, resulting in a halt to all CTR funding until he was able to obtain and use authority to waive the certification requirement in early 2003.

The conditions have also provided CTR opponents within Russia with an excuse to blame the United States for delays caused by a lack of access and transparency on the part of Moscow.

We also ask for the President, in our bill, to catalog impediments to renegotiation of the CTR umbrella agreement and other bilateral programs with Russia. The hope is that by identifying what Graham Allison of Harvard University has termed the ultimate preventable catastrophe. I am pleased that we were joined as original cosponsors by 11 of our colleagues.

Over the past several months, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I have consulted with a range of experts to produce a set of policies that we believe will be effective and which can be implemented quickly. Our bill will do the following:

It creates an Office of Nonproliferation Programs in the White House to centralize budgetary and policy authority. Since nonproliferation programs are spread across the U.S. Government, it makes sense to have one office overseeing all of it, signing off on budgets and developing a coordinated strategy.

The bill enhances the Cooperative Threat Reduction, CTR, program by streamlining and accelerating Nunn-Lugar implementation and granting more flexibility to the President and the Secretary of Defense to undertake nonproliferation projects outside the former Soviet Union. Our bill does this by removing conditions on Nunn-Lugar assistance that in the past have forced the suspension of time-sensitive efforts.

In 2002, President Bush was unable for the first time to certify that Russia had met all of its program-wide conditions, resulting in a halt to all CTR funding until he was able to obtain and use authority to waive the certification requirement in early 2003.

The conditions have also provided CTR opponents within Russia with an excuse to blame the United States for delays caused by a lack of access and transparency on the part of Moscow.

We also ask for the President, in our bill, to catalog impediments to renegotiation of the CTR umbrella agreement and other bilateral programs with Russia. The hope is that by identifying what Graham Allison of Harvard University has termed the ultimate preventable catastrophe. I am pleased that we were joined as original cosponsors by 11 of our colleagues.
The bill asks the President to address the issue of unresolved liability protections for U.S. firms doing nonproliferation work in Russia.

This bill will enhance the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, announced by former Secretary Abraham last May, to accelerate the global clean-out of the most vulnerable stockpiles of nuclear material. At its current pace, it will take more than a decade to clean up the most vulnerable nuclear sites around the globe.

This bill also authorizes the President to expand the Proliferation Security Initiative beyond its current members and to engage the U.N. Security Council to provide the specific legal authority to interdict WMD material. It also provides funding for training and exercise with our PSI partners, especially the new members.

At present there are no international standards regarding the securing of nuclear weapons. The Schiff-Shays bill urges the President to develop a set of internationally recognized standards and to work with other nations and the IAEA to get such standards adopted and implemented.

Russia’s tactical nuclear arsenal is considered the most likely place from which a nuclear weapon would be stolen and sold or given to terrorists. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I authorize U.S. assistance to Russia to conduct an inventory of tactical and nonsecured weapons. Our bill also requires the DOD to support a report on past U.S. efforts to help Russia account for and secure its tactical and nonsecured nukes and to recommend ways to improve such efforts.

We also deal with the problem of scientists in the former Soviet Union and work to prevent them from selling their services to North Korea, Iran and al Qaeda.

We also encourage the President to deal with the problem of the NPT’s loophole that allows nations like Iran to purchase nuclear weapons through the guise of a nuclear energy program. Our bill asks the President to submit a report outlining strategies to better control fuel cycle technologies and possible ways to close the loophole in Article IV without undermining the overall integrity of the treaty.

These are common-sense approaches to combating the nuclear threat. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I are committed to working together on a bipartisan basis to do whatever we can to reduce the danger of a nuclear attack on the United States, and we hope that all of our colleagues will join us in that effort.

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.)

EXPLORATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO DECREASE HEALTH CARE COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, we need to explore measures that will decrease health care costs and improve patient safety. Electronic medical records, also known as EMRs, are a technological solution to an antiquated paper system.

Often, patient records are scattered between multiple hospitals and doctors’ offices, resulting in the likelihood that important medical records could be lost and that valuable data is unavailable to the physician when he needs it. Time is wasted trying to obtain paper medical records, especially in cases of emergency care, and patients sometimes provide incomplete medical histories which often omit or distort important data.

Tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars are lost every year due to medical error, and EMRs would go a long way to reducing these costs. The electronic medical record centralizes all records on a patient and can instantly communicate this information to any health care provider in a secure and confidential manner.

EMRs also have a number of other advantages. They eliminate the need for paper charts. They reduce the search time for medical histories and limit instances of lost files, patient recall or unaccessible files. They can instantly search for symptoms, findings, treatments, diagnoses and health care providers involved with patient care. They can reduce the need for additional staff and the expansive storage space needed to maintain paper files.

When complications occur, medical records of an electronic type can allow providers to retrace the exact steps through the process to see if a different approach was needed. They can prompt providers to pursue certain avenues of treatment based upon their diagnosis, and they can automatically generate bills and reimbursements that reduce billing errors.

Some concerns regarding electronic medical records have been raised about the cost. However, the key to implementing an electronic medical record is not to have the Federal Government pick up the whole tab. Health information technology companies, hospitals and medical practices must share information to improve the process and recommend standards for the industry. Let me give my colleagues an example of how this is done.

This process can be expensive to implement at this stage, and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center accomplished their EMR system via private means and established a cost of $500 million. By implementing electronic medical records, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center has already decreased the need for repeat laboratory, radiology or other invasive and expensive tests because the data and X-rays are easily shared by authorized users.

△ 1500

UPMC is ranked number one in the United States and health care industry, and number five among all industries in the use of information technology, according to InformationWeek 500.

We need positive examples from the business community to make the case for health information technology today and tomorrow. Examples of successful electronic medical records such as these provide the leadership necessary to ensure that health information technology becomes a reality.

The President has already shown his commitment to health information technology by committing $125 million to the Office of the National Health Information Technology Coordinator. Now we need to work with private industry to continue to make the case for successful implementation of health information technologies.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress accomplishes one thing this year to improve health care, we should work to develop incentives for hospitals and providers to successfully implement a secure and interoperable electronic health record. This will save money; it will save lives.

As the cochairman of the 21st Century Health Care Caucus, which I cochair with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), we will continue to work on a bipartisan basis to fully implement electronic medical record systems and to reach this important goal of using this as a mechanism to improve health care in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. BOUSTANY. 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.)

SMART SECURITY AND $80 BILLION IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has recently indicated that he will ask Congress to approve another supplemental appropriation bill to fund the ongoing military operations in Iraq. The number is rumored to be somewhere in the $80 billion range; $80 billion.

If this request for emergency funds is anything like the last three passed in this Congress, it has two exact two things: one, the President will once again refuse to explain precisely where this money will be spent; and, two,
congressional Republicans will meekly accede to the President's demands without asking for even the slightest degree of accountability from the White House in return.

We in Congress must do more than just rubber stamp the President's every last wish. We hold the power of the purse; and, accordingly, we must exercise our constitutional authority to hold the executive branch accountable. Up to now, the Congress has failed to hold senior administration accountable for the moral mistakes and missteps in Iraq; and, as a result, the Members of Congress, all 535 of us, are responsible for the nearly 1,500 American troops who have been needlessly killed in Iraq, not to mention the 11,000 Americans who have been forever wounded and the untold thousands of Iraqi civilians who have died in this war.

Before appropriating a single dollar for the Iraq war, more than we have already Congress must demand that President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld tell Congress exactly what they plan to do to address the growing crisis in Iraq, demanding accountability from the Bush administration on critical lines because it is about more than just politics. It is about taking care of our men and women who are serving in Iraq, and it is about advancing policies that will secure America for the future.

Together, with 27 of my House colleagues, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 35, an Iraq withdrawal plan, that has four components. President Bush needs to address, at the very least, each of these important components before Congress provides him any further funds for Iraq.

First, the President needs to begin the process of bringing our troops home. How can we possibly ask these brave men and women, who have selflessly answered the call of duty for their country, to continue to die for an unjust, unfair, and poorly planned military failure halfway across the world? These are the troops the administration assured us would be embraced as liberators, but who continue to be the focal point of anti-American extremism, leaving them like sitting ducks.

In fact, I believe the insurgency in Iraq is fueled primarily by our military presence. Ceasing the military operation will be sufficient to defeat the insurgency, no way, but staying will continue to intensify it, and that is for certain.

Second, President Bush needs to develop and implement a plan for Iraq's civil and economic infrastructure. The U.S. has a moral responsibility to clean up the mess we made in Iraq, but that responsibility needs to be fulfilled not by our military but by humanitarian groups and companies that will help rebuild Iraq's infrastructure; and all future work must be matched to the needs of Iraqis being paramount, not the United States Government contractors and other war profiteers.

Third, the President must convene an emergency meeting of Iraq's leadership, Iraq's neighbors, and the United Nations to create an international peacekeeping force in Iraq and to replace U.S. military forces with Iraqi police and national guard forces to ensure that the Iraqis security problems the most serious cause for concern in the country at the moment, an international peacekeeping force in place of the U.S. military would better serve Iraq's needs.

An international peacekeeping force, supported by Iraq's neighbors and the United Nations, would provide real legitimacy to a conflict that has flown in the face of international law from the very beginning.

Finally, the President must take all steps to provide the Iraqi people the opportunity to control their internal affairs. The Iraqi people cannot truly control their own affairs until the U.S. military has ceded back authority to the Iraqi people. That is why it is essential for the Iraqi government and national guard forces to manage Iraq's security, not the American military.

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.)

SECURING OUR BORDERS & TIGHTENING NOOSE ON PERPETRATORS OF SENSELESS VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, just last October, FBI agents, in cooperation with Baytown, Texas, and LaPorte, Texas, police, both law enforcement departments in my district, shattered a major document forgery operation being run out of a trailer house just across the street from the massive Exxon Mobile Refinery in Baytown, Texas. The result: six men were arrested and charged with numerous Federal and state felony charges, including Texas driver's licenses, resident alien cards, and industrial safety training cards used for employment in the strategic petrochemical industry.

The REAL ID Act that our Chamber passed today was a sensible first step toward desperately needed immigration reform in the United States. Still, however, in order to truly construct a watertight system, we cannot, when legislating here in Congress, just hitch our wagon to the newest pony when we have a solid team of stallions sitting around with nothing to do. Before discussion of any new proposals or their benefits, we must first ensure the laws currently on the books are being enforced. We must expect people from other nations to respect our borders.

Not only is it essential that we enforce existing laws; we must also reduce the incentives we offer foreigners to come to our country illegally. CNN reported a short time after the forger was arrested that there were three Americans who do not even have their own medical care, paying the cost.

Similarly, in the Washington Times, they had an article dealing with the invasion of illegal immigrants and the exorbitant cost to taxpayers in the health care and prison areas. It was reported that one in every four uninsured people in the United States is illegal. Moreover, its study revealed that in 2000 alone States like Texas, which are on the Mexican border, have losses in almost $190 million in unreimbursed costs in treating illegals, with an additional $113 million in ambulance fees and follow-up medical services.

Mr. Speaker, why, as unintentionally as it may be, are we rewarding brazen lawlessness? During my tenure on the bench as a felony court judge in Houston, Texas, I can recall that approximately 15 to 20 percent of the criminals I sentenced in my court for the most serious felony crimes were illegal immigrants. And while these individuals were doing time in the penitentiary, Texans, Americans no less, were once again paying the price for their incarceration.

Americans pay for the illegal immigration. Americans always pay. As that noted scholar Pogo once said: "We have found the enemy, and it is us." I believe, though, as we heed vital lessons from the tragedy of the September 11 attacks on our soil, that we are making progress in securing our borders from unlawful immigration, while tightening the noose of the perpetrators of senseless violence and terror who harm our citizens.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary; the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee; and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Tom Davis), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for their leadership towards these collective goals.

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.)
REMARKS ON RECENT STATEMENT
BY IRISH REPUBLICAN ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to once again call upon the British Government to get the Northern Ireland peace process back on track and implement the recommendations of the Patten Commission in reforming the police service. The recent statement by the Irish Republican Army to announce the taking of their arms from the police force if it is continually beingusement that they are committed to the peace process and are opposed to any return to violence. It is essential that we get back the authority for the people of Northern Ireland, both Catholic and Protestant alike.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, 109TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, I submit the Rules Governing Procedure for the Committee on Science for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On February 10, 2005, the Committee adopted these rules by a voice vote, with a quorum present.

RULES GOVERNING PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

General Statement

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, as applicable, shall govern the Committee and its Subcommittees, except that a motion to recess from day to day and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its Subcommittees and shall be decided without debate. The rules of the Committee, as applicable, shall be the rules of its Subcommittees. The rules of germaneness shall be enforced by the Chairman. [XI 1(a)]

Membership

(b) A majority of the majority Members of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority Members of each Subcommittee and shall authorize the Chairman to negotiate that ratio with the minority party. Provided, however, that any investigation in the name of a Subcommittee (including any ex-officio Members) shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee. Provided further, that recommendations of conferences to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee.

Power to Sit and Act; Subpoena Power

(c) (1) Notwithstanding subparagraph (2), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, papers, and documents as deemed necessary, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any Member designated by the Chairman. [XI 2(m)]

(2) The Chairman of the Full Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, may authorize and issue such subpoenas as described in paragraph (1), during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period longer than 3 days. [XI 2(m)]

(3) A subpoena so issued may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or a hearing of the Committee.

Sustainable or Confidential Information Received Pursuant to Subpoena

(d) Unless otherwise determined by the Chairman or Subcommittee, certain information received by the Committee or Subcommittee pursuant to a subpoena made as part of the record at an open hearing shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session when the Chairman of the Full Committee in his judgment and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, deems that in view of all the circumstances, such as the sensitivity of the information or the confidential nature of the information, such action is appropriate.

National Security Information

(e) All national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping. The Chairman of the full Committee may establish such regulations and procedures as in his judgment are necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any Member of the Committee, or any other Member of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

Oversight

(f) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and Oversight, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the House of Representatives.

(g) The Chairman of the Full Committee, or a Subcommittee, may undertake any investigation in the name of the Committee without formal approval by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee.

Order of Business

(h) The order of business and procedure of the Committee and the subjects of inquiries and investigations will be determined by the Chairman, subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

Suspended Proceedings

(i) During the consideration of any measure or matter, the Chairman of the Full Committee, or of any Subcommittee, or any Member acting as such, shall suspend further proceedings upon a question having been put to the Committee at any time when there is a vote by electronic device occurring in the House of Representatives.

Other Procedures

(j) The Chairman of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

Use of Hearing Rooms

(k) In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman of the Full Committee shall establish guidelines for use of Committee hearing rooms.

RULE 2. COMMITTEE MEETINGS [AND PROCEDURES]

Quorum [XI 2(h)]

(a1) One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for all purposes except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this Rule.
(2) A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum in order to:
(A) report or table any legislation, measure, or matter; (B) close Committee meetings or hearings; (C) authorize the issuance of subpoenas pursuant to Rule 1(c).

(3) Two Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which, unless waived by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, shall include at least one Member from each of the majority and minority parties.

Time and Place
(b)
(b)(1) A meeting dispensed with by the Chairman, the meetings of the Committee shall be held on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of each month the House is in session at 10:00 a.m. and at such other times and in such places as the Chairman may designate. [XI2 (b)]

The Chairman of the Committee may convene as necessary additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other business subject to such rules as the Committee may adopt. The Committee may not meet for such purpose under that call of the Chairman. [XI2 (c)]

(3) The Chairman shall make public announcement of the time, place and subject matter of any of its hearings, and to the extent practicable, a list of witnesses at least one week before the commencement of the hearing, with a statement of the presence or absence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines, a quorum is present, a quorum may be present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made pursuant to Rule 1(c) shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and promptly made available by electronic form including the Committee website. [XI2 (g)(3)]

(c) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography, unless the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that the hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House. Persons other than Members of the Committee and such non-Committee Members, Delegates, Resident Commissioner, congressional staff, or departmental representatives as the Chairman may authorize, may not be present at a business or markup session that is held in executive session. This Rule does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by Rule 2(d).

(d)(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee shall be open to the public including radio, television, and still photography coverage except when the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information or would violate a law of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, and Rule 2(q) a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, which, unless waived by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, shall include at least one Member from each of the majority and minority parties.

Audio and Visual Coverage [XI, clause 4]
(e)(A) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is not open to the public, these proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, except as provided in Rule 1(c)(2) of the Rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall not be able to limit the number of television, or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate considerations in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(B)(1) Radio and television tapes, television film, and internet recordings of any Committee hearings or meetings that are open to the public may not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(2) It is, further, the intent of this rule that the general conduct of each meeting or hearing covered under authority of this rule by audio or visual means, and the personal behavior of Members and staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the meeting or hearing, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations, and may not be such as to:
(i) distort the objects and purposes of the meeting or hearing or the activities of Committees in the House; or
(ii) cause discredit or dishonor on the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or bring the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner into disrepute.

(3) The coverage of Committee meetings and hearings by audio and visual means shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this rule.

(f) The following shall apply to coverage of Committee meetings or hearings by audio or visual means:
(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents’ Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns may not be used in any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and Broad Weekend Press and pictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the Committee at any time during a hearing or meeting. Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(9) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents’ Galleries.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers’ Gallery.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers’ Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photographers shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Special Meetings
(g) Rule XI 2(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference (Special Meetings).

Vice Chairman to Preside in Absence of Chairman
(h) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the Chairman’s absence, by a member designated by the Chairman as the Vice Chairman of the Committee and such non-Committee member of the Committee present as Acting Chairman. [XI 2(d)]
Opening Statements; 5-Minute Rule

(1) Insofar as is practicable, the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall limit the total time of opening statements by Members to no more than 5 minutes, and shall pro rata divide equally the time to be divided equally between the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. The time any one Member may speak shall be the Committee on any bill, motion or other matter under consideration by the Committee or the time allowed for the questioning of a witness at hearings before the Committee shall be limited to five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be waived by the Chairman in his discretion. [XI 2 (e) (4)]

(2) Notwithstanding Rule 2 (i), upon a motion the Chairman, in consultation with the Rankings Minority Member, may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not to exceed one hour in the aggregate or, upon a motion, may designate staff from each party to question a witness for equal periods that do not exceed one hour in the aggregate. [XI 2 (j)]

Witnesses

(1) No Member may authorize a vote by proxy with respect to any measure or matter before the Committee. [XI 2 (i)]

(2) Proxies

(k) No Member may authorize a vote by proxy with respect to any measure or matter before the Committee. [XI 2 (i)]

(3) Witnesses

(l) Insofar as is practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall be given written notice of the testimony in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and curriculum vitae. Each witness shall limit his or her testimony to a 5-minute summary, provided that additional time may be granted by the Chairman when appropriate. [XI 2 (g) (4)]

(m) The greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) which is relevant to the subject of his or her testimony and was received during the current fiscal year or of the 2 preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. [XI 2 (g) (4)]

(n) Any witness may require the Chairman to transmit to them before the complete hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereof. [XI 2 (j) (1)]

Hearing Procedures

(n) Rule XI 2 (k) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference.

Bill and Subject Matter Consideration

(o) Bills and other substantive matters may be taken when called by the Chairman of the Committee or by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, except those matters which are the subject of special-committee callings outlined in Rule 2 (g). [XI 2 (c)]

Private Bills

(p) No private bill will be reported by the Committee if there are two or more dissenting votes. Private bills so rejected by the Committee will not be reconsidered during the same Congress unless new evidence sufficient to justify a new hearing has been presented to the Committee.

Consideration of Measure or Matter

(q) (1) It shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any new or original measure or matter unless written notice of the date, place and subject matter of consideration and to the maximum extent practicable, a written copy of the measure or matter to be considered, and to the maximum extent practicable the original text for purposes of markup of the measure to be considered have been available to each Member of the Committee or by a majority of them for at least 48 hours in advance of consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays. To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to the measure or matter to be considered, shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk of the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter. [XIII 4 (a)]

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this rule, consideration of any legislative measure or matter by the Committee shall be in order by vote of two-thirds of the Members present, provided that a majority of the Committee is present.

Requests for Written Motions

(1) Any legislative or non-procedural motion made at a regular or special meeting of the Committee and which is entertained by the Chairman shall be presented in writing upon the demand of any Member present and made available to each Member present.

Requests for Record Votes at Full Committee

(1) A record vote of the Members may be had at the request of three or more Members or, in the absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

Report Language on Use of Federal Resources

(1) No legislative report filed by the Committee on any measure or matter reported to the House may contain language which has the effect of specifying the use of federal resources more explicitly (inclusively or exclusively) than that specified in the measure or matter as ordered reported, unless such language has been approved by the Committee during a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members.

Committee Records

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The record shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) The Secretary of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Secretary of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 (b) (3) or clause 4 (b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. [XI 2 (e) (3)]

(3) To the extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form, including the Committee website. [XI 2 (e) (4)]

(4) (A) Excerpts may be issued for in subdivision (B), all Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office of the Committee, and shall be the property of the House, and each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner, shall have access thereto.

(B) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, other than members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, may not have access to the records of the Committee respecting the conduct of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer of the executive branch, or employee of the executive branch for which the specific prior permission of the Committee is required.

Publication of Committee Hearings and Markups

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the publication of the verbatim form, with the material requested for the verbatim transcript. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript. Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee and shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chairman.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

Structure and Jurisdiction

(a) The Committee shall have the following standing Subcommittees with the jurisdiction indicated.

(1) Subcommittee on Energy

(2) Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards

Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority over all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration and projects therefor, and commercial application of energy technology including: Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs; Department of Energy laboratories; federal energy science activities; energy supply activities; nuclear, solar and renewable energy, and other advanced energy technologies; nuclear safety and environmental quality and the Department of Energy waste management and environment, safety, and health activities as appropriate; fossil energy research and development; clean coal technology; energy conservation research and development; energy aspects of climate change; pipeline research, development, and demonstration projects; energy standards; and energy conservation including building performance, alternate fuels for and improved efficiency of vehicles, distributed power systems, and industrial processes

(2) Subcommittee on Energy

(3) Oversight and investigative authority over all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration and projects therefor, and commercial application of energy technology, and environmental research, development, and demonstration including: technical standards and standardization of measurement; the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce; the National Institute of Standards and Technology; the National Technical Information Service; the Office of Minority Business Competitiveness; tax, antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental
policies as they relate to technological development and commercialization; technology transfer including civilian use of defense technologies; patent and intellectual property policy; international technology trade; research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation; surface and water transportation; navigation; flood control; environmental protection programs; Environmental Protection Agency research and development programs; biotechnology policy; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration research activities; scientific issues related to environmental policy, including climate change; Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer; and life sciences research and ratios on all matters before the Subcommittee.

**Procedures**

(d) No Subcommittee shall meet for markup or approval when any other Subcommittee of the Full Committee is meeting to consider any measure or matter for markup or approval.

(e) Each Subcommittee is authorized to conduct its legislative oversight, investigation, and general oversight hearings; to conduct inquiries into the future; and to undertake budget impact studies. Subcommittee Chairman may also, after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(f) Any Member of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any Subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee shall vote or participate in such Subcommittee, except as provided in Rule 3(c).

(g) During any Subcommittee proceeding for markup or approval, a record vote may be had at any time by the vote of two or more Members of that Subcommittee.

**RULE 4. REPORTS**

**Substance of Legislative Reports**

(a) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall include the following, to be provided by the Committee:

1. (1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to Rule X 2(b)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, separately set out and identified 

2. The statement required by section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified

3. with respect to reports on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, and any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the report if submitted after the conclusion in the report if submitted after the conclusion in the report.

4. with respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report unless timely requested for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that Committee.

5. The estimate and comparison prepared by the Committee under Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2) or the Rules of the House of Representatives, unless the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepared under subparagraph 2 of section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified

6. if in the case of a bill or joint resolution which reduces or limits tax expenditures as specified in section 3(c), the estimate and comparison prepared by the Committee under Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2) or the Rules of the House of Representatives, unless the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepared under subparagraph 2 of section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified

7. the statement of the text of the measure or matter in which the measure or matter is included within, and shall be a part of, the report of the Committee upon that measure or matter.

8. the statement of the text of the measure or matter in which the measure or matter is included within, and shall be a part of, the report of the Committee upon that measure or matter.

9. the statement of any additional views (and any material submitted under Rule 4(b) (1)) are included as part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views, which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and shall be upon the date of the filing of any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under Rule 4(b) (1) are included as part of the report)

10. the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely requested for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be accepted for inclusion in the report if submitted after the announced time has elapsed unless the Chairman of the Committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that Committee.

11. the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall advise Members of the day and hour when the time for submitting views relative to any given report elapses. No supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be accepted for inclusion in the report if submitted after the announced time has elapsed unless the Chairman advises Members of the day and hour when the time for submitting views relative to any given report elapses. No supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be accepted for inclusion in the report if submitted after the announced time has elapsed unless the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, decides to extend the time for submission of views the 2 subsequent calendar days after the day of notice.

**Consideration of Subcommittee Reports**

(e) Reports and recommendations of a Subcommittee of the Committee shall be printed in a single volume which shall include within the report of the Committee until after the intervention of 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays, from the time the report is submitted to the Full Committee membership and printed hearings thereon shall be made available, if feasible, to the Members, except that this rule may be waived by a vote of the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the North Atlantic Assembly:

Mr. HEFFLEY of Colorado, Chairman;
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Vice Chairman;
Mr. REGULA of Ohio;
Mr. MURPHY of Ohio;
Mr. EHlers of Michigan;
Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida;
Mr. SHUMER of New York; and
Mr. REYNOLDS of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern over our Nation's involvement in the war in Iraq. I would have hoped that the recent Iraqi elections would quell my concern, but the fact is that I had grave concerns before we engaged in this war. I have had grave concerns during the unfolding of this war and today I still have serious concerns over this administration's ability to provide a positive outcome in Iraq. This President must be held accountable to this Congress and more importantly to the people of the United States. He must provide a success strategy and a vision for what comes next in Iraq and how and when our brave troops will be able to come home. We owe this public statement to the more than 1,400 troops that have died and those tragically that may lose their lives in the future. The President, during his State of the Union that one of our responsibilities to future generations is to "leave them an America that is safe from danger, and protected peace." However, absent an articulated success for exit plan by our troops, the very existence of that future generation is in jeopardy. This war has certainly created more terrorists than it has eliminated. In addition, our troops are now returning home in worse condition than before they left. Too many of our men and women have suffered life changing injuries in Iraq and now must come home to live with the rest of their lives. Troops are being asked to stay in Iraq longer than they had ever committed for and all of this takes a toll on their families. In the end this war will not be the legacy that our young families. In the end this war will not be the legacy of our young troops will be able to face the rest of their lives based on the consequences of this war. Their bloodshed demands a reasonable success and exit plan.

My distinguished colleague, Ms. WOOLSEY, and I today will be the legacy of our young people. We are now able to discuss the consequences of this war. Our troops are being asked to stay in Iraq longer than they had ever committed for and all of this takes a toll on their families. In the end this war will not be the legacy that our young families. In the end this war will not be the legacy of our young troops who will have to face the rest of their lives based on the consequences of this war.

Their bloodshed demands a reasonable success and exit plan.

My distinguished colleague, Ms. WOOLSEY, has introduced legislation that calls on the President to develop and implement a plan to bring our troops home. We have the opportunity to control their own national administration will surely respond that they are committed to a free Iraq and the...
truth is that we all are committed to that ideal, but this administration seems incapable of providing clarity on its plans in this war.

From the very beginning we have been left in the dark as to what this administration was planning in regards to Iraq. Our troops and their families have been the ones to suffer and the fact is that the Iraqis have yet to see a free and stable nation. Yes, the recent elections were positive outcome, but they are far far from resolving the predicament in Iraq. I support my colleague’s legislation and I urge all Members of the House to support it. How can we possibly be against legislation that calls upon the President to notify Congress and the American people about the future plans for the war in Iraq.

In formulating a success and exit plan, we must take additional steps to improve Iraq’s economic and political stability. We must change our military focus from combat operations to training the Iraqi army. Moreover, we must intensify our reconstruction efforts with projects that give the Iraqi people real, tangible hope for their future.

The fact remains that American troops have remained in Iraq for 2 years, and the death toll continues to rise; therefore, we must proceed with caution. The positive momentum that has come from a successful election must be used as an opportunity to stop the bloodshed and the expenditure of tax dollars on this effort. I hope that the administration will use the positive momentum of this achievement as an opportunity to devise an success and exit plan for our troops as outlined by Representative Woolsey’s legislation.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

'I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

The oath has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 109th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1 Jo Bonner
2 Terry Everett
3 Mike Rogers
4 Robert B. Aderholt
5 Robert E. (Bud) Cramer Jr.
6 Spencer Bachus
7 Artur Davis

ARKANSAS

At Large, Don Young

ALASKA

ARIZONA

1 Rick Renzi
2 Trent Franks
3 John B. Shadegg
4 Ed Pastor
5 J. D. Hayworth
6 Jeff Flake
7 Raúl M. Grijalva
8 Jim Kolbe

1 Marion Berry
2 Vic Snyder
3 John Boozman
4 Mike Ross

1 Mike Thompson
2 Wally Herger
3 Daniel E. Lungren
4 John T. Doolittle
5 Lynn C. Woolsey
6 George Miller
7 Nancy Pelosi
8 Barbara Lee
9 Ellen O. Tauscher
10 Richard W. Pombo
11 Jim Costa
12 Devin Nunes
13 William M. Thomas
14 Lois Capps
15 Eric Cantor
16 Howard P. “Buck” McKeon
17 David Dreier
18 Brad Sherman
19 Howard L. Berman
20 Adam B. Schiff
21 Henry A. Waxman
22 Xavier Becerra
23 Hilda L. Solis
24 Diane E. Watson
25 Lucille Roybal-Allard
26 Maxine Waters
27 Jane Harman
28 Juanita Millender-McDonald
29 Grace F. Napolitano
30 Linda T. Sánchez
31 Edward R. Royce
32 Jerry Lewis
33 Gary C. Hill
34 Joe Baca
35 Ken Calvert
36 Mary Bono
37 Dana Rohrabacher
38 Loretta Sanchez
39 Christopher Cox
40 Darrell Issa
41 Randy “Duke” Cunningham
42 Bob Filner
43 Duncan Hunter
44 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1 Diana DeGette
2 Mark Udall
3 John T. Salazar
4 Marilyn N. Musgrave
5 Joel Hefley
6 Thomas G. Tancredo
7 Bob Beauprez

CONNECTICUT

1 John B. Larson
2 Rob Simmons
3 Rosa L. DeLauro
4 Christopher Shays
5 Nancy L. Johnson

DELAWARE

At Large, Michael N. Castle

FLORIDA

1 Jeff Miller
2 Allen Boyd
3 Corrine Brown
4 Ander Crenshaw
5 Ginny Brown-Waite
6 Cliff Stearns
7 John L. Mica
8 Ric Keller
9 Michael Bilirakis
10 C. W. Bill Young
11 Jim Davis
12 Adam H. Putnam
13 Katherine Harris
14 Connie Mack
15 Dave Weldon
16 Mark Foley
17 Kendrick B. Meek
18 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19 Robert Wexler
20 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
21 Lincoln Diaz-Balart
22 E. Clay Shaw Jr.
23 Alcee L. Hastings
24 Tom Feeney
25 Mario Diaz-Balart

GEORGIA

1 Jack Kingston
2 Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3 Jim Marshall
4 Cynthia McKinney
5 John Lewis
6 Tom Price
7 John Linder
8 Lynn A. Westmoreland

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 2005, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 2005, at noon.
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H577

9 Charlie Norwood
10 Nathan Deal
11 Phil Gingrey
12 John Barrow
13 David Scott
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EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS. ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

739. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to section 233(c)(1), Committee on Government Reform.


742. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-742, “Public School Enrollment Integrity Clarification and Board of Education Honoraria Amendment Act of 2004,” pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.


747. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives: Airbus; Model A300 B2, and A300 B4; D33-AD; Amendment 39-13843; AD 2004-23-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.


760. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200B, -200C, -200F, -300, -400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes; and Model 747SP Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2004-13892; Amendment 39-13892; AD 2004-20-16) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

761. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model GV and GV-SP Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2004-19942; Directorate Identifier 2001- NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-13840; AD 2004-22-16) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

762. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2001-NM-201-AD; Amendment 39-1439; AD 2004-12-11) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

763. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes; and Model A300 B4-600, B3-600 and B2-600 Series Airplanes (including Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-B600)) (Docket No. FAA-2004-19802; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-190-AD; Amendment 39-1165; AD 2004-22-15) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

764. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2004-19972; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-273-AD; Amendment 39-1352; AD 2004-26-12) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

765. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB 135 and EMB-145 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 2003-NM-85-AD; Amendment 39-13838; AD 2004-20-13) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

766. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-14, DC-9-15, and DC-9-15F Airplanes; and Model DC-9-83 (MD-83), and DC-9-87 (MD-87) Airplanes; and Model MD-88 Airplanes (Docket No. 2002-NM-333-AD; Amendment 39-13902; AD 2004-25-14) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

767. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200B, -200C, -200F, -300, -400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes; and Model 747SP Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2002-13821; Amendment 39-13821; AD 2004-20-16) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

768. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; LETE CEKA ZODY Model L 23 SUPER-BLANIK Sailplanes (Docket No. FAA-2004-18034; Directorate Identifier 39-13905; AD 2004-25-17) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

769. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 2002-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-13996; AD 2004-26-15) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.


771. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Canadair PW150, PW160, PW170, PW180, PW200, PW300, PW400, PW500, PW600, and PW670 Engines (Docket No. FAA-2004-19863; Amendment 39-13981; AD 2004-24-10) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.


773. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-B4-600R, A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes, and A300 C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-B600) (Docket No. FAA-2004-19866; Amendment 39-13983; AD 2004-24-02) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

774. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Extra 300 Aircraft (Docket No. FAA-2004-19869; Amendment 39-13984; AD 2004-25-11) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

775. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model 737-700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes; and Model 737-800, -900, and -900ER Series Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-2004-19870; Amendment 39-13985; AD 2004-24-27) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

776. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A, B, L-1, L-3, and L-4 Helicopters (Docket No. FAA-2004-81-AD; Amendment 39-1433; AD 2004-04-08) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
H.R. 742. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the award of attorneys' fees and costs to small employers when such employers prevail in litigation prompted by the issuance of a citation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 743. A bill to clarify the authority of States to establish conditions for insurers to conduct business within a State based on provision of information regarding Holocaust era insurance policies of the insurer and to establish a Federal cause of action for declining such insurance policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HALL, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 744. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to discourage spyware, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 745. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project on the use of educational assistance under programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with the purchase of certain franchise enterprises; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RANSEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BECKER, Mr. LAHON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. EMANK):

H.R. 746. A bill to require Congress to impose limits on United States foreign debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 747. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to achieve a national health information infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable credit for expenditures of health care providers implementing such infrastructure; 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 Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCCaUL of Texas, Ms. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California, Mr. BERRY, Ms. NORTHUP, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BERRY, Mr. NORTHUP, and Mr. MCHUGH):

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 739. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative flexibility with regard to the filing of a notice of contest by an employer following the issuance or proposed assessment of a penalty by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 740. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for judicial deference to conclusions of law determined by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission with respect to an order issued by the Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):
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801(a)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCKeeN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WIlSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 742. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the award of attorneys' fees and costs to small employers when such employers prevail in litigation prompted by the issuance of a citation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California, and Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 743. A bill to clarify the authority of States to establish conditions for insurers to conduct business within a State based on provision of information regarding Holocaust era insurance policies of the insurer and to establish a Federal cause of action for declining such insurance policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HALL, and Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 744. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to discourage spyware, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 745. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project on the use of educational assistance under programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with the purchase of certain franchise enterprises; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RANSEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BECKER, Mr. LAHON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. EMANK:

H.R. 746. A bill to require Congress to impose limits on United States foreign debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 739. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative flexibility with regard to the filing of a notice of contest by an employer following the issuance or proposed assessment of a penalty by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 740. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for judicial deference to conclusions of law determined by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission with respect to an order issued by the Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 739. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative flexibility with regard to the filing of a notice of contest by an employer following the issuance or proposed assessment of a penalty by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 740. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for judicial deference to conclusions of law determined by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission with respect to an order issued by the Commission; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKeON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 739. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative flexibility with regard to the filing of a notice of contest by an employer following the issuance or proposed assessment of a penalty by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.
Diaz-Balart of Florida, Mr. Garrett of New Jersey, Mrs. Cubin, Mr. Buyer, Mr. Manzullo, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Runy of Kansas, Mr. Strarns, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Rogers of North Carolina, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Souder, Ms. Foxx, Mr. Weldon of Florida, Mr. Shimkus, Mr. Stupak, Mr. Petri, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Hostetter, Mr. Drake, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hoekstra, Mr. Davis of Mississippi, Mr. Jefferson of Kentucky, Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Burton of Indiana, Mr. Delay, Mr. Green of Wisconsin, Mr. Latham, Mr. Petters of Minnesota, Mr. Renzi, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Neugebauer, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mrs. Musgrave, Mr. McCrery, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mr. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Costello, Mrs. Myrick, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Barrett of South Carolina, Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Foxx, Mr. McMillan of Maryland, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Sullivan, Mrs. Miller of Michigan, Mr. Westmoreland, Miss Mckinney of North Carolina, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Doolittle, Mrs. Eidenbenz, Mr. Ingles of South Carolina, Mr. Goode, Mr. Nyr, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Fosseilla, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Guttenreich, and Mr. LaHood:

H. R. 748. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent the transportation of mislabeled or misbranded controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Gerlach (for himself, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Davis of Ohio, Mr. LaTourette, Mr. Kanjorski, and Mr. Gutterrez):

H. R. 749. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide expanded access for persons in the field of membership of a Federal credit union to money order, check cashing, and money transfer services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Shaw (for himself, Mr. Lewis of Kentucky, and Mr. Norwood):

H. R. 747. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to preserve and strengthen the Social Security system through the creation of a personal Social Security guarantee accounts ensuring full benefits for all workers and their families, restoring long-term Social Security solvency, to make certain benefit improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Budget, and the Budget, 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. McDermott (for himself, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Stark, Mr. Becerra, and Mr. Tinkham):

H. R. 751. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program by promoting work, family supports, and neighborhood supports; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. Berry (for himself, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Allen, Mr. Hinchey, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Solis, Mrs. Christensen, Ms. Delauro, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Mr. Lee, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Stark, Mrs. McCarth, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Engel, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Ross, and Mr. Udall of New Mexico):

H. R. 752. A bill to provide for a program of scientific research on abrupt climate change, to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven greenhouse gas tradeable allowances that will limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, reduce dependence upon foreign oil, and ensure benefits to consumers from the trading in such allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. Bradley of New Hampshire:

H. R. 753. A bill to establish the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to protect the public health from the unsafe importation of prescription drugs and from counterfeit prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. Calvert:

H. R. 754. A bill to amend the Act of August 13, 1946, to raise the amount that may be allotted by the Secretary of the Army for the construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. Costello (for himself, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Ehlers, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Woolsey, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Wu, and Mr. McNulty):

H. R. 755. A bill to provide for the external regulation of nuclear safety and occupational safety and health responsibilities at any nonmilitary energy laboratory owned or operated by the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. Culberson (for himself, Mr. Garrett of New Jersey, Mr. Paul, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Souder, Mr. Miller of Florida, and Mr. Hooley):

H. R. 756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income tax all compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Dingell:

H. R. 757. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase certain criminal penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. Ehlers (for himself, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mrs. Tauscher, and Mr. Velazquez of Florida):

H. R. 758. A bill to establish an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training, and cultivation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. Gilchrest (for himself, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Shays, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Bordloik, Mr. Isley, Mrs. Kelly, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Castle, Mr. Mendendez, Mr. Pritti, Mr. Ford, Mr. Leach, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Saxton, Mr. Slaughter, Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Markey, Mr. Walsh, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. George Miller of California):

H. R. 759. A bill to provide for a program of scientific research on abrupt climate change, to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven greenhouse gas tradeable allowances that will limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, reduce dependence upon foreign oil, and ensure benefits to consumers from the trading in such allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. Hefley:

H. R. 760. A bill to establish a program and criteria for National Heritage Areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. Hinojosa (for himself, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Berman, Mrs. Wilson of New Mexico, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Maloney, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Schiffer, Mr. Ranger, Mrs. McCarthy, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Owens, Mr. Lee, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Kucinich, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Watson, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Etheridge, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Oetcéñ, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Gutiérrez, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. Cardoza, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Fortúño, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Shimane, Mr. Hastings of Florida, Mr. Waters, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Rush, Mr. Holt, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Baca, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Ms. LoBETTA Sanchez of California, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Farber, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Payne, Mr. Wu, Mr. George Miller of California, Ms. Solís, Mr. Case, Mr. Salazar, Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Tiberi, Mr. Towns, Mr. Pecker, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Davis of Florida, Mrs. Capps, Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Bishop of Florida, Mr. Farr, Mr. Bonilla, and Mr. Moran of Virginia):

H. R. 761. A bill to expand and enhance post-baccalaureate opportunities at Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. Holt (for himself, Mr. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia, Mr. Hinchey, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Markey, Mr. Swerny, and Mr. Wolfrum):

H. R. 762. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the battlesfields of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. Holt (for himself, Mr. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Markey, Mr. Swerny, and Mr. Souder):
H.R. 763. A bill to amend the American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant sites and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 764. A bill to require the Attorney General to establish a Federal register of sites of the Revolutionary War and the War for the acquisition and protection of national significance, for purposes of preventing the sale of Federal lands and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BUDOWE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JONES of Massachusetts, Mr. TRELLIS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. GONZALÈS, Mr. SOLOWAY, Mr. BAHRAMS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HUNTSMAN, Mr. GRAM, Mr. RUZBISHI, Mr. ZEPPPO, Mr. T.WILLIAMS, Mr. PLATT, Mr. SENSINEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. JO ANN DANFORTH of Missouri, and Mr. NERI):

H.R. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of private health insurance, and to establish State health insurance safety-net programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. KLINE (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GATEWOOD of New Jersey, Mr. POE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HERDIE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 766. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign the face of $50 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of President Ronald Wilson Reagan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LaHOOD (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. IAMUON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COSTILLO, Mrs. RIGGERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZUOLO, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KEJAR, Mr. SCHAPIRO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. GUTERREZ):

H.R. 767. A bill to provide for the redesign of the reverse of the Lincoln 1-cent coin in 2009 in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln, to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WORKSLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORINNE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CUMMINGS of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FABR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRADY, Mr. GUTERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of New Hampshire, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. KLINE, Mr. KURTZER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NORTWOOD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SENSINEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. JO ANN DANFORTH of Virginia, and Mr. NERI):

H.R. 768. A bill to provide for the reduction of adolescent pregnancy, HIV rates, and other sexually transmitted diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. KAPUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MERHAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NORTON, Mr. WEEXLER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 769. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the National World War I Museum at Fort Snelling, Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 770. A bill to require the annual poverty estimate and the National Assessment of Educational Progress to be subject to certain standards of the National Assessment of Educational Progress to be subject to certain standards of accuracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARKY (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BACA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MERHAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WINTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WOOLEY, Mrs. CROMBIE, Mr.w. MCDERMOTT of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RUZBISHI, Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. McCUSKER, Mr. KHALID, Mr. WELKER, Mr. FRADE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MILLER, Mr. MILLER of Nevada, Mr. WATT, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MCDERMOTT of New York, Mr. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. STEFANIC, Mr. ANGEL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 771. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require that a member of the uniformed services who is killed or otherwise injured while serving in a combat zone continue to be paid monthly military pay and allowances, while the member recovers from the wound or injury, at least equal to the monthly military pay and allowances the member received immediately before receiving the wound or injury, to continue the combat zone designation for the member during the recovery period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MATHESON (for himself and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 772. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to provide entitlement to education assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill to members of the Selected Reserve who aggregate more than 2 years of active duty service in any five year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MCGEON:

H.R. 773. A bill to discourage frivolous, vexatious, or objectively baseless lawsuits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 774. A bill to adjust the boundary of Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for gain from a sale of property held for purposes similiar to the exclusion from gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 776. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to exist from conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 777. A bill to prohibit any Federal official from expending any Federal funds for any population control or population planning program or any activity; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. PUTNAM:

H.R. 778. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to provide greater accountability for Head Start agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 779. A bill to provide for a study of the potential for increased hydroelectric power production at existing Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 780. A bill to amend section 5322 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to provide for assured funding for more Border Patrol agents; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas:

H.R. 781. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Geary County Fire Department certain land in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KAPUR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 782. A bill to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 to assist the neediest of senior citizens by modifying the eligibility criteria for supplemental foods provided under the commodity supplemental food program to take into account the extraordinarily high out-of-pocket medical expenses that some seniors pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERHED, Mr. BILLIKES, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOBAMOS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LOBONDO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHAUD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WOOLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WINTER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOOKMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HERSHEF, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOOLEY, Ms. KENNEDY of Kentucky, Mrs. MCDERMOTH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCGRAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCGRAN, Mr.
H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should not ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H. Res. 84. A resolution providing that the Department of Commerce and the Inter-American Development Bank, in conducting 5-year sunset reviews of anti-dumping or countervailing duties on steel products, take into account, and report on, the impact of such duties on steel-consuming manufacturers and the overall economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. POLFY, and Mr. DENT):

H. Res. 85. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of “National MPS Day”; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANGELY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCOIN, Mr. MESHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TREYGER, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. TURNER):

H. Res. 86. A resolution congratulating the New England Patriots for winning Super Bowl XXXIX; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 789) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamichael; 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. 3: Mr. HOLLISKY.
H. 27: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. BOUCHANY.
H. 32: Mr. COSTTLEBER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. WEINBER.
H. 34: Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. OTTER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. LOWEY of New York.
H. 61: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNDBERG of California.
H. 68: Mr. SHAW.
H. 111: Mr. EMANuELU, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H. 196: Mr. GARY M. MILLER of California, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BLEIRAKIS, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H. 197: Mr. OTTER.
H. 213: Mr. STARK.
H. 224: Mr. LANGREIN.
H. 263: Mr. PLATTS.
H. 283: Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTTLEBER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WATSON, Mrs. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HUSH, Mr. MILL-MCDONALD, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. 284: Mr. COSTTLEBER.
H. 292: Mr. PETRI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. TOMPSON of California, and Ms. HART.

H. 329: Mr. CUBBERSON.
H. 331: Mr. POMEROY.
H. 358: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUPPALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GILCHRIST of North Carolina, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HYDE, Mr. OSDERINE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DOUGEETT, Mr. RAHALI, and Mr. FARH.
H. 390: Ms. JACKSON-Lee of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MATHEWSON, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. 420: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H. 458: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. NEUGRAUER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H. 516: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MACK, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H. 525: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HEFFLEY, Mr. HENNING, and Mr. RADANOVI.
H. 533: Mr. THIERIEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. 534: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. DRAKE, Mr. NUSSELL, and Mr. MACK.
H. 550: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. 558: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. PLATTS, and Mrs. CAPP.
H. 562: Mr. HINCHRY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOWEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HOLT.
H. 581: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. 583: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LEACH.
H. 588: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. ROSLEITZEN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. LOWEY.
H. 591: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. RENZI, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WEMLER.
H. 592: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SWEENY, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H. 601: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WEMLER, and Mr. HONDA.
H. 613: Mr. OSDERINE.
H. 615: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. NRY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ESHOO, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. 635: Ms. JACKSON-Lee of Texas.
H. 651: Mr. GRAVES.
H. 655: Mr. SCHLUNKE.
H. 668: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. OWENS.
H. 682: Mr. CANNON, Ms. KELLY, and Mr. MACK.
H. 688: Mr. GOODE.
H. 712: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, and Mr. GOHMER.
H. 722: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FORD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHOY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. FORBES, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H. Res. 16: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H. Res. 22: Mr. MACK.
H. Res. 41: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 70: Mr. Wynn, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OSDERINE, and Mr. HOLDEN.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

We praise You, O God, for all of Your works. We thank You for the opportunity to serve one another in the name of Jesus Christ. Give us a sense of Your abiding presence. May they honor Your name in their thoughts, words, and actions. Give them compassion for the poor and helpless, and use them to rescue the perishing. Bless our great land and make it a beacon of hope for our world. Give us the graciousness to serve one another in all humility, following Your example of sacrifice. Fill us with Your hope that we may celebrate now that glorious day when You will reign forever as Lord of all. 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

The President pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 2 hours, the first 30 minutes under the control of the minority leader or his designee, the second 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, the third 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCain, and the final 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The President pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, this morning there will be a 2-hour period for morning business. Following that time, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 5, the Class Action Fairness bill. As the majority leader noted last night, we made substantial progress on the bill yesterday. Senator Feingold’s amendment on remand limit is pending. It is our desire to have that vote around 12:30 or so today.

We will also need to dispose of the Durbin amendment on mass actions. I know that discussions continue with respect to that Durbin amendment.

We are not aware of any other amendments to be offered, and therefore it is hoped and expected that we can proceed to final passage of the class action bill at a reasonable hour this afternoon.

Finally, I would say that the two leaders are close to an agreement on the consideration of the Chertoff nomination for next week. We will lock in that unanimous consent at the first opportunity.

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

The President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Thune. Mr. President, I rise today for the first time as a Senator from the State of South Dakota. First and foremost, I thank the people of South Dakota for placing their trust in me, for sending me to fight for their values and to represent them here in Washington, DC.

I had the distinct pleasure of serving the State of South Dakota for three terms in the House of Representatives, and now I am looking forward to continuing my service to South Dakota and to our Nation here in the Senate. I decided to run for the Senate because I believe we can make better progress on an agenda that strengthens our Nation and increases the prosperity of every American. We have a lot of work to do, and we should not let partisanship or political gamesmanship get in the way of this agenda.

The Senate is known for its deliberative qualities, most commonly manifested through the right to free debate. This quality is part of the fiber of the Senate, part of the character that makes it one of the most august institutions in the world.

Some of the greatest debates in our Nation’s history have taken place in this very Chamber, from the 19th century debates on slavery and the Republic to the 20th century debates on civil rights and Social Security. While there is time to debate, we all came here to solve problems, not pass them on to our children. I think I speak for many Members when I say that the only thing that sustains me when I am away from my children is the knowledge that we are improving their lives through our work. That is why I firmly
hope that Congress can work together to do more than simply debate our problems, but work together to solve them.

There are some goals that we can all agree on: a national energy policy that increases the use of renewable fuels, more affordable and accessible health care, and meaningful tort reform. We are, in fact, on the eve of passing class action reform that will restore fairness to the judicial system in this country. Our tort system is broken and, without the necessary reforms, beginning with class action lawsuits, we deny our Nation not only fair and efficient access to justice, but we allow this problem to pull our economy downward. Excessive and often unnecessary litigation expenses cost us in terms of lost jobs, lost growth, and lost revenues every day that it goes unabated. We have a full agenda ahead of us. The American people have put their trust in us to make this Nation even greater than it is today, and we cannot let them down.

Part of the task before us, and the reason I rise today, is the need to fix Social Security. Social Security as the system exists today is in danger. While the system has provided 70 years’ worth of benefits to our Nation’s retirees, the system as we know it today will no longer be able to keep that promise for the next generation.

I understand the intergenerational aspect of this discussion. My father turned 84 in May. My father has served his country as a combat pilot in World War II. He has shot down enemy warplanes for his country. He and my mother rely—depend upon Social Security. We need to keep faith in our promise to them.

But I also have teenage daughters. I understand, if we do nothing to improve this system, that our children and grandchildren will not see the Social Security benefits to our Nation’s retirees, the system as we know it today will no longer be able to keep that promise for the next generation.

The explanation of why this is happening is not that difficult to understand. In 1950, there were 21 workers for every retiree. Today’s seniors, like my mom and dad back in Murdo, SD, and those nearing retirement age, can be assured that their benefits are safe and sound. The same cannot be said for my two daughters and the rest of their generation.

The explanation of why this is happening is that our children and grandchildren will not see the Social Security benefits that they are counting on receiving. Today’s seniors, like my mom and dad back in Murdo, SD, and those nearing retirement age, can be assured that their benefits are safe and sound. The same cannot be said for my two daughters and the rest of their generation.

The explanation of why this is happening is not that difficult to understand. In 1950, there were 21 workers for every retiree. Today’s seniors, like my mom and dad back in Murdo, SD, and those nearing retirement age, can be assured that their benefits are safe and sound. The same cannot be said for my two daughters and the rest of their generation.

Some may ask, When will we start to see the effects from these changes? The Social Security trustees have told us that beginning in 2018, Social Security will begin paying out more in benefits than it is taking in. This means that we will need to start raising taxes, cutting spending, or reducing benefits in just 13 years to cover the promises that have been made to our retirees. In 2042 the system will no longer be able to pay full benefits without major restructuring.

Some will say those dates sound like they are way off. As the Vice President recently put it, some might be inclined to “kick the can further down the road,” leaving the problem for another President and another Congress to fix. Thirteen years is not that far away. Believe me, if you have children or grandchildren, you know how those first 12 years can go by, and all of a sudden you have a teenager. It happened to me twice with my two daughters. So the problems with Social Security are not going away, and the longer we wait, the more expensive the solution will be and the more painful to the American taxpayer.

The Social Security trustees have told us that if we wait to solve this problem, we are facing a $18.4 trillion shortfall. Experts agree that if we work on solving the problem today, that cost will be closer to $1 trillion—$1 trillion today, $10 trillion later.

My teenage daughters—and I daresay most Americans—can understand the dimensions of that problem. It is our duty to fix this problem now.

Possible solutions are numerous. Many include personal retirement accounts which would create a nest egg for younger generations. These voluntary accounts would allow younger workers to save some of their payroll taxes in a personal account for their retirement. In fact, they would most likely be fashioned like the Thrift Savings Plan that is available to Federal employees. With personal retirement accounts, our children and grandchildren will be able to get more out of the Social Security system when they retire. In addition, they will have something to pass on to their children.

Many include personal retirement accounts which would create a nest egg for younger generations. These voluntary accounts would allow younger workers to save some of their payroll taxes in a personal account for their retirement. In fact, they would most likely be fashioned like the Thrift Savings Plan that is available to Federal employees. With personal retirement accounts, our children and grandchildren will be able to get more out of the Social Security system when they retire. In addition, they will have something to pass on to their children.

The Social Security trustees have told us that if we wait to solve this problem, we are facing a $18.4 trillion shortfall. Experts agree that if we work on solving the problem today, that cost will be closer to $1 trillion—$1 trillion today, $10 trillion later.

My teenage daughters—and I daresay most Americans—can understand the dimensions of that problem. It is our duty to fix this problem now.

Possible solutions are numerous. Many include personal retirement accounts which would create a nest egg for younger generations. These voluntary accounts would allow younger workers to save some of their payroll taxes in a personal account for their retirement. In fact, they would most likely be fashioned like the Thrift Savings Plan that is available to Federal employees. With personal retirement accounts, our children and grandchildren will be able to get more out of the Social Security system when they retire. In addition, they will have something to pass on to their children.

Many include personal retirement accounts which would create a nest egg for younger generations. These voluntary accounts would allow younger workers to save some of their payroll taxes in a personal account for their retirement. In fact, they would most likely be fashioned like the Thrift Savings Plan that is available to Federal employees. With personal retirement accounts, our children and grandchildren will be able to get more out of the Social Security system when they retire. In addition, they will have something to pass on to their children.

The Social Security trustees have told us that if we wait to solve this problem, we are facing a $18.4 trillion shortfall. Experts agree that if we work on solving the problem today, that cost will be closer to $1 trillion—$1 trillion today, $10 trillion later.

My teenage daughters—and I daresay most Americans—can understand the dimensions of that problem. It is our duty to fix this problem now.

Possible solutions are numerous. Many include personal retirement accounts which would create a nest egg for younger generations. These voluntary accounts would allow younger workers to save some of their payroll taxes in a personal account for their retirement. In fact, they would most likely be fashioned like the Thrift Savings Plan that is available to Federal employees. With personal retirement accounts, our children and grandchildren will be able to get more out of the Social Security system when they retire. In addition, they will have something to pass on to their children.
Stop and think for a minute of your own birth date, and then address the question, Is Social Security going to be a problem for me? If you were born in the 1930s, as I was, or if you were born in the 1940s, as my wife was, or if you were born in the 1950s, as my nieces and nephews were, the answer is no; there is not a problem for you with respect to Social Security. Your benefits will be paid. They will be paid at the full level the law requires. You do not have a problem with Social Security.

If you were born in the 1960s as my children were, the question of whether you have a problem depends on how long you will live. If you were born in the 1960s and you live into your eighties, chances are in the last few years of your life the Social Security benefits are going to be cut quite dramatically. If you manage to die before you get to age 80, then you won't have a problem.

If you were born in the 1970s, it is almost certain you will have a problem. And if you were born in the 1980s, it is guaranteed that the Social Security benefits will have to be cut before you reach retirement age.

For those young pages sitting here, it is very possible that you may not have to do something now, you will be penalized for your youth. The Social Security benefits will be seriously curtailed for you.

Let us review some history to put some flesh on the bones as to whether there is a problem. Think of Social Security in these terms: It is a little like a lottery. A lottery works this way: A lot of people pay in, and only some people get paid out. So it produces winners and losers. With Social Security, a lot of people pay in, and not all of them get money out.

Here are the statistics which demonstrate what has been happening to this lottery. In the 1940s, 51 percent of the workers paid into the lottery and the other 49 percent who paid in and had gotten nothing out. Fifty-four percent in 1940 of the men—and in 1940 our workforce and retiree population was almost entirely male—got money out of the lottery and the other 46 percent who had paid in got nothing. This is the ideal political situation, because the losers were dead. They were not in a position to protest that they had paid in and had gotten nothing out. Fifty-four percent in 1940 of the men—and in 1940 our workforce and retiree population was almost entirely male—got money out of the lottery and the other 46 percent who had paid in got nothing, but they weren't complaining because they were dead.

But then the women started to join the workforce, and now women make up as high a percentage of the workforce as men, and the age kept going up. Today, 72 percent of the men who paid into the lottery are eligible for benefits, and 83 percent of the women who paid into the lottery are eligible for benefits. Whereas it was 54 percent who were winners in 1940, it is now 80 percent who are winners, and the number keeps going up.

There is another factor. This shows how many people get into the winner side who are going to be drawing money from Social Security. How long did they stay there? In 1940, once a man got to retirement age, he would stay there on the average for 12 years. Women—there were fewer of them who were in the program—lived for 14.7 years. But the numbers kept going up. Today, a man will be in the program for 15 years or more, and a woman will live into her eighties, chances are in the last few years of your life the Social Security benefits are going to be cut quite dramatically. If you manage to die before you get to age 80, then you won't have a problem.

In 1945, there were 42 people paying in for every one person drawing out. That is true because the program was still new enough that there were not enough people old enough to take advantage of it. That came down dramatically, and as the baby boomers started to retire, it would, as more and more retirees came on. In the 1950s, 5 years later, the number was down to 17. Now it is down to 3, and the projections are that it will go down to 2. You cannot have that kind of imbalance two people paying in for every person who is drawing out, while the people who are drawing out are growing as a percentage of the whole program.

How do we deal with this? How have we dealt with this historically over this period? This is how we have dealt with it. Take the 50-year period from 1945 to 1995, and this is the list of tax rates that have been applied to Social Security. For 50 years of time, we have run into one of these demographic problems. We have solved it by raising the tax rate.

I would like to demonstrate what Franklin Roosevelt and Congress in 1936 promised the American people on this line. This is the photographe of the brochure that was distributed to every recipient of Social Security in 1936. “Security In Your Old Age, Social Security Board, Washington, DC.”

Here is the quote from that pamphlet that was distributed to every Social Security beneficiary. “Beginning in 1949, twelve years from now, you and your employer will each pay 3 cents on each dollar you earn up to $3,000 a year. That is the most you will ever pay.”

If ever there was a promise so stupid as a promise where only two people are paying in for every person who is drawing out, while the people who are drawing out are growing as a percentage of the whole program, this is it.

I have cited the history. Now it is time to get prospective and talk about what is coming.

All of the demographic statistics I have quoted are shown here on this chart. It starts in 1950, and here is where we are now. In the next 30 years the percentage of Americans who are 65 or older. It has been going up. Yet, it leveled off starting around 1990, and stayed stable; even went down a little. But starting in 2008, something is going to happen. I stress the 2008, because a lot of the problems have been ignored, and I said, No, the crisis is in 2018, or 2042, or 2042 isn’t right, it’s 2052.

Here are the demographic realities of what we are facing. Starting in 2008, this line is going to start up dramatically and steeply, and over the period of the next 30 years the percentage of Americans who are 65 and older will double.

When will it hit? It will start to hit in 2008. That is not a long way off. That is the year 2008, that is the year we just elected—the 6-year term for which I was just elected—the 6-year term that the people of Utah gave to me—that this problem is going to start to hit us. We have to deal with it now or 30 years from now we are going to end up with a population twice the percentage of the level it is now and no solution.

Let’s look at what the Social Security Administration says this will do. This is the chart of current benefits, current law. Here is the revenue line; here is the cost line. Here is the hole in the hole of the cost line that is much higher than the revenue line. This hole by itself is $1.5 trillion. Where is that $1.5 trillion going to come from to pay the benefits? It will have to come from either increased tax revenues or increased borrowing to the public. Or it will have to come from some kind of increased rate of return on the money coming in down here. Those are the three ways to deal with it.

If we doubled taxes, again, the pressure will start in 2008. It will be gradual but it will build. And over the next 30 years, it will overwhelm us if we do not either raise the taxes, cut the benefits, or increase the rate of return.

The proposals of what to do about this range across a wide spectrum of ideas. The President has focused on an idea that he thinks will raise the rate of return on the income coming in. Others have focused on taxes. That is, indeed, how we have handled this for the last 50 years. We have always raised taxes. Some have said we have to begin to adjust the benefits. All of these proposals should be on the table. All of these proposals should be discussed in perfectly good faith. I am willing to discuss anything.

As I said at the outset, we have a history now in the committee that I have chaired of examining these issues. We believe we understand the realities of the past and the challenges and opportunities of the future. We are willing to discuss with anyone any of these proposals and responsibilities.
Remember, there is a problem. It is at the very least a $1.5 trillion problem. It is going to start to hit us in 2008. Surely we in this Chamber can in good faith recognize these facts and deal with them in a spirit of cooperation, reach out to the White House and try to find a solution so that these pages will not, in fact, be penalized for their youth and find themselves in a situation where they do not get the benefits their grandparents and others received. They will be paying into the system. They will never receive the benefits that others have received unless we lock arms, cooperate, and produce a solution.

My focus today has been to review the history of where the problem has been and review the prospective demographic realities we face. At some future time I will outline some of the solutions my committee has discovered might very well work as we try to find a way to deal with this very real problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Murkowski). The next 30 minutes is under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee. The Senator from Illinois.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first I salute my colleague from Utah. I agree completely with his conclusion—completely. We need to get together on a bipartisan basis and talk about the future of Social Security. That should be the starting point.

Unfortunately, it is not the starting point. The starting point is a proposal by the administration that we create this privatization of Social Security. That is not a good starting point. We should be able to come together and agree on some facts. The facts are fairly obvious. They have been certified by the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office. They differ a little bit from what was just said. I was in Congress in 1983. We looked at Social Security and said we have a serious, immediate crisis: If we do not do something, and do it now, we will find ourselves in a position where we will not be able to meet our promises to all the retirees who paid into Social Security their entire working lives.

President Ronald Reagan, a Republican President, reached across the aisle to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Tip O'Neill, a leading Democrat, and said: Can’t we find a bipartisan way to deal with the most popular and important social program in America? Tip O’Neill said: We have to.

They created a commission with Alan Greenspan as the Chairman. They brought real bipartisanship to the Commission. They did not try to load it one way or the other which, unfortunately, has happened many times when it comes to Social Security. This Commission came up with a list of suggestions to Congress. They said: If you do these things, Social Security will have a long life. The baby boomers whom we know will retire after the turn of this century, we will be able to take care of them.

Some of the things they proposed were controversial: They increase the retirement age to the age of 67 over a period of years; there were suggestions of taxing Social Security benefits for higher income retirees; there were cuts in benefits; there were increases in payroll taxes which were to be long list; but each of the proposals in and of itself was not that extreme or radical. When it was all said and done, on a bipartisan basis, Congress enacted that law, changed Social Security.

Let me tell you what we bought for the political courage of President Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O’Neill in 1983. What we bought was, literally, 59 years of solvency for Social Security. We came together and solved the problem.

There are people ever since who have been carping about and criticizing the 1983 bipartisan approach, but I am glad I voted for it. I am glad because I can stand and face those retiring and say we faced the problem and we solved the problem.

Frankly, that is what we have to acknowledge today. The future problems are, in fact, long-term future problems for Social Security. What we know now is obvious and has been certified and sound to be true: that, is, untouched, without a single amendment to the Social Security law, no changes whatsoever, Social Security will make every payment to every retiree, with a cost-of-living adjustment, every month, every year, until 2022—according to the Congressional Budget Office, 2002. So for 37 years, Social Security is intact, solid, performing, and solvent. Some say it is beyond that. Some say at the end of 47 years we will reach a point where we will not be able to meet every obligation.

Think of that. There is not a single program in our Federal Government today that we can say with any degree of certainty will be here 3 years from now. We can say with certainty, under the current law, Social Security will be there 37 years from now making every single promised payment.

What happens after 37 years? It is true, we will have taken the surplus in Social Security and invested it in the mutual fund and it does not sound like much, but it is a substantial change.

As we play out this White House suggestion, what we find is alarming. What the White House memo proposed would lead to a 40-percent decrease in Social Security benefits. So we step back and say, wait a minute. If we do nothing in the year 2042 we can see a 20- to 30-percent decrease in our payments in Social Security. But if we buy into President’s approach we know we will see a 40-percent decrease. How can that be a good solution? The President’s plan does not make Social Security any stronger. The President’s plan makes Social Security even weaker.

Then there is the kicker, the one thing that the administration does not want to talk about. This administration says their budget is focused on taming the budget deficit. I have to tell the President quite honestly, if it is not in the cost of living added to our national debt. How are you going to pay for that?

Well, we will add it to the debt of America. For all the young people, the
To suggest this is a crisis we did not anticipate, I was here when we did anticipate it. President Reagan and Tip O'Neill, in anticipation of it, came up with a good, bipartisan approach.

I yield to the Senator from Utah for another question. Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that the Comptroller General of the United States, who runs GAO, has used the 2008 figure because the 2008 date is the date the baby boomers start to retire? Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that I did not say there is a looming crisis that hits us in 2008, that what I said was the pressure on the Social Security system will begin in 2008 and will build from that date to the point that ultimately $1.5 trillion will have to be raised to fill in the hole in the trust fund, once we cross the line where the amount coming in does not meet the amount going out, and that the 2008 figure is the beginning of the crisis? By no means did I imply or state that 2008 was indeed a crisis point.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reining my time, let me concede to the Senator from Utah, if I misstated his position. I do not want to make it clear, though, that I sincerely disagree with your conclusion. To suggest we are facing a crisis in 2008 is to suggest we did not anticipate what will happen in 2008, and that is plain wrong. In 1983, we anticipated the baby boomer generation, larger numbers of retirees, and we did something about it because we made changes in the law. Because we are prepared for the baby boomers, we will not be in crisis in 2008. We will have the money to pay every single baby boomer every penny promised.

That is the point many on the other side of the aisle want to overlook. They want to overlook what we did in 1983. Instead, they should look at that as a model for what we did in 2005. If we want to do something for Social Security, let’s do it on a bipartisan basis.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, before I yield, I would ask the President Officer, how much time is remaining in morning business on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I will make a statement that will take about 7 or 8 minutes on Medicare prescription drugs. Then I will yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, that would be great. Can I ask the Senator to yield for one question on Social Security?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator for one question.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I listened carefully to the discussion of the Senator from Illinois on Social Security, and I am curious, because I heard the President say if you are 55 or older you are fine, you will be OK under his new plan. He is targeting it to everybody else. But as I listened to the Senator talk about the fact that money would be taken out of the payroll roll tax, and we also would be increasing the debt by substantial amounts, do you think someone who is 55 today is going to be OK under this plan 10 years from now when they retire and money has been taken out of the payroll tax?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in response to the question of the Senator from Washington, I obviously cannot answer that because no one knows what this privatization plan would do exactly. It certainly is not healthy for the Social Security system to see payroll taxes that had been anticipated and dedicated to paying retirees being removed and put into private investments with the risk attached to them. So I do not think there is any certainty for any retiree. The President cannot come up with more details on what he plans to do. I, for one, think the President’s plan weakens Social Security and does not strengthen it.

The remarks of Mr. DURBIN and Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 341 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

BUDGET IMPACT ON VETERANS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, one week ago we walked across the Capitol to hear President Bush outline his priorities for the Nation when he issued his State of the Union Address. On that night, President Bush told all of us and the Nation reflecting his priorities, his fiscal year 2006 budget, “... substantially reduces or eliminates more than 150 government programs that are not getting results, or duplicate current efforts, or do not fulfill essential priorities.”

Less than a week after delivering that address, the President unveiled his budget that defines exactly what he sees as those nonessential priorities. What are they? Students; our ports and our borders; accessible health care; nuclear waste cleanup.

In addition, his budget has not one dollar—that is right, not one single dollar—for the two top priorities the President talked about that night. His two top priorities: Social Security transition, and making the tax cuts permanent. Both of those items are completely ignored in his budget. This is a camouflage budget that we have been presented, and it is meant to hide the truth from American families.

What the President should know is that families in my home State of Washington and across the country are concerned about the security of their
jobs, the security of their communities, access to affordable health care, and quality education.

Unfortunately, rather than inspiring confidence, I believe the President’s budget leaves too many Americans questioning if we will ever have a future. On issues that impact our communities, this budget leaves too many Americans wondering if their communities will move forward and to feel secure.

What I would like to focus on is this budget’s impact on one group that we absolutely must take care of, and that is our Nation’s veterans. We have no greater obligation as elected officials than to take care of those who have taken care of us. Unfortunately, I fear this administration is failing in this most important responsibility. After asking thousands of soldiers to serve us overseas, this administration is not making their health care and their well-being a priority when they cease being soldiers and become veterans.

Access to first-class care should be a reality for all veterans, especially while our Nation is at war. The President’s budget may have a few small steps in the right direction, but, sadly, he does not go far enough to meet the needs of all veterans. If this budget and its missteps were enacted, it would devastate veterans’ health care. Payroll and inflation increases for doctors, for nurses, for medications cost more than $1 billion. But the President has proposed to give the VA only $390 million to meet these needs. To make up for the shortfall, the budget forces more than $2 million so-called middle-income veterans to pay more than double for their needed medications and to pay a $250 enrollment fee. That is not what we promised veterans when we asked them to serve us overseas.

In addition, the President’s budget actually continues to ban some veterans from coming to the VA for care. So far under this flawed policy, 192,260 veterans have been turned away from the country, including more than 3,000 in my home state. This State sends the wrong message to our troops overseas. They need to know we are there for them when they return home.

Sadly, this budget also destroys the relationship between the VA and our States. After the Civil War, the VA has supported the cost of veterans who reside in our State VA nursing homes. But this budget now calls on States to cover the entire cost of care for many veterans in these cost-effective nursing homes.

To make this budget add up, the President calls for $590 million in unspecified efficiencies. Thousands of nurses and other providers will be cut, thousands of nursing homes will be shuttered, and more than 1 million veteran care will no longer be able to afford to come to the VA for care.

You don’t have to take my word for this. Listen to a head of the AFW who addressed this issue in Commerce Daily a few days ago. John Furgess, who heads the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said the administration’s proposed $380 million increase in veterans health care only amounts to an increase of about $100 million because the budget proposes that veterans shoulder a $250 enrollment fee and an increased copay on prescription drugs in addition to nursing home cuts. Furgess said:

"Part of the President’s deficit will be balanced on the backs of military veterans, because it’s clear that the proper funding of veterans’ health care and other programs is not an administration priority."

There is another way. Before the budget was even sent to Congress, I read this in the New York Times:

Richard B. Fuller, legislative director of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, said:

“The proposed increase in health spending is not sufficient at a time when the number of patients is increasing and there has been a huge increase in health care costs. It will not cover the need. The enrollment fee is a healthcare tax and to discourage people from enrolling.”

Mr. Fuller added that the budget would force veterans, hospitals, and clinics to limit services. He said:

“We are already seeing an increase in waiting lists, even for some Iraq veterans.”

The story went on to say that there are already some hospitals with waiting lists for Iraqi veterans:

In Michigan, for example, thousands of veterans are on waiting lists for medical services, and some veterans returning from Iraq say they have been unable to obtain the care they were promised. A veteran clinic in Pontiac, Mich., put a limit on new enrollees. Doctors, once at a veterans hospital at Alamo, Pa., are forced to send some veterans to seek treatment elsewhere.

And yesterday, in an editorial titled “Penalizing Veterans,” the Boston Globe said:

"It is a sign of how desperate the Bush administration is to protect tax cuts for the wealthy while also trying to reduce runaway deficits that it would call for veterans to pay more for their health benefits. Congress should end this case-by-case, hands-off, put enough money into veterans’ health care to end the inexcusable waiting lists at many veterans’ facilities.”

I ask unanimous consent to print the editorial “Penalizing Veterans” in the Record.

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

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 9, 2005]

Penalizing Veterans

It is a sign of how desperate the Bush administration is to protect tax cuts for the wealthy while also trying to reduce runaway deficits that it would call for veterans to pay more for their health benefits. Congress should reject this proposal out of hand and put enough money into veterans’ health care to end the inexcusable waiting lists at many veterans’ facilities.

Under the Bush proposal, veterans would have to pay an enrollment fee of $250 for VA care. Their copay for prescription drugs would rise from $7 to $15 for a monthly prescription. The administration lamely defends its misguided proposals were enacted, it is an insult to those who have served us overseas.

The American Legion’s national commander, Thomas Cadmus, said yesterday, it is particularly wrong-headed for the administration to choose veterans when some of the armed services have had trouble filling their ranks. Congress should tell the Bush administration that veterans, who enlisted to help our nation, should not be enlisted anew, involuntarily, and burdened with the job of balancing the budget.

Mrs. MURRAY. As my colleagues can see, I am not alone in my concern for this budget’s tremendous impact on our veterans. Unfortunately, the widespread outrage at this budget is not limited to its impact on veterans. I could speak for much time on this floor about my concern as the committee’s ranking member that inadequate spending for veterans is a symptom of how the Bush administration is to protect tax cuts for the wealthy while also trying to reduce runaway deficits. It is an insult to them, to their health is undermining the unwritten promise to end the inexcusable waiting lists at many veterans facilities. Veterans Affairs. Veterans advocates think this care should not be discretionary but mandatory, like Medicare. In spite of the growing number of veterans from recent wars, the increasingly severe health needs of older veterans, and overall increases in health care costs, the administration is asking for just a 2.7 percent increase for “discretionary” health care. Veterans groups favor an increase of 25 percent.

That is not realistic, but it is a reflection of the frustration the advocates feel knowing that inadequate spending for veterans’ health care undermines the promise of lifetime care that many veterans believe was made to them when they took the oath. Congress should reject this proposal out of hand and put enough money into veterans’ health care to end the inexcusable waiting lists at many veterans’ facilities.”

As a member of the Budget Committee, I raised some of these concerns last week with the Office of Management and Budget. I was pretty disappointed with OMB Director Bolten’s responses to our questions on energy policy, on veterans, and on a number of other issues that came before the Budget Committee. This morning, Secretary Snow is addressing the committee. I will leave the floor now to attend that hearing. I hope we get better responses from him.

But for now, let me just say that it seems to me that President Bush believes that in his budget veterans are a nonessential priority. That is an insult. It is an insult to them, to their service, and their sacrifice. I know I, and I believe many of my colleagues, will not stand for this assault on our veterans. They deserve better.

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

Mr. President, the PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(The remarks of Mr. McCaIN and Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 342 are located in today's Record under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. McCaIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 5, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5) to amend the procedures that apply to the consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Durbin (Modified) Amendment No. 3, to preserve State court procedures for handling mass actions.

Feingold Amendment No. 12, to establish time limits for action by Federal district courts on motions to remand cases that have been removed to Federal court.

Mr. SPEcTER. Mr. President, I thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation in moving this class action bill. We reported it out of committee a week ago today and started the opening debate on it on Monday afternoon and then proceeded in a very timely fashion. The prospects are good that we will conclude action on the bill today. A unanimous consent agreement is currently in the process of being worked out, and we will know in the next few minutes precisely what will happen.

We are going to proceed in a few minutes to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FeINGOLD, which would impose some time limits on the courts which, as I said at the committee hearing last week, I think is a good idea. I advised Senator FeINGOLD that I would feel constrained to oppose it on this bill because of the procedural status, where the House of Representatives has been reported to accept the Senate bill provided it comes without what we call a clean bill, without amendments.

But as I said to Senator FeINGOLD, and will repeat for the record, I had heard many complaints about delays in our Federal judicial system. I believe that is an appropriate subject for inquiry by the Judiciary Committee on a broader range than the issue specifically proposed by Senator FeINGOLD. It is in the same spirit.

I want to be emphatic. We are not impinging in any way on the independence of the Federal judiciary, their discretionary judgments. But when it comes to time limits, how long they have these matters under advisement, I think it is a proper matter for congressional inquiry. It bears on how many judges we need and what ought to be done with our judicial system generally. So that will be a subject taken up by the Judiciary Committee at a later date.

I think the Senate bill—this may be a little parochial pride—is more in keeping with an equitable handling of class action bills than is the House bill. For example, the House bill would be retroactive and apply to matters pending in the State courts, which would be extraordinarily disruptive of many State court proceedings. I think it is fair and accurate to say that the House bill is more restrictive than the Senate bill and also the House bill, I think, is a better measure to achieve the targeted objective of having class actions decided in the Federal court with balance for plaintiffs and for defendants as well.

So we are moving. I think, by this afternoon, to have a bill which will be ready for concurrence by the House, and signature by the President, and that I think will be a sign that we are moving forward on the legislative calendar.

The Senator from Louisiana is going to seek recognition in a few minutes. I thank my distinguished colleague, Senator Hatch, the former chairman, who has agreed to come over and manage the bill as an amicus. We are, at the moment, having hearings on the bankruptcy bill which we hope to have in executive session next Thursday, to move ahead on our fast moving, ambitious judiciary calendar.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. I wish to recognize and thank them for their leadership, so many Senators who have moved the bill thus far, certainly including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee who just spoke, also the Senator from Iowa, the chief sponsor of the bill, and also the Senator from Utah, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

I am also an original cosponsor of this bill, because it would protect consumers from some of the most egregious abuses in our judicial system.

Let me begin by saying that class actions are an important part of our justice system. They serve an important purpose when properly defined. No one would dispute they are a valuable feature of the legal system. This bill doesn’t do away with them.

As stated so eloquently by the bill’s chief sponsor, my colleague from Iowa, the class action is a powerful tool, but it can work against the public interest.

The reason we need to pass this bill is that there are loopholes in the class action system, and bad actors to game the system. As a result, in recent years class actions have been subject to abuses that actually work to the detriment of individual consumers, plaintiffs in such cases. That is exactly why the law is supposed to help.

Additionally, this gaming of the system clearly works to the detriment of business and our economy, and the need for job creation in forging a strong economy.

Such abuses happen mainly in State and local courts in cases that really ought to be heard in Federal court.

We currently have a system, therefore, which some trial lawyers seeking to game the system to maximize their fees seek out some small jurisdiction to pursue nationwide cookie-cutter cases, and they act against major players in a targeted industry. Often, these suits have very little, if anything, to do with the place in which they are brought. Rather, lawyers select the venues for strategic reasons, or for political reasons, a practice known as forum shopping.

These trial lawyers seek out jurisdictions in which the judge will not hesitate to approve settlements in which the lawyers walk away with huge fees and the plaintiff class members often get next to nothing. The judges in these jurisdictions will decide the claims of other State citizens under their unique State law. They will use litigation models that deny due process rights to consumers and defendants.

Often the decisions coming out of these hand-picked and selected venues are huge windfalls for trial lawyers and big law firms and a punch line for consumers and the people the lawyers claim to represent. There is now in our country a full blown effort aimed at mining for jackpots in sympathetic courts known as “magnet courts” for the favorable way they treat these cases.

Let us look at a few examples of exactly what I am talking about. The best example nationwide, in terms of preferred venues for trial lawyers, is Madison County, IL, where class action filings between 1998 and 2000 increased nearly 2,000 percent. There is actually an example of a South Carolina law firm filing a purported class action on behalf of three named plaintiffs. None of them lived in Madison County, IL, but the lawsuit was filed in that jurisdiction against 31 defendants throughout the United States. None of those defendants were based in Madison County. These lawyers based the alleged jurisdiction on the mere allegation that some as yet unknown class
member might happen to live in Madison County.

I have a law degree. That is stunning to me. You can imagine how astounding and silly and ridiculous that seems to the American people, small business owners, and consumers around the country. Madison County is a great example of one of these magnet jurisdictions. Once their reputation as a magnet jurisdiction is established, they attract major nationwide lawsuits that deal with interstate commerce—exactly what my home State of Louisiana is....

As noted in one study:

Virtually every sector of the United States economy is on trial in Madison County, Palm Beach County, FL, and Jefferson County, TX—long distance carriers, gasoline pur- chasers, insurance companies, computer manufacturers and pharmaceutical developers.

Let us review some of the outrageous decisions that this gaming of a broken system produces.

The Bank of Boston case, where class action members actually lost money when their accounts were debited to pay their lawyers $8,5 million; the Bloch's case, where the class action members received coupons off their next rentals while their lawyers were paid $9.25 million; and the Cheerios case where the plaintiffs got coupons for cereal, while the lawyers were paid $9.25 million; in one case, plaintiffs were paid $88 billion per year. This huge drain on the American economy.

Imagine what this means to your State’s job creation efforts when national attention is brought to your local jurisdiction because it is a new magnet jurisdiction—such as in Louisiana, enormous amounts, including in terms of jobs not created or lost jobs.

Why is S. 5 the solution? I believe S. 5 is a careful, reasonable, and moderate response to the problem with our class action system. We have a bipartisan compromise that has been in the making for 6 years: 6 years of nego- tiation, careful study, and careful compromise.

The House of Representatives has already passed similar class action reform legislation more than twice. I have personally supported and worked for that, and voted for that when I served in the House.

S. 5 provides for Federal district court jurisdiction for interstate class action, specifically those in which the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds $5 million. This means that a plaintiff class is a citizen of a different State from any defendant. Under the bill, certain class actions with more than 100 plaintiffs also would be treated as class actions and subject to Federal jurisdiction.

The bill provides exceptions for cases in which Federal jurisdiction is not warranted. Under the so-called home State exception and the local controversy exception, class action cases will remain in State court if there is a significant connection to a local issue or event or a significant number of plaintiffs are from a single State.

The bill includes consumer protections so the real little guy, the plain- tiff, the consumer who is wronged, is truly made whole. The bill’s consumer bill of rights would require, among other things, that judges review all coupon settlements, and limit attorney fees paid in such settlements to the value actually received by class members. It would also require judges to carefully scrutinize net law settle- ments in which the class action members end up losing money in a class ac- tion settlement, and prohibit settlements in which parochial judges allow some class action members to have a larger recovery because they simply live closer to the courthouse.

I am pleased there is bipartisan, bi- cameral support for a carefully crafted, well-thought-out measure. S. 5 is long overdue.

It is also important to say what we are not doing. This bill is not an at- tempt to eliminate class action law- suits. Time and again, it has been said by parties on all sides that class ac- tions have a proper place in the legal system. This bill is a modest effort to swing the pendulum back toward com- mon sense, making the system work as it was intended.

This bill will not move all class ac- tions to Federal court, only the ones most appropriately settled there. This bill will not overload Federal courts with class actions. They are prepared to deal with these cases far better than State courts, many of whom are over- burdened now. We are not also delaying justice for plaintiffs. Federal courts have as good or better records of dealing with class actions in a timely man- ner.

In closing, our class action system is rife with abuses. It is gamed. It is broken. We need to fix it. First, we need to fix it for the consumers who are hurt by alleged abuses which are the subject of class actions. Plaintiffs leave feeling cheated because they receive a token settlement in many cases for their efforts while lawyers reap all of the financial benefits.

Second, the system is broken and we need to fix it so we do not hurt legiti- mate business, legitimate job-creation efforts in Louisiana and elsewhere. Right now, businesses, fearing the mere threat of legal action, settle cases—a form of judicial blackmail. The whole economy is dragged down and fewer jobs are created.

Third, our system of federalism is un- dermined today because one State’s legal system, rather than the legal sys- tem of the Federal branch of the courts, is making class action decisions that affect each and every other State. So the system is not working for anyone but the lawyers and law firms gaming that system.

A lot of good, hard work has been put into S. 5. I compliment again the prime sponsor, Senator Grassley, as well as the Judiciary Committee, led by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I com- pliment all of their leadership and
their respective staff members for their efforts. I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 5. I urge my colleagues to support and vote for the Class Action Fairness Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today is going to be an important day for the American public because the Senate will adopt legislation that takes a significant step forward in improving our Nation’s civil justice system. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together on this very bipartisan basis. Your work in this body bodes well for the very important bipartisan bill. Our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together on this bipartisan legislation will adopt legislation that takes a significant step forward in improving our Nation’s civil justice system. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together on this very bipartisan basis. Your work in this body bodes well for the Senate’s ability to tackle important issues in the 110th Congress.

Let me now take a couple of minutes to address the pending amendment, Senator Feingold’s amendment, that would add a provision to S. 5 requiring Federal courts to consider remand motions in class actions within a specified period. This amendment is based on the question of whether Federal courts move too slowly and consumer claims will stall while plaintiffs are waiting for courts to rule on jurisdictional issues. In fact, in many cases, Federal courts move more quickly than the State courts. Resolving remand motions is always their first course of business, and we are moving these cases to Federal courts.

The amendment also fails to recognize the important considerations a judge must make as part of a remand decision. Like other amendments that have been offered, this proposal would result in a less workable bill, not a better one. This amendment should be rejected.

The fact is, the Federal courts do not drag their feet in dealing with remand motions. Courts always consider jurisdictional issues first, as they must, before allowing discovery or other substantive motions. The Supremor Court has repeatedly held that jurisdiction is a threshold matter that must be decided first. This is a matter of fairness to other substantive issues in a case. Courts take up jurisdiction as the first course of business already. The amendment is, therefore, unnecessary.

I also want to correct the misunderstanding that Federal courts drag their feet in dealing with class actions generally. This is not the case. In fact, Federal courts generally move more quickly than State courts when it comes to class actions. A recent 2004 study by the Federal Judicial Center found that State courts are far more likely than Federal courts to let class actions linger without ruling on class certification. Moreover, the median time for final disposition of a civil claim filed in Federal court throughout this country is 9.3 months; the median time to trial in a civil matter in State court is 22.5 months. Let me repeat that: 9.3 months in Federal courts versus 22.5 months in State courts for civil claims to be disposed. The dates show the Federal courts act more than twice as fast as State courts come from the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the United States Courts. There is simply no evidence that States proceed more quickly. Thus, the alleged problem that this amendment would fix is nonexistent. It does not exist.

Take, for example, the case cited by Senator Feingold yesterday, Lizana v. DuPont. It did take a year to rule on the motion to remand, but it is my understanding that the court’s docket reveals that the court was very busy on the case before the ruling on the motion to remand was even handed down. In fact, one of the motions the court was contending with was a motion for continuance filed by, yet again, plaintiffs’ counsel. This means it was the plaintiffs who wanted the court to delay its ruling. How can anyone complain about the time it takes for a district court not to rule on a remand motion when there are scores of docket entries in a single year and the plaintiffs themselves were seeking delays?

Some opposed to this amendment suggest that this will use removal as a delay tactic, but Federal law already penalizes defendants who engage in such tactics. The Federal law governing removal gives judges discretion to make a defendant pay the plaintiffs’ attorney’s fees if remand is granted. In addition, rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure gives Federal judges the authority to levy sanctions for frivolous filings. Thus, the law already addresses concerns about improvident removals.

The bottom line is that this amendment will make it unnecessarily difficult for judges to issue fair rulings in these more complicated cases. And class actions generally are more complicated cases. By forcing judges to decide remand motions by a certain date, as the Feingold amendment would do, that amendment fails to recognize that in some cases the jurisdictional issues will be complex, requiring discovery, substantial briefing, and hearings before the judge.

At times, courts consider several remand motions jointly in order to conserve judicial resources, such as in multidistrict litigation, or MDL, as it is called, and this may, in a limited number of complex cases, result in a slightly longer time period for resolution as well. Forcing judges to rush these issues in all cases regardless of their complexity could result in a denial of due process in these cases where the judge cannot adequately and resolve the issue, or issues, in the time allotted by the Feingold amendment.

The reality is that most remand motions will be decided in less time than the amendment requires, but in some cases, other substantive motions. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that jurisdiction is a threshold matter that must be decided first. This is a matter of fairness to other substantive issues in a case. Courts take up jurisdiction as the first course of business already. The amendment is, therefore, unnecessary.

I also want to correct the misunderstanding that Federal courts drag their feet in dealing with class actions generally. This is not the case. In fact, Federal courts generally move more quickly than State courts when it comes to class actions. A recent 2004 study by the Federal Judicial Center found that State courts are far more likely than Federal courts to let class actions linger without ruling on class certification. Moreover, the median time for final disposition of a civil claim filed in Federal court throughout this country is 9.3 months; the median time to trial in a civil matter in State court is 22.5 months. Let me repeat that: 9.3 months in Federal courts versus 22.5 months in State courts for civil claims to be disposed. The dates show the Federal courts act more than twice as fast as State courts come from the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the United States Courts. There is simply no evidence that States proceed more quickly. Thus, the alleged problem that this amendment would fix is nonexistent. It does not exist.

Take, for example, the case cited by Senator Feingold yesterday, Lizana v. DuPont. It did take a year to rule on the motion to remand, but it is my understanding that the court’s docket reveals that the court was very busy on the case before the ruling on the motion to remand was even handed down. In fact, one of the motions the court was contending with was a motion for continuance filed by, yet again, plaintiffs’ counsel. This means it was the plaintiffs who wanted the court to delay its ruling. How can anyone complain about the time it takes for a district court not to rule on a remand motion when there are scores of docket entries in a single year and the plaintiffs themselves were seeking delays?

Some opposed to this amendment suggest that this will use removal as a delay tactic, but Federal law already penalizes defendants who engage in such tactics. The Federal law governing removal gives judges discretion to make a defendant pay the plaintiffs’ attorney’s fees if remand is granted. In addition, rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure gives Federal judges the authority to levy sanctions for frivolous filings. Thus, the law already addresses concerns about improvident removals.

The bottom line is that this amendment will make it unnecessarily difficult for judges to issue fair rulings in these more complicated cases. And class actions generally are more complicated cases. By forcing judges to decide remand motions by a certain date, as the Feingold amendment would do, that amendment fails to recognize that in some cases the jurisdictional issues will be complex, requiring discovery, substantial briefing, and hearings before the judge.

At times, courts consider several remand motions jointly in order to conserve judicial resources, such as in multidistrict litigation, or MDL, as it is called, and this may, in a limited number of complex cases, result in a slightly longer time period for resolution as well. Forcing judges to rush these issues in all cases regardless of their complexity could result in a denial of due process in these cases where the judge cannot adequately and resolve the issue, or issues, in the time allotted by the Feingold amendment.

The reality is that most remand motions will be decided in less time than the amendment requires, but in some cases, they will require more time. We should not create rules of law that force judges to decide issues without full and fair consideration. And that is exactly what the Feingold amendment would do.

Finally, there is a reason the time limits make sense for remand appeals and not for initial rulings on remand motions. In contrast to district courts, which often must develop a factual record to address remand issues, an appeals court that is asked to review a remand order will be provided with a full record from which to reach a decision. Often, the appeals court’s decision will be based simply on a reading of the law, and it will, thus, be less time-consuming than the district court’s decision.

Even a 180-day time limit may be too stringent in some circumstances. Extending it to district court judges will make it more difficult for them, in some cases, to do their jobs in a fair and efficient fashion.

So I hope our colleagues will vote down the Feingold amendment. Frankly, it is another poison pill amendment that would probably scuttle this bill for another year. We have already been on this bill for 6 solid years. We have a consensus in this body to pass it. We know if we pass it in the form that it is in, the House will take it. We know it will become law because the President will sign it into law. Frankly, I hope this amendment will be voted down for all of those reasons.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to talk more generally about the Class Action Fairness Act because it responds to a serious abuse of the class action system that is on the rise; namely, the filing of copycat or duplicative lawsuits in State courts.

Over the past several years, we have seen a rise in the number of class action lawsuits filed in a few State courts known for tilting the playing field in favor of the plaintiffs’ bar; in other words, dishonestly, basically, getting the facts to not go. These courts, referred to as “magnet courts” for their attractive qualities to enterprising plaintiffs’ lawyers, certify class...
actions with little regard to defendants’ due process rights. They award substantial attorneys’ fees as part of class settlements, and they approve coupon settlements to the class members that are sometimes worth little more than the paper on which they are printed.

It has not taken the plaintiffs’ lawyers long to figure out which courts are good for their bank accounts. There was an 82–percent increase in the number of class actions filed in Jefferson County, TX, between the years of 1998 and 2000. During the same time span, Palm Beach County, FL, saw a 35–percent increase. The most dramatic increase, however, has occurred in Madison County, IL. Madison County has seen an astonishing 5,000–percent increase in the number of class action filings since 1998.

Let me just refer to this bar chart. It shows that the number of class actions filed in State courts has skyrocketed under current law: Palm Beach County, 35 percent in just 2 years or 3 years; Jefferson County, 82 percent in the same 2 or 3 years; and Madison County, over 5,000 percent. And then this chart shows the overall increase in State court dockets.

Now, in their effort to gain a financial windfall in class action cases, some aggressive plaintiffs’ lawyers file copypcat class action lawsuits. This tactic helps explain the dramatic increase in filings since 1998. Some lawyers, and sometimes even the same lawyers, file nearly identical class action lawsuits asserting similar claims on behalf of essentially the same class in State courts around the country. Some lawyers file duplicative actions in an effort to take a potentially lucrative role in an action. Other times, these duplicative actions are the product of shopping by the original plaintiffs’ lawyers who file similar actions in different State courts around the country, perhaps with the sole purpose of finding a friendly judge willing to certify the class.

Because these duplicative actions are filed in State courts of different jurisdictions, there is no way to consolidate or coordinate these cases. As a result of the separate, redundant litigation of copypcat lawsuits, our already overburdened State court systems are involved with complicated class actions that potentially affect the rights and recoveries of class members throughout the entire country.

There is not a single magnet State court in this country that has not encountered the copypcat phenomenon. For example, it is my understanding that in Shields v. Allstate County Mutual Insurance Company, filed in Jefferson County, TX, in the year 2000, three named plaintiffs sought certification of a nationwide class of policyholders. At the very same time this action was brought in Jefferson County, no fewer than nine similar actions, representing a similarly situated class and alleging the identical claims, were pending in Madison County, IL, against the same insurance companies.

Another example of copypcat lawsuits is Flanagan v. Bridgestone/Firestone, filed in Palm Beach County, FL. Now, this lawsuit was but one of the approximately 100 identical class actions filed in State courts throughout the country in the wake of the Bridgestone/Firestone tire recall in the year 2000.

One of the most obvious problems with copypcat lawsuits is that they place new burdens on an already stressed State court system. Class actions are large, complex lawsuits with potential ramifications in jurisdictions across the country. Our State courts are courts of general jurisdiction that deal with issues ranging from domestic disputes to personal injuries. They are simply not the best entity to handle the growing number of these complex lawsuits being filed across the country where multiple parties and multiple issues are involved. S. 5 will mitigate the growing burden on our State courts by providing a means through which truly national class actions will be resolved in the most appropriate forum; that is, the Federal courts.

Over the past several months, I have heard some opponents of this bill argue that the Class Action Fairness Act will somehow result in a delay or even a denial of justice to consumers. They have pointed out that State courts resolve claims more quickly, and that removing these actions will result in the overburdening of our Federal courts. I have yet to see or hear a single shred of persuasive evidence to support these claims. In fact, according to the data, a strong case in the opposite direction can be made. According to two separate examinations of the State and Federal court systems conducted by the Court Statistics Project and Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the average State court judge is assigned nearly three times—nearly three times—as many cases as a Federal court judge. The increase of State court class actions further compounds this burden and interferes with the ability of the State court judges to provide justice to their citizens.

In fact, the Illinois Supreme Court has repeatedly criticized its own Madison County court for its horrible backlog. The backlog is the result of the local court’s willingness to take on cases that have nothing to do with Madison County, the county in which they sit. In fact, one Madison County court judge has his willingness to take on cases that have little or no connection to Madison County, or even Illinois, for that matter, when he stated:

"I am going to expand the concept that all cases in the United States are for all citizens of the United States..."

The fact is, when cases are accepted that have nothing to do with the State in which they are filed, it is difficult to see how justice is served. When the cases are forced to remain in State court because some plaintiffs’ lawyers have exploited the system by engineering the composition of the class and in defendants both the class members and the defendants can easily be deprived of justice. In some cases, it appears that the interests disproportionately served are those of the class counsel who stand to receive millions in attorney’s fees upon the swift approval of a proposed settlement while their clients receive next to nothing.

Despite claims to the contrary, S. 5 will not flood or remove all class actions to Federal court. Instead the bill acts to decrease the number currently falling in State court dockets. Most of the cases that would be removed to the Federal courts under the bill are precisely the type of cases that should be heard by such courts in the first place; namely, large national class actions affecting citizens in and around the country, including the very copypcat lawsuits I have discussed today.

Class actions generally have three things in common. No. 1, they involve the most people. No. 2, they involve the most money. And No. 3, they involve the most interstate commerce issues. Taken as a whole, the national implications of class actions are far greater than many of the cases filed and heard by the Federal courts today. With this bill, one is left to wonder how anyone could argue that these actions are not deserving of the attention of our Federal courts.

As Chief Justice Marshall noted: ‘However true the fact may be, that the tribunals of the States will administer justice as impartially as to those of the nation, to parties of every description, it is not less true that the Constitution itself either entertains apprehensions on this subject, or views with such indulgence the possible fears entertained by the Federal courts...’

When the Framers of the Constitution created the Federal courts in article 3 of the Constitution, they gave them jurisdiction over cases involving large interstate disputes, cases such as class actions. Contrary to the claims of opponents of this bill, article 3 does not require complete diversity amongst parties to a claim.

The Class Action Fairness Act will also help protect the interests of consumer class members from copypcat lawsuits. When duplicative lawsuits are pending in different States, a settlement or judgment in any one case has the potential to make every other pending case moot. This winner-takes-all scenario acts as an incentive for plaintiffs’ lawyers with multiple class actions to seek a quick settlement in the case, even if the settlement does no more than make the lawyers involved rich. This also benefits plaintiffs to the other class actions are wiped out by the settlement. That is not fair, but that is what is happening.
Sometimes they file multiple suits so they can force a settlement with a simple settlement demand. And what company wouldn’t pay the defense costs to get out of this type of abusive jurisdiction of the various courts throughout the country. This further is that the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Durbin amendment, with no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote. I further ask unanimous consent that following that vote the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate. Finally, I ask that no other amendments be in order other than the two above-mentioned amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, in light of the unanimous consent agreement that will bring this bill to closure, there is something I needed to get on the record. I appreciate getting a few minutes. I intend to vote for the bill. Everything the Senator said about the bill is very much true. The Senator from Utah has been working as chairman for years. The legal abuse that the Senator described is real. This bill really brings it to an end. I found Federal court to be a fair place to try cases. The Senator is also right about the scope of class action lawsuits. They involve many people from different places throughout the country. We have a good balance in the bill of when you can be removed. Every class action is not going to go to Federal court. If the formula is right, and if it has enough national impact, Federal court will be the place to go because of the abuses described.

Those of us who practiced law for a living before we got here understand that the legal system can be reformed. I admire what the Senator from Utah and Senators SPECTER and GRASSLEY have done to bring about reform. But I find myself sometimes in a unique political dynamic with this bill. Our friends in the House say they want it like we have it. We all agree there are amendments that could make the bill better that we would vote for, but the political moment will not allow that to happen. I regret not offering in committee the amendment I am going to speak about. I learned from my mistakes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 o’clock, the Senate resume debate on the Feingold amendment, and that the time be equally divided in the usual form; provided further that at the conclusion of the debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees until the hour of 5 p.m.; provided further that the time between 2:20 and 2:40 be equally divided between Senator SPECTER and Senator LEAHY; and that at 2:40, the final 20 minutes be reserved, with the Democratic leader in control of 10 minutes, to be followed by the majority leader for the final 10 minutes; provided further that at the conclusion of the debate the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Durbin amendment, with no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote. I further ask unanimous consent that following that vote the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate. Finally, I ask that no other amendments be in order other than the two above-mentioned amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, in light of the unanimous consent agreement that will bring this bill to closure, there is something I needed to get on the record. I appreciate getting a few minutes. I intend to vote for the bill. Everything the Senator said about the bill is very much true. The Senator from Utah has been working as chairman for years. The legal abuse that the Senator described is real. This bill really brings it to an end. I found Federal court to be a fair place to try cases. The Senator is also right about the scope of class action lawsuits. They involve many people from different places throughout the country. We have a good balance in the bill of when you can be removed. Every class action is not going to go to Federal court. If the formula is right, and if it has enough national impact, Federal court will be the place to go because of the abuses described.

Those of us who practiced law for a living before we got here understand that the legal system can be reformed. I admire what the Senator from Utah and Senators SPECTER and GRASSLEY have done to bring about reform. But I find myself sometimes in a unique political dynamic with this bill. Our friends in the House say they want it like we have it. We all agree there are amendments that could make the bill better that we would vote for, but the political moment will not allow that to happen. I regret not offering in committee the amendment I am going to speak about. I learned from my mistakes.
doing business when the formula is right and when there is a national impact to stop home cooking.

The reason the diversity clause exists to begin with is that when you have two people from different States, you want to take a neutral sight. You do not want to do home cooking. Really, the whole goal of this bill is to get it in a neutral site where people can have their fair day in court. I certainly appreciate that.

But there is another component to class actions that is missing in this bill. Class actions, by their very nature, as Senator HATCH described, involve a lot of people from different places and usually a lot is at stake. Sometimes it is money. Sometimes it is a business practice that does not have a lot of economic effect on one person, but when you add up the economic effect, it is bad for the country. People are cheating. People are nickel and diming folks, getting rich at the expense of the small fry, by taking a few dollars here, and it adds up to be a very bad situation for the country. Those type cases lend themselves to class action.

There is another group of cases that could be remiss to class action, too. That is when products are not designed right. They are consumer cases where consumers throughout the country are affected by the particular behavior in question.

Most States have a procedure, when such cases exist affecting the public at large, where the judge is able to determine what is fair in terms of sealing documents relating to settlements. I had an amendment that was modeled after a South Carolina statute—and over 20 States have a similar statute—that says in cases where the public’s interest is present, where there is a consumer case that affects the health or well-being of the community at large, some documents be sealed, and only by the judge determines that the public interest is also being met.

The amendment I proposed would have received well over 50 votes in this body, and I think Senator HATCH would have been friendly to it. But I understand the effect it would have on the bill.

The current chairman, Senator SPECTER, and I will have a colloquy for the record. This is the point of my seeking recognition.

This bill will leave the Senate and go to the House in a way to solve abuse, sometimes in another place. Sometimes it is money. Sometimes it is OK to lose. Losing when you can win and when you can’t. Sometimes it is OK to lose. Losing when you can win and when you can’t.

I do not want to offer the amendment, have colleagues vote against it, and create problems unnecessarily, but I do want my colleagues to know—and this colloquy will express this—that this bill needs to be amended and this problem needs to be addressed. We need to have a provision that is married up with the bill that is about to leave the Senate and go to the House that will allow a judge, upon motion of the parties, to determine where there is a request to keep the settlement secret and seal the documents from public review, to have a judge to determine what documents should be sealed in secret and what documents should be released to the public, balancing the needs of business and the right of the public to know what they should know about their health and their safety.

There were class action cases with the sunshine statute, about which I am talking, in effect. Without that statute, deadly lighters, exploding tires, defective drugs, toxic chemicals, and faulty automobile designs would not have been known if it were not for a procedure for release of certain documents because the request was: We will give you money, but you cannot tell anybody about the underlying problem.

Sometimes that is very much unfair. I have case after case of sunshine statutes allowing the judge to determine what was in the public interest, to inform the public of deadly events, and peoples lives were saved and their health was protected.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

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

PROTECTIVE ORDERS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I appreciate Chairman SPECTER taking the time to join me in discussing a concern I have about the class action bill. I am still prepared to seek a vote on my amendment, but based on my conversations with a number of senators this week, including Chairman SPECTER, and in a desire to see this bill pass as soon as possible, I have decided not to offer my amendment.

I agreed to support this bill some time ago because I believe we are long overdue for reform in the class action area. Over the last few years, I have worked to support this bill in both the Judiciary Committee and on the Senate floor.

While I have fully supported this reform, I have also noticed some areas where the bill could be improved. I had hoped to offer an amendment on the floor regarding protective orders during discovery. I am confident that the amendment that I had hoped to introduce with Senator Pritchard of Arkansas would have made a significant improvement in the area of class action discovery.

Our amendment is very simple. It is based on the local rule in South Carolina Federal Courts for obtaining protective orders for documents. All it says is, if you want a protective order, you must make a motion at the beginning of trial, explain why it is necessary for the court to seal your documents, and provide public notice of the motion and a description of the documents, that’s it.

At least 20 states have taken action to limit secrecy agreements. This type of scrutiny should be extended throughout the nation, especially where we are removing parties from the protection affording them by their States.

And let me be clear. This is not an onerous burden to place on those seeking protective orders. It is not that far from the current discovery rules. We could have gone a lot further; with higher standards, a presumption against sealing, and other controversial discovery reforms. However, we are not seeking to tilt the playing field to one side or the other, just make sure some reasonable, well-thought out ground rules are applied to everyone.

My amendment creates a presumption of openness—it would require the parties in class action lawsuits to justify their requests for secrecy, followed by a medical review of the information they want the court to keep under seal.

They would have to identify the documents or information they want sealed—and most importantly the reasons why it’s necessary to keep them secret.

They also would have to explain why a protective order approach is necessary and justify the request based on controlling case law.

The public would be notified of the information that was being put under seal—and a descriptive non-confidential index of the secret documents would be provided.

In the end, however, it is still up to the judge’s discretion, albeit with a slightly higher standard than currently exist under the Federal rules of civil procedure.

I am doing this because I am convinced Federal Judges will come down on the side of consumer protection when it’s in the public interest and come down on the side of secrecy where merited. In short, while the burden here is on any party that wants to keep
something secret, it is not an onerous task, nor impossible.

Valid trade secrets and proprietary information—sensitive information that goes to the heart of a company being able to compete in the market place and will be protected. There must be safeguards for businesses—they have a right to protect valid trade secrets—patents and other proprietary information. But this isn’t something that can just go on automatically—there has to be some judicial review and I am confident the procedures protect all the parties in a class action lawsuit.

So again, we have merely tried to find a way to balance the legitimate interests of companies, who we want to remain strong competitors in the marketplace, with the public’s interest in disclosing potentially harmful products or practices.

Our amendment strikes the right balance because it raises the bar only slightly to justify why they need to impose secrecy, using our courts to do so, but does not force them to open up their companies to every passerby simply because they are defending a lawsuit.

Now I hear my colleagues who warn that an amendment like this is going to create a number of problems in the judicial system, making discovery more difficult and deterring settlements.

I do not agree. Take a look at Florida, one of the most stringent sunshine laws. I don’t think anyone can tell you Florida is a magnet for class actions. In fact, the most recent studies in the 20 States that have sunshine laws show that limiting court secrecy has not led to more litigation or curtailed the number of cases that are settled.

In fact I do not believe there is any evidence that supports the proposition that more cases will go to trial and fewer settlements will be reached if some procedural safeguards are put in place.

Also, you have to remember that our amendment only applied to court-ordered secrecy. Parties would still have been free to privately agree upon secrecy between them.

In closing Mr. President, I must say I have been a bit taken aback by all the turmoil this amendment has caused. I am pretty sure we can all agree that ours is better. As an amendment, one that serves both the public and those before our courts.

Toward that end, I very much appreciate the understanding I and Senator Pryor have been able to reach with Chairman Specter regarding the substance of our amendment. The chairman has graciously agreed to assist us with this amendment in the Judiciary Committee. I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him to address this issue in the near future.

Mr. SPECTER. I appreciate Senator Graham’s willingness to help us move forward on this bill. He and I have agreed that, due to the procedural posture of this particular bill, we should address the substance of his amendment in committee in the future.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my chairman for his future assistance.

Mr. President, I seek my colleagues that they will have done a good thing by passing this bill. They will do a very good thing if we can take up this amendment at another time to make this bill more balanced because the abuses as described by Senator Hart are real. My colleagues have worked a long time to bring about this date. They should be proud of it.

There is a way to make this bill better, and if we do not address this problem, I predict something is going to happen out there without a sunshine amendment. There is going to be a class action case involving consumer interests, and if there is no procedure for the judge to balance the public interests against any interests, we are going to shield the public from something they should know. There is no reason we cannot do both: Stop the legal abuse and help consumers. It is my pledge and my promise to work with everybody in this body to make that happen.

I yield the floor and thank the Senate for its indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa. Without objection, the Senator is recognized on the minority time.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

MR. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senator Feingold’s amendment. I would add an provisión to the bill requiring the Federal courts to consider remand motions in class actions within a set timetable. This amendment needs to be rejected because it is unnecessary.

There is not any evidence that the Federal courts are particularly slow in dealing with class actions, or specifically that they are slow relative to remand motions. In fact, there is evidence that the Federal courts move more quickly in considering these motions because they always consider jurisdictional issues first. Senator Feingold cites three examples of delay to support his amendment, but I do not think that is enough to start placing strict time limits on court procedure. I think that Senator Feingold is in search of a problem that does not really exist.

Also, the amendment could make it hard for judges to fairly rule in complicated class action cases because judges would be forced to make rushed decisions. This deadline may be too stringent and inflexible to deal with complex cases, where sometimes several motions are considered jointly in order to conserve judicial resources. These motions may require hearings, and the timeframe provided in Senator Feingold’s amendment may not be enough time for a court to schedule a hearing and consider all the evidence.

I also understand that Federal judges who have learned of this possible time limitation on deciding these kinds of motions are concerned that it would place an unreasonable restriction on their ability to fairly decide cases. The Judicial Conference sent a letter opposing a previous iteration of Senator Feingold’s amendment that is more stringent than the current language. However, this amendment still puts significant time constraints on Federal judges that could prove to be too stringent.

So there just is not any evidence that there is a problem with remand motions in class action cases that requires this time limitation that Senator Feingold is proposing. This is just an attempt to weaken the bill. So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 seconds remaining.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have restored the full 5 minutes I was originally granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 seconds remaining.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent to have the 5 minutes restored. I would appreciate that, because the only person who is holding this bill on the floor asked me to stay in committee and finish the bankruptcy hearing. I feel justified in asking for my time to be restored.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, everyone understands that this bill will allow many more class actions to be removed from State to Federal court, but as the supporters have been proclaiming all week long, there are still class actions that belong in State court, even under this bill. Unfortunately, that may not stop defendants from removing cases that should still be in State court.

When a notice of removal is filed, the case is removed to Federal court. There is no proceeding in the State court to make sure the removal is proper. It is up to the Federal court to decide that question, but only if the plaintiffs file a motion to remand to return the case back to the State court.

The amendment I have offered is designed simply to make sure that this process of removal and remand does not become a tool for delaying cases of which the plaintiffs do not want.

It requires a district court to take a look at a motion to remand within 60 days of filing and then do one of two things: Decide it, which I hope will be possible in almost all cases, or issue an order stating why a decision is not yet possible. If the court issues that order, it must then reach a decision within 180 days of filing. The parties can agree on an extension of any length.

I want to make this clear because I heard Senator Grassley responding to my original argument when I came on the floor. The amendment before us actually gives the court a great deal of flexibility. It will also assure that a
motion to remand does not languish for months, or even years, before a court reviews it and says, oops, this case really should be back in State court.

As I noted last night, we have many examples of remand motions sitting unresolved for years, and then the case goes back to State court.

As the Senator from Iowa pointed out, the Judicial Conference did oppose my amendment in committee that had a strict limit of 60 days, but what I have tried to accommodate this concern, which I believe moves in their direction, is tripped that limit in the pending amendment. I think that is eminently reasonable, as the Senate from Delaware, a strong supporter of this bill, acknowledged last night on this floor.

The bill itself provides that appeals of remand motions must be decided within 60 days. So why would there be any rush to change this bill, if they have decided it was unnecessary earlier? Today, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

This amendment does not blow the bill up. It is not a poison pill. Everyone think so.

It is a moment today to go through and cite examples—not all of them: this is not an exhaustive list—but some of the examples we have discussed in cases where the majority of class action litigation remains in State court where it belongs.

Let me cite a couple of examples where this bill has been modified over the years to enable a majority of class action litigation cases to stay in State court.

First, for example, the cases where the litigation will remain in State courts: No. 1, cases against State and State officials will remain in state court. Smaller cases will remain in State court.

Cases where there are fewer than 100 plaintiffs or in which less than $5 million is at stake, those cases are not eligible for removal from State to Federal court. Cases in which two-thirds or more of the plaintiffs are from the same State as the defendant will remain in State court. Cases in which between one-third and two-thirds of the plaintiffs are from the State where the plaintiff is based will probably remain in State court. It is left to the discretion of the Federal court to decide whether it is Federal or State based on the criteria laid out in the bill.

Similarly, cases involving a local incident or controversy, where the people involved are local, where at least one significant defendant involved in the litigation is within the State, in those instances as well, the cases can and probably should remain in State courts.

That is a handful of the examples where we make sure a lot of the class action litigation remains in State courts where it belongs.

If you go back, the first bill introduced on class action litigation goes back about 7 years, I think, to 1997. The original bill and the number of bills that were introduced in subsequent Congresses, was opposed by the Federal bench. There is an arm of the Federal judiciary called the Judicial Conference of the United States. In recent years, the work they are doing.

The initial legislation proposed, I take a moment today to go through and cite examples—not all of them: this is not an exhaustive list—but some of the examples we have discussed in cases where the majority of class action litigation remains in State court where it belongs.
judiciary opposed that legislation. As the legislation has evolved, we have gone back to ask the Federal judiciary: What do you think? We know you were opposed to original versions of this bill in the late 1990s. How about this latest revision? They continued to oppose substantive provisions of the class action reform until the last Congress.

The Federal judiciary has the same concerns a lot of us have, the wholesale shifting of class action cases from the State courts to the Federal courts. Federal courts, busy, active, and not want to see an avalanche of litigation coming to them. With the adoption of a number of provisions in this legislation that comes to us today, the Judicial Conference wrote to the Senate in 2003 that, particularly given the changes Senator FEINSTEIN proposed, their concerns about the wholesale shifting of State class action litigation to the Federal courts, for the most part, had been met and been satisfied. The Conference has a position saying the Senate should vote for this legislation. That is not what they are about. But the concerns they had expressed earlier, year after year after year, have been addressed.

Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Judicial Conference of the United States, dated April 25, 2003.

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

Hon. Patrick J. Leahy, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Leahy: Thank you for your letters of April 9, 2003, and April 11, 2003. In those letters, you requested that the Judicial Conference provide the Senate Judiciary Committee with legislative language implementations of the Conference’s March 2003 recommendations on class-action litigation and the views of the Conference on S. 274, the “Class Action Fairness Act of 2003,” as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 11, 2003.

As you know, at its March 18, 2003, session, the Judicial Conference adopted the following resolution:

That the Judicial Conference recognize that the use of minimal diversity of citizenship may be appropriate to the maintenance of significant multi-state class action litigation in the federal courts, while continuing to oppose class action legislation that contains jurisdictional provisions that are similar to those in the bills introduced in the 106th and 107th Congresses. If Congress determines that certain class actions should be brought original and removal jurisdiction of the federal courts on the basis of minimal diversity of citizenship and an aggregation of claims, Congress should be encouraged to include sufficient limitations and threshold requirements so that the federal courts are not unduly burdened and states’ jurisdiction over in-state class actions is preserved, such as by employing provisions to raise the jurisdictional threshold and to fashion exceptions to such jurisdiction that would preserve a role for the state courts in the handling of in-state class actions. Such exceptions for in-state class actions may appropriately include such factors as whether substantially all members of the class are citizens of a single state, the relationship of the defendants to the forum state, or whether the claims arise from a single event, policy, or technical property damage within the state. Further, the Conference should continue to explore additional approaches to the consolidation and coordination of large class actions that do not unduly intrude or state courts or burden federal courts.

S. 274, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, generally provides for federal jurisdiction of a class action based on minimal diversity of citizenship if the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of $5 million, exclusive of interest and costs. (S. 274 as introduced established a $2 million minimum amount in controversy.) The bill also now permits the interdistrict transfer of a case to the district courts of the United States for the judicial districts in which the defendants are citizens of the state in which the action was originally filed. The court would be required to consider factors that constitute a substantial factor in exercising this discretion. (This discretionary provision was not included in the bill as introduced.) In addition, S. 274 as reported provides that the federal district courts shall not have original jurisdiction over any class action in which more than one-third but less than two-thirds of the members of all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate and the primary defendants are citizens of the state in which the action was originally filed. The court would be required to consider factors that constitute a substantial factor in exercising this discretion. (This discretionary provision was not included in the bill as introduced.)

We thank you for your efforts in this most complex area of jurisdiction and public policy.

Sincerely,

Lionidas Ralph Mercham,
Secretary.

Mr. CARPER. We are going to vote on final passage in an hour or so. I think Senator DURBIN is going to come to the floor. He may ask for a vote on his amendment. I am not sure he will. He cares deeply, passionately about these issues and has sought to try to make this legislation a bad, unwise public policy decisions. My guess is, he is not going to come to the floor and urge us to vote for the bill or say he is going to vote for it. I know he has serious misgivings about this legislation. But he has worked constructively, as have people on our side and the Republican side, to get us to this point in time.

Senator REID of Nevada is our new leader on the Democratic side. He is not on the floor, but I express to him, and my colleagues, if he is listening, my heartfelt thanks for working with the Republican leadership and those on our side who support this legislation, to enable us to have this opportunity to debate it fairly and openly, allowing people who like it, people who do not like it, those who wanted to offer amendments, those who did not want to offer amendments, to have a chance for the regular order to take place, to debate the issues and vote, and then to move forward.

I do not know if this legislation, the way we have taken it up and debated it, can serve as a template or example to use in addressing other difficult issues—energy policy, asbestos litigation, a variety of other issues—but it might. Because in this case, Democratic and Republican leaders have worked together, have urged us, the rank and file in the Senate, to work together.

Each of the folks in the private sector—people who have an interest in this bill, not only the business side, but the plaintiffs’ lawyers side, and other
interested parties, labor, and so forth, consumer groups—I think everybody has acted in good faith to get us to this point in time.

Whether you like the bill, I urge my Democratic colleagues, if you are on the edge and not sure which way to go—yes or no—that you have voted for all the amendments, and you are not sure how to vote on final passage of the bill—I urge you to vote for this bill.

I do not know if it is possible to have a big margin. I would love to have 70 votes, 75 votes for this bill. I hope we can do that.

Let me close, if I can, by saying, whether you are for the bill or against it, for the amendments or against them, I hope there is one thing we can all agree upon. I will bring to mind the words of one of our colleagues, a legendary trial lawyer from Illinois, who has gone on to be elected and serves with us in the Senate. I will close my comments with his admonition. That admonition is the old Latin phrase: semper ubi sub ubi. Whether you like the bill, I think we can all agree on that admonition today.

With that having been said, I yield back my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. 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. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that again we go into a quorum call, but that the time be equally divided.

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this week’s debate is the culmination of more than 6 years of work in the Senate on a very important piece of legislation Act to save America’s court system.

I practiced law for most of my adult life and have litigated in a number of different forums. I believe in our legal system. It is critical for America’s economic vitality and our liberty to have a good legal system. There is no doubt in my mind that the strength of this American democracy, the power of our economy, and our ability to maintain freedoms are directly dependent on our commitment to the rule of law and a superb legal system, and we can make it better.

To keep our system strong, we in this Congress have to meet our responsibility to pass laws that improve litigation in America. Our court system must produce effective results that further our national policy, correct wrongs, punish wrongdoers, and generate compensation for those who suffer losses in a fair and objective way. We, therefore, as a Congress must periodically review what is happening in our courts and make adjustments if they are needed. That is what we are here for.

This class action fairness bill, S. 5, seeks to make the adjustments we currently need, in my opinion. It will guarantee that the plaintiffs in a class action, the people who have been actually harmed and have a right to be compensated, are the actual beneficiaries of the class action and not just their attorneys and not sometimes the defendants who benefit by being able to get rid of a bunch of potential litigation by settling the case and paying less to the plaintiffs than the case is really worth.

The Class Action Fairness Act will not move “all class actions” to Federal Court or “shut the doors to the courthouse,” as some have claimed—rather it will provide fairness for the class action parties by allowing a class action to be removed from a State court where it has been filed to a Federal court when the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds $5 million and the class contains a minimum of 100 plaintiffs or $10 million and the class contains a minimum of 250 plaintiffs. I believe in our legal system. It is critical for America to keep our court system strong.

One hundred thousand individual lawsuits would not be appropriate when one case could settle the issue for all involved.

Congress is looking closely at our legal system today knows that we have a number of problems to address. One of the main problems is how much the system costs the average American. Americans pay these costs primarily through increases in their insurance premiums. They also pay it in increased costs for our judiciary.

The 2004 Tillinghast study on the cost of U.S. tort system found that the U.S. tort system returned less than 50 cents of every dollar to the people it is designed to help—the plaintiffs—and only 22 cents on the dollar to compensate for actual economic loss. Who, then, would appear to be making the money that our current tort system—An earlier Tillinghast study found that the income of litigation attorneys, trial lawyers, in 2001 was $39 billion. That same year Microsoft made only $26 billion, and Coca-Cola, $17 billion.

As a Washington Times editorial has noted: No portion of the American civil justice system is more of a mess than the world of class action.

There are a number of problems with the class action system currently making up the mess. The Washington Post referred to.

The number of class actions pending in State courts, many of them nation-wide, increased 1,042 percent from 1988 to 1992, while the number pending in Federal courts increased only 338 percent during that same period. State courts are being overwhelmed by class actions. A number of State courts lack the necessary resources to sustain the class actions. The class actions affected. Many State judges do not have even one law clerk, and most of the class actions involve citizens from a number of different States, requiring the application of multiple State laws. Sometimes a State court docket becomes jammed while the judge researches out-of-State law to get up to speed.
Some say it is a burden on the Federal courts, but Federal judges have on their docket a fraction of the cases of most State court judges in America. Some cases are complex, but that is the nature of Federal court cases for the majority. They have at least two law clerks. The occupant of the chair, the most part. They have at least two

cases even if they are frivolous so they do not risk the cost of litigation and the embarrassment and difficulty of explaining some complex transaction.

There are several other problems. One is forum shopping, and another is settlements detrimental for class members.

Forum shopping occurs when the attorney sets out to try to find the best place to file the class action lawsuit. Often you could hire an attorney from New York with California plaintiffs filing a class action lawsuit in Mobile, AL. Where can national class action lawsuits be filed today? Amazingly, the answer is in almost any venue, any court, county, circuit court in America. A plaintiff can search this country all over and select the single most favorable venue in America for filing their lawsuit—that is, if it is a broad-based class action that covers victims in every state and county in the American scene. Some of them may just cover a region or half the counties in America or involve 10 percent of the States. At any rate, they are able to search within that area for the most favorable venue.

I believe this is not healthy. A report issued this year by the American Tort Reform Association about the abuse of this choice named the various counties around the country as "judicial hellholes." The study pointed to the large number of frivolous class actions found in counties it named, citing judicial cultures that ignore basic due process and legal protections and efforts by the county's judges to intimidate proponents of tort reform.

By bringing their suits in one of these areas, plaintiffs' attorneys can defeat diversity by naming a single defendant and a single plaintiff who have citizenship in the same State, thus preventing a Federal court from hearing the case. It could be in a single county to bind people all over the country under that one State or county's laws.

Let me read what the Constitution says about diversity:

The judicial Power of the United States shall extend to all Cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States . . . . to Controversies which the United States shall be a party; Controversies between two or more States, between a State and a Citizen of another State;—between Citizens of different States.

Our Founding Fathers thought about this issue, and they concluded that, if a person from Alabama wanted to sue a person from Illinois, the person in Illinois might not be comfortable being sued in an Alabama state court. They might think that might not be a favorable forum. There might be "home cooking" for the Alabama citizen there. So they said those cases ought to be in Federal court.

As history developed, pretty early in our courts concluded that diversity required complete diversity; that is, if one plaintiff and one of a host of potential defendants was a local defendant, then that could be kept in State court.

I am not disputing that. All I am saying is I believe the Founding Fathers would have believed that a lawsuit that is predominantly intrastate in nature, involving the real defendant, should be in Federal court.

So what happens is if you sue a drug company and you want to keep it in State court, you sue the lady in small town Mississippi who sells the prescription; the store owner in Little Rock, whereas the person who is going to be paying the judgment is out of State. If the drug company had been sued directly, it would have been in Federal court, but by suing one local State defendant along with the big-money deep-pocket in New York, that is not the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by the majority has expired. Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I think the majority has a longer time available by saying there are a lot of reasons we ought to support this bill. It has been thought out very carefully. A lot of work has gone into it over a number of years. We are in a position to pass good legislation at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few minutes to discuss my amendment No. 3, which is pending at this time, and then ask that it be withdrawn. This is the amendment I had offered on Tuesday to clarify the scope of the "mass action" provision in Section 4(a) of the bill.

As I had explained earlier this week, this provision requires that mass actions be treated the same as class actions under this bill, and therefore taken out of State courts and removed to Federal courts. But it was still un-derstood by me—and by the in-jured people who will be affected by this bill—that precisely the drafters had in mind in coming up with this "mass action" language in the bill.

When I last took the floor, I had raised some questions about the differences between "mass actions" and "mass torts," and whether mass torts would be affected by the language in S. 5. I heard from proponents of this bill that these are two very different types of cases, and that the bill is designed to affect only mass actions and not mass torts.

In fact, Senator LOTT of Mississippi the other day explained on the floor that:

Mass torts and mass actions are not the same. The phrase "mass torts," refers to a situation in which many persons are injured by the same underlying cause, such as a single explosion, a series of events, or exposure to a particular product. In contrast, the phrase "mass action" refers to a specific type of lawsuit in which a large number of plaintiffs seek to have all their claims adjudicated in one comprehensive action; whereas in one specific action, the defendants are basically disguised class actions.

I am glad that the proponents of this bill agree with me that there is a very
significant difference between these two types of cases. Mass torts are large scale personal injury cases that result from accidents, environmental disaters, or dangerous drugs that are wide-
ly sold.

Cases like Vioxx that I described ear-
erlier, and cases arising from asbesto
exposure, are examples of mass torts. These personal injury claims are usu-
ally based on State laws, and almost ev
ery State has well established rules of procedure to allow their State courts to customize the needs of their litigants in these complex cases.

Senator Lott also explained on the
floor that:

There are a few States, like my State—I
think, and West Virginia is another one and
there may be some others—which do not pro-
vide a class action device. In those States, plaintiffs’ lawyers often bring together hun-
dreds, or even thousands of plaintiffs, to
try their claims jointly without having to
meet the class action requirements. And of
ten the claims of the multiple plaintiffs
have little to do with each other.

There have been many examples of claims
that were stacked; they were filed there—frankly, many of these discus-
sions overlook what these class action
lawsuits are all about.

I had reported on some information on
some of these lawsuits because people tell me: I don’t understand what is a class action. I can understand if I am in an automobile accident, I get hurt, and I sue the person who ran into me. Is this what we are talking about? That probably wouldn’t be a class ac-
tion.

Let me give you some examples of real class action lawsuits. These cases will be more difficult to file and more difficult to be successful because the business interests are going to pass
this bill.

U.S. postal workers given Cirpro after
the anthrax attacks in 2001 found out there were many damages that came
defined the drug, and the postal workers
came together as a group to sue the
company that made Cirpro. This is a class action lawsuit.

Then, we had a group of people in
Rhode Island who were harmed because they wanted to sell paint, which turned out to be lead in paint. They sued, as a class, the manufactur-
ers of lead paint that caused the dam-
ager to them physically. But because the manufacturers are not based in
Rhode Island, this class action might be remitted to a Federal court under
this bill.

Then there was a court in Illinois in a
class action lawsuit in one of the coun-
ties the proponents of this bill like to
talk about. It was against Ford Motor
Company. In Illinois, the Illinois police
officers might have to litigate this case in a Federal court.

There is another one against Foodmaker, which ran Jack-in-the-Box
restaurants. It turned out thousands of
their patrons were subjected to food contamination and serious illness. The
police officers might have to litigate this case in a
Federal court.

The parent finds out that the same thing happened to hundreds of
other kids, so all the parents come to-
together and say: Jack-in-the-Box, you
ought to have done a better job. And this
class of plaintiffs went forward in a
State court. But they would have less of
a chance for success under this bill. That is what it is about.

A suit was brought by Mothers and fathers when they discovered that
Beech-Nut was selling apple juice for
infants that turned out to be nothing
but sugar water.

What is the damage to an individual
infant, or a single family? How do you
measure it? How do you want to do it?
Beech-Nut sold millions of bottles of this defective product. Shouldn’t that company be held ac-
countable?

That is what this debate is all about.

It is about accountability for those
who cause harm to the public. The
businesses that are responsible for en-
vironmental contamination, for pro-
ducing dangerous products that cause
injuries, for manufacturing items that
shouldn’t be sold, or for overcharging
customers, should be held liable.

But these business interests come
to Congress for help, and they are going
to win today. As a result of this vic-
tory, fewer consumers and fewer fami-
lies are going to have a chance to suc-
cceed in court.

The Government closes down the agencies to protect you, Congress will
not pass the laws to protect you, and
now this Senate will pass a law to close
the courthouse doors in your States
as a group and ask for justice. This is the
highest priority of the Bush adminis-
tration: closing that courthouse door, making sure these families and these
individuals don’t have a fighting chance.

I think there are a lot of other priori-
ties we should consider, such as the
cost of health care in America. We will
not even talk about that issue on the
Senate floor, let alone discuss bipar-
tisan options for addressing that press-
ing problem.

This so-called Class Action Fairness
Act may pass today, but the ultimate
losers are going to be families across
America who are hoping that Congress will at least consider their best interests in the very first piece of legislation that we consider.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote against the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because, although this bill is an improvement over previous versions, it still has significant deficiencies that would have been corrected by a number of common sense amendments that were not adopted.

For example, forty seven attorneys general, including the attorney general of Michigan, expressed concern that this legislation could limit their powers to investigate and bring actions in their State courts against defendants who have caused harm to their citizens. The attorneys general supported an amendment offered by Senator Pryor that would have exempted all actions brought by State Attorneys General from the provisions of S. 5 statute applied to all of our constituents, but especially to the poor, elderly and disabled, that the provisions of the act not be misconstrued and that we maintain the enforcement authority needed to protect them from such practices. The Pryor amendment was defeated.

Federal courts generally do not certify class actions if laws of many states are involved. However, this legislation would force nationwide class actions into Federal courts where they would likely be dismissed for involving too many state laws. This would deprive the plaintiffs from the opportunity to have their case heard. An amendment sponsored by Senator Feinstein, a co-sponsor of this legislation, and Senator Bingaman would have fixed this problem by prohibiting the district court from denying class certification in whole or in part on the ground that the law of more than one State will be applied. However, that amendment failed.

Senator Feingold offered an amendment that would have set a time limit for a district court to assume jurisdiction or rule on a remand motion to State court. The amendment, which failed, would have provided protection for plaintiffs against attempts to remove cases to Federal court merely to delay the outcome.

We do need class action reform, however this bill fails to adequately protect the rights of our citizens and therefore I oppose it.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I rise to express my support for S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act, and to explain why I supported the amendment proposed by my friend from California, Senator Feinstein, and on behalf of my friend from New Mexico, Senator Bingaman.

I support the class action legislation before us today. Certain lawsuits have become a concern to many Americans. Many lawsuits have been filed in local State courts that have no connection to the plaintiff, the defendant, or the conduct at issue. This allows forum shopping, which undercuts the basic fairness of our justice system.

Having said that, I am not one of those who think access to the courts should be unduly blocked. Our citizens’ use of the courts has led to many important reforms to protect our rights and the environment, and has held corporate malefactors accountable for improper conduct that has cost victims billions of dollars. Often for those without power, a lawsuit is the only avenue for redress. We need lawsuits, but the rules governing them should be fair.

As we have heard yesterday and today, courts in some places have become magnets for all kinds of lawsuits. Some of these lawsuits are meritorious; some are not. In either scenario, if the case affects the Nation as a whole, it should be heard in Federal court. Judges in small counties should not make law for all of America. Although those judges might make good law, there is a real risk that parochial rulings could erode that type of decision. That is not to say that there are not judges in the Federal courts who do not have extreme views on both sides of the issues, much as we try not to confirm judges who fall outside of the mainstream. Consequently, we need to rein in forum shopping. When consumers allege that a product sold nationwide to consumers in all 50 States is defective, a Federal court should decide that case, even when the claim is brought by fifteen plaintiffs.

One area where the bill could be improved stems from a real concern that many of the consumer class actions removed to Federal court might not be certified on the grounds that there would be too many non-common issues due to differences among State laws that would apply to different members of the national class. To date, at least 26 Federal district courts have refused to certify class actions on those grounds.

Some of us believed that not certifying could have resulted in a problem because it would effectively mean the weakening, if not the disappearance, of the class members’ ability to get reme- dies, particularly with the changes made to current law by this bill. Not certifying could also create a practical problem for plaintiffs laws and not have the opportunity to try their class action before one court, and post-decertification might have to re-plead and try several class actions in several courts, thereby destroying the sought-after efficiency of class actions and creating the risk that the results are inconsistent. This was not the desired outcome of our compromise: We intended to send national class actions to Federal court, not to their graves.

The amendment that my friend from California, Senator Feinstein, and my friend from New Mexico, Senator Bingaman, introduced would not only have improved the bill, but would have also furthered the spirit of the compromise by clarifying our intention to preserve class actions, even when Federal judges face a choice of law issue.

Importantly, this amendment would not have aided forum-shopping plaintiffs’ lawyers. Instead, it would have given judges and Federal judges facing a choice of law question. That clarification would have helped to grind to a halt the class action merry-go-round between the State and Federal courts. I hope that Federal judges will treat this bill as deliberate and amend- ment, as a vehicle that was intended to bring national class actions to the Nation’s courts and not as a vehicle to balk at certification. The use of subclasses to protect people’s rights under their State laws is now in the hands of Federal judges. They have the tools to protect those rights. This bill was not intended to destroy them.

That view will protect an important instrument of deterrence against future wrongdoing and an important adjunct to regulators in the enforcement of laws protecting our citizens.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I rise in support of S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. The class action system in our country is broken. Over the past decade, class action lawsuits have grown by over 1,000 percent nationwide. This extraordinary increase has created a system that produces hasty claims that are often unjust. Lawsuits that have all defendants from multiple States are tried in small State courts with known biases. This leads to irrationally large verdicts that make little sense legally or practically.

The U.S. Constitution gives jurisdiction to the Federal Government when cases involve citizens of differing states. It makes sense, that, in a case involving plaintiffs from Wyoming and Alabama and defendants from New York and Idaho, that no party be given the “home-court” advantage that comes when a case is tried in your backyard. Regrettably, for years, Congress has required all plaintiffs to be...
diverse from all defendants. In large class action lawsuits, with plaintiffs or defendants from states throughout the Nation, it is increasingly difficult for this requirement of complete diversity to be met.

In the system we have created, we see lawyers seeking out victims instead of victims seeking out lawyers. We see lawsuits being adjudicated in a select few courts with proven track records for delivering large verdicts instead of lawsuits being tried in courts with the most appropriate jurisdiction. S. 5 is a step in the right direction. It eliminates the lottery-like aspect of civil liability that individuals now face by moving interstate cases to the federal level. If passed, S. 5 makes it so that class action cases involving citizens from Wyoming, Utah, Kansas and Texas will not be adjudicated at a courthouse in Madison County, Illinois. In the same vein, it ensures that cases involving folks from Illinois, Arkansas, and others will not be decided by non-Jurisdiction. These lawyers are more concerned with reaching a settlement than helping their victims. They push for quick class certification, and once they have crossed that hurdle, they push for a quick settlement by threatening the defendants with large monetary verdicts that have come about in past cases.

In the face of these ridiculous verdicts, defendants settle quickly. They know the stars are lined up against them. They use the right to trial and often times, by agreeing to coupon settlements, the defendants pay only a fraction of the stated damages. The Class Action Fairness Act takes steps to change this practice. It takes the fight to defendants. When a settlement is reached, the lawyers and the defendants do not come out ahead when the victims come out behind.

Is S. 5 perfect? Absolutely not. It does not require that individuals opt-in to class actions and does not require sanctions be brought against attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits over and over again. There are a number of provisions that I believe should be included in the bill that did not make the cut.

But S. 5 is the true example of a bipartisan compromise. S. 5 takes into account the wants of the various parties. It took a lot of give and take to get to this point, and now, we have a bill that serves the public interest. We have a bill that takes a first step toward reforming our court system to make it more fair for both the plaintiffs and the defendants.

I look forward to voting in favor of the Class Action Fairness Act later today, and I will encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today on the final day of debate on the class action reform bill to say a final word on a notion. We have worked for many years on this bill through numerous hearings, committee markups and repeated floor consideration. We can proudly say that we are about to succeed in passing modest, yet important changes to the class action process. Consumers and businesses across the country will benefit and not a single case with merit will go unheard.

Today is the culmination of many years of our bipartisan efforts on this issue and we have attempted to make the class action system fairer for both consumers and businesses alike. Our success once again demonstrates that the Congress works best when we work together. I am most proud that we were able to construct a bipartisan core of supporters to pass this bill.

While this bill does not solve all of the problems in the system, consumers will never again be burdened, injured and receiving worthless coupons as damages. Businesses will never again need to fear being sued in a small county court where the rules are stacked against them. Most importantly, under our bill every claim with merit will still get a forum and the court house doors will always be open.

It is a well-known saying that success has many fathers, so many will deserve thanks for their work leading to the passage of this bill today. I would like to mention a few people specifically who have been indispensable to the passage of this legislation. Senator GRASSLEY and I have worked on this bill for 7 years now. He has been a good partner and leader. He deserves tremendous credit for his willingness to accept bipartisan compromises in an effort to get this bill done.

Senators CARPER and HATCH also deserve praise for the tremendous energy that they have brought to this bill over the years. With them, class action reform certainly would not have made it to the verge of passage today.

In addition, Senators DODD, FEINSTEIN, SCHUMER and LANDRIEU contributed significantly in this process by making important changes to the bill. They were successful in identifying ways to ensure that primarily State cases stayed in state court and only truly national cases could be removed to the Federal courts. This has been our goal all along. With their assistance we have accomplished it.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the many very fine staffers whose work often goes unheralded. This bill addresses a very technical and difficult area of the law, so their contribution to this bill was truly indispensable. All of the following were essential to the final passage of this bill: Rita Lari with Senator GRASSLEY; Jonathan Jones, Sheila Murphy and John Kilvington with Senator CARPER; David Hantman with Senator FEINSTEIN; Jeff Berman with Senator SCHUMER; Shawn Maher with Senator DODD; and Harold Kim with Senator HATCH.

Finally, Paul Bock and Jeff Miller, my chief of staff and chief counsel respectively, deserve significant credit for the passage of this bill. They have worked tirelessly on this legislation for several years and have provided wise counsel during the long and difficult process. With their assistance, we succeeded in drafting a moderate bill that will help business and consumers alike. For that, we should all be proud.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Class Action Fairness Act.

This legislation we are considering today is crucial to ensuring that there
is fairness in our courtrooms, that claimants receive the judicial consideration they deserve, and that the American economy and small businesses are able to stay competitive.

This class action reform legislation is designed to allow defendants to move a class action lawsuit from State court to Federal court when there is diversity or citizens from different States involved in the litigation. This concept is as old as our Republic. No one will be denied access to the courts. It is simply allowing most litigants to find the most appropriate court to decide the case. In significant cases with diversity, the Federal courts are the proper choice.

We have heard about cases where lawyers shop around to find courts in particular counties that have a proven track record of being sympathetic to class action lawsuits with absurdly large judgments. When justice arbitrarily hinges on what county in which a case is filed, justice is not fair. A recent study found that 89 percent of Americans believe the legal system is in need of reform. The statistics are indeed alarming: Over the past decade, the number of class action lawsuits has increased by over 1,000 percent nationwide. And the cost of the U.S. tort system has increased one hundred fold over the last 50 years. Lloyd’s of London estimates that the tort system cost $256 billion in 2001, or $721 per U.S. citizen. Lloyd’s estimates this number to rise to $298 billion by this year. At current levels, U.S. tort costs are equivalent to a five percent tax on wages.

The implications of an abused tort system on the American economy are of legitimate concern. While there is no doubt that many class action lawsuits are legitimate, the inadequacies of the system have resulted in frequent abuses. And the increased cost to businesses and consumers has an enormous impact—lying the hands of businesses and restricting their ability to expand, provide additional jobs, or contribute to the economy. Even the threat of class action lawsuits forces businesses to spend millions of dollars. Defendants face the risk of a single judgment in the tens of millions or even billions of dollars, simply because a State court judge has roused to certify a class without proper review. The risk of a single, bankrupt business losing its business is certain. If the courts fail to settle the case with sizeable payments even when the defendant has meritorious defenses.

Believe it or not, some opponents of the Class Action Fairness Act are still arguing that the current class action system works well and that class action reform is unnecessary. Apparently, they do not think it is a problem when consumers take home 50-cent coupons to compensate them for their injuries, while their lawyers pocket millions. And importantly, Lloyd’s estimates two of 106 class actions filed were certified to proceed to trial, and in 2003, only 2 of 106 class actions filed were certified.

Yes, there are some problems in the use of class actions, and in some cases there are excessive fees or inappropriate coupon settlements. I am pleased that after many years of seeking to move class action “reform” legislation, the bill proponents finally agree to include language that addresses some of the abuses concerning “coupon” settlements, in which plaintiffs who have proven their case in court receive in turn coupons for products or services that have little value. This language has been advocated by the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, and it is a good provision because in contrast to most of the bill, it is narrowly crafted to address an actual problem that the legal system and litigants confront.

But the vast majority of the provisions in this legislation are not narrowly crafted to address discrete problems. Instead, this legislation is an example of the usual broken promise that will result in justice delayed and justice denied for many Americans.

There have been many claims about “judicial hellholes” and “magnet jurisdictions” but the evidence shows that these claims are not supported, at least not where I live, and are certainly not so widespread so as to justify passage of this legislation that turns 200 years of federalism on its head. Indeed, a recent report by Public Citizen found that there were, for example, 172 class actions filed in Madison County and St. Clair County, IL—of the 3,141 court systems in the United States for which bill proponents have provided limited data that they are “magnet jurisdictions.” As to Madison County in particular, the facts also do not support the rhetoric. In 2002, only 3 of 77 class actions were actually certified to proceed to trial, and in 2003, only 2 of 106 class actions filed were certified.

Moreover, the Public Citizen report notes that, in recent years, at least 11 states have made major changes to the class action process used in their States to aid in the administering of justice, and in fact Illinois is in the process of doing the same. The legislation purports to help Americans but I believe it will hurt them. The legislation itself states its purpose is to: “(1) assure fair and prompt recoveries for class members with legitimate claims; (2) restore the original meaning of the United States Constitution by providing for Federal court consideration of interstate cases of national importance under diversity jurisdiction; and (3) benefit society by encouraging innovation and lowering litigation costs.”

As to assuring “fair and prompt recoveries,” hundreds of consumer rights, labor, civil rights, senior, and environmental organizations, esteemed legal experts, and many State Attorneys General have testified that this legislation will do just the opposite.

There is also no reasonable basis for the assertion that this legislation “will
restore the intent of the framers’ with respect to the role of our federal courts. As Arthur Miller, the distin-
guished Harvard Law School professor, author, and expert in the fields of civil procedure, complex litigation, and class actions, would recall, these rights and remedies were intended to be a guarantee that state courts have the competence of state courts to which we have historically and frequently entrusted the enforcement of state-created rights and remedies.”

As a Senator representing the great State of New York, I have worked closely with many businesses in my state to help them with their efforts to grow and create jobs, and I am a firm believer in encouraging innovation and lowering consumer prices. But even if we assume there is a strong connection between innovation and other goals, there are many more appropriate means to achieve those ends without doing the harm to the administration of justice that I believe this legislation will impose.

In addition to being unfair to the American people, I do not believe this legislation is fair to our State or Federal judiciaries. This bill will effectively preclude state courts in many instances from employing their expertise and experience in class action cases based on state law that they have historically considered. I believe that state courts should determine matters of state law whenever possible. It is not fair to our Federal judiciary, which simply does not have the resources or experience to handle a mass influx of class action cases to our federal courts.

Indeed, the Judicial Conference of the United States has expressed its opposition to similar legislation introduced in prior Congresses because it “would add substantially to the workload of the federal courts and [is] inconsistent with principles of federalism.” Similarly, the Board of Directors of the Conference of Chief Justices representing the Chief Justices of our state courts has said that legislation of this kind is simply unwarranted “absent hard evidence of the inability of the state judicial systems to hear and decide fairly class actions brought in state courts.” That evidence simply does not exist.

As the National Conference of State Legislatures, NCSL, has noted in its strong opposition to this legislation, the legislation “sends a disturbing message to the American people that state court systems are somehow inferior or untrustworthy.” The NCSL went on to say that the effect of the legislation “on state legislatures is that state laws in the areas of consumer protection and antitrust, which were intended to protect the citizens of a particular state against fraudulent or illegal activities, will almost never be heard in state courts. Ironically, state courts, whose sole purpose is to interpret state laws, will be bypassed and the federal judiciary will be asked to render judgment in those cases.”

Although bill proponents have sometimes suggested the contrary, make no mistake: legislation that will not only result in the majority of class action lawsuits being transferred from our state to Federal courts, but it will also serve to terminate some class action lawsuits that seek to provide justice to everyday Americans.

Proponents of this legislation refer to an alleged abuse by lawyers in bringing class actions and assert that too many cases are instituted that are without merit. As I have already noted, I believe some proponents of this legislation have mischaracterized the extent of the problems concerning class actions. But, even if these assertions were true, the proponents have failed to justify the rejection of the very reasonable amendments offered by my colleagues that would have clarified the role that State Attorneys General would continue to play in State class action cases. That amendment had the express written support of 47 of the 50 State Attorneys General in our Nation. As the highest law enforcement officers in their respective States, I cannot imagine that anyone in this body would believe that such public servants would bring “frivolous lawsuits” or would seek to abuse the class action process. And yet, that amendment failed, primarily along party lines.

The remaining amendments met a similar fate, including one offered by Senators BINGAMAN and FEINSTEIN. There is no general Federal consumer protection statute which is why consumer fraud, deceptive sales practices, and defective product cases are almost always commenced in state courts.

Yet, the legislation before us would effectively move many of these cases to Federal courts, courts that are already overburdened and have neither the experience nor the expertise to handle these cases. If such cases are forced into Federal courts through consolidation of many state court cases, a potential defendant in a case must then decide which state laws should be applied. Because these kinds of circumstances have presented enormous challenges to our Federal courts, many Federal judges have simply, and understandably, denied certification of nationwide consumer fraud cases. Yet, the bill language would preclude the consideration of many of these cases in state courts, creating what many have described as the bill’s “Catch-22.” At that point, such cases would literally lose the ability to redress the harm that the federal court would have dismissed the case but under the provisions of the legislation, the case could not withstand a defendant’s challenge to maintain the case in a State court.

The amendment offered by Senator FEINSTEIN, an original cosponsor of the underlying legislation, and Senator BINGAMAN, would have provided a process to handle such cases that would oe the likelihood that such cases would be certified by a Federal court and the appropriate State laws would be applied. This was a more than reasonable effort to address a significant problem with this legislation without undermining the legislation’s intent to transfer many class actions to Federal courts. But, once again, a majority of the Members of this body chose to reject it.

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has stated, and no one has refuted, that “there is no evidence that lawsuits brought by workers seeking justice in state courts on issues ranging from overtime pay to working off the clock are abusing the system. To the contrary, failure to exempt such lawsuits in this legislation is an abusive act against every hard-working American seeking fair pay and a better life.” Yet, the amendment by Senator KENNEDY that would have carved out such cases from this legislation was rejected as well.

In short, this bill currently stands now in the same shape as when it was introduced. Though valiant efforts were made to improve it, none were successful. Eliot Spitzer, the distinguished New York State Attorney General, and a number of other State Attorneys General, expressed their overwhelming concern with the fact that the legislation still “unduly limits the right of individuals to seek redress for corporate wrongdoing in their state courts.” I could not agree more.

In speaking in opposition to this legislation on the Senate floor earlier this week, Senator LEAHY, the Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, reminded all of my colleagues that sometimes what is so small that even though a harm was done for which a plaintiff should receive relief, it is not worth it for him or her to spend significant financial resources to obtain that relief through the judicial process. Unfortunately, as he said, “[sometimes] that is what cheaters count on, and it is how they get away with their schemes. [Yet,] cheating thousands of people is still cheating. Class actions allow the little guy to band together to afford a competent lawyer, and allow them to redress wrongdoing.” With the expected passage of this legislation today, I believe the “little guy” loses, and I believe that is neither fair nor just. That is why I cannot support this legislation.

I appreciate the concerns raised by businesses in New York and around the country about the cost of litigation. I too believe the litigation costs have increased significantly. An amendment that seeks to address discrete problems with class action litigation should address this and other concerns without
unnecessarily and negatively affecting the ability of Americans to seek and obtain justice through our courts. A proper balance must be struck. The so-called Class Action Fairness Act simply does not strike that balance.

Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, legislation that is greatly needed to restore public confidence in our Nation’s judicial system and protect jobs in my own State and throughout the country.

Prior to 1996, our courts had helped drive the total cost of our tort system to more than $230 billion a year. Tort costs in America are now far higher than those of any other major industrialized nation, and in our global economy, this has become a tremendous disadvantage for American manufacturers and entrepreneurs, who have long sought reform. But this affects not just certain businesses; this affects our overall economy and all Americans.

The Class Action Fairness Act will provide that some class action suits be litigated in the Federal courts rather than allowing venue shopping for a sympathetic State court. The measure will ensure that cases of national importance are not overlooked. Most importantly, this legislation will ensure that class members with legitimate claims are fairly compensated.

Class action suits are an important part of our legal system. They originated to make our courts more efficient by joining together parties with a common claim. However, growing abuses by opportunistic plaintiffs’ attorneys—coupled with the skyrocketing costs of runaway litigation and excessive awards—have had a dramatic impact on America’s interstate commerce.

Over the past decade, the number of class action lawsuits has grown by over 1,000 percent worldwide. And jury awards are sharply increasing over time as well. In 1999, the top 10 awards totaled $9 billion; by 2002, that number had jumped to $32.7 billion.

Businesses, like those in my home State of North Carolina, are losing out because the rules in place today allow lawyers to “shop” for the “friendliest” court to hear their case. And it is not just large companies being sacked with enormous payouts in class action lawsuits; small businesses are bearing the majority of tort liability costs. According to a study conducted for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, small businesses bear 68 percent of tort liability costs but take in just 25 percent of business revenue.

We all know that small businesses are the job creators and the engines of our economy. They create 70 percent of all new jobs in America. Yet the rules in place today allow for a judicial system that is truly hurting them and causing them to suspend money—on average $150,000 a year—on litigation expenses rather than on business development and equipment and expansion—the very things that can lead to more jobs.

Our goal in reforming class action lawsuits is to provide justice to the truly injured parties, not to deny victims their day in court and their just compensation. Class action lawsuits have risen substantially over the past several decades, and a significant part of these costs is going towards paying exorbitant lawyers’ fees and transaction costs. And some injured plaintiffs are suffering because of weak State court systems and proportional cases. In fact, under the current U.S. tort system, less than 50 cents on the dollar finds its way to claimants, and only 22 cents compensate for actual economic loss.

And sometimes class members don’t receive cash at all. For example, in a settlement with Crayola, approved by a State court in Illinois, crayon purchasers in North Carolina and around the country received 75-cent coupons for the purchase of more crayons; their lawyers, however, received $600,000 in cash.

And in the Cheerios class action settlement, also approved by State court in Illinois, consumers in North Carolina and around the country received coupons for high-fructose corn-sweetener in a box of cereal, while lawyers got $1.75 million. I hardly think it’s in the best interest of the class member to actually have to purchase more of a product to receive any benefit. And it isn’t fair that class members are losing out while their attorneys are cashing in.

This legislation establishes a “Consumer Class Action Bill of Rights” that will ensure that class actions do not harm the intended beneficiaries—people who were actually harmed by the actions of a defendant. And it does nothing to prevent class members from having their cases heard—it just establishes that some of these cases may be heard in Federal court.

It is the right and proper thing to do, and it is the right thing to repair this broken system—for claimants in class action cases, for our Nation’s economy, businesses large and small, and for all Americans.

Mr. VINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of the Class Action Fairness Act, a bill to stop unfair and abusive class action lawsuits that ignore the best interests of injured plaintiffs. This legislation is sorely needed to help people understand their rights in class action lawsuits and protect them from unfair settlements.

It is also needed to reform the class action process, which has been so manipulated in recent years that U.S. companies are being driven into bankruptcy to escape the rising tide of frivolous lawsuits and has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector.

Unfortunately, not enough Americans realize that we are in a global marketplace and businesses now have choices as to where they manufacture their products. Many of our businesses are leaving our country because of the litigation tornado that is destroying their competitiveness. The Senate must start taking into consideration the impact of its decisions on this Nation’s competitive position in the global marketplace.

I believe that for the system to work, we must strike a delicate balance between the rights of aggrieved parties to bring lawsuits and the rights of society to be protected against frivolous lawsuits and outrageous judgments that are disproportionate to compensating the injured and made at the expense of society as a whole. This is what the Class Action Fairness Act, does, and I am proud to cosponsor it.

Since my days as Governor of Ohio, I have been very concerned with what I call the “litigation tornado” that has been sweeping through the economy of Ohio, as well as the Nation.

Ohio’s civil justice system is in a state of crisis. Ohio doctors are leaving the State and too many women have stopped delivering babies because they can’t afford the liability insurance. From 2001-02, Ohio physicians faced medical liability insurance increases ranging from 28 to 60 percent. Ohio ranks among the top states for premium increases in 2002. General surgeons pay as much as $74,554, and OB-GYNs pay as much as $152,496. Comparatively, Indiana general surgeons pay between $14,000-$30,000; and OB-GYN pay between $42,000-$50,000.

Further, Ohio businesses are going bankrupt as a result of runaway asbestos litigation. And today, one of my fellow Ohioans can be a plaintiff in a class action lawsuit that she doesn’t know about and taking place in a State she has never even visited.

In 1996, as Governor of Ohio, I was proud to sign H.B. 350, strong tort reform legislation that became law in Ohio for a while. It might have helped today’s liability crisis, but it never got a chance.

In 1999, the Supreme Court of Ohio, in a politically motivated 4-3 decision, struck down Ohio’s civil justice reform law, even though the only plaintiff in that case was the Ohio Association of Trial Lawyers—the personal injury bar’s trade group.

Their reason for challenging the law? They claimed their association would lose members and lose money due to the civil justice reform laws we enacted.

The bias of the case was so great that one of the dissenters, Justice Stratton, had this to say:

This case should have never been accepted for review on the merits. The majority’s acceptance of this case means that we have created a whole new arena of jurisdiction— advisory opinions on the constitutionality of a statute challenged by a special interest group.

Then there is the problem of the way we currently administer class actions is not working.

Prior to 1996, our courts had helped drive the total cost of our tort system to more than $230 billion a year. Tort costs in America are now far higher than those of any other major industrialized nation, and in our global economy, this has become a tremendous disadvantage for American manufacturers and entrepreneurs, who have long sought reform. But this affects not just certain businesses; this affects our overall economy and all Americans.

The Class Action Fairness Act will provide that some class action suits be litigated in the Federal courts rather than allowing venue shopping for a sympathetic State court. The measure will ensure that cases of national importance are not overlooked. Most importantly, this legislation will ensure that class members with legitimate claims are fairly compensated.

Class action suits are an important part of our legal system. They originated to make our courts more efficient by joining together parties with a common claim. However, growing abuses by opportunistic plaintiffs’ attorneys—coupled with the skyrocketing costs of runaway litigation and excessive awards—have had a dramatic impact on America’s interstate commerce.

Over the past decade, the number of class action lawsuits has grown by over 1,000 percent worldwide. And jury awards are sharply increasing over time as well. In 1999, the top 10 awards totaled $9 billion; by 2002, that number had jumped to $32.7 billion.

Businesses, like those in my home State of North Carolina, are losing out because the rules in place today allow lawyers to “shop” for the “friendliest” court to hear their case. And it is not just large companies being sacked with enormous payouts in class action lawsuits; small businesses are bearing the majority of tort liability costs. According to a study conducted for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, small businesses bear 68 percent of tort liability costs but take in just 25 percent of business revenue.

We all know that small businesses are the job creators and the engines of our economy. They create 70 percent of all new jobs in America. Yet the rules in place today allow for a judicial system that is truly hurting them and causing them to suspend money—on average $150,000 a year—on litigation expenses rather than on business development and equipment and expansion—the very things that can lead to more jobs.

Our goal in reforming class action lawsuits is to provide justice to the truly injured parties, not to deny victims their day in court and their just compensation. Class action lawsuits have risen substantially over the past several decades, and a significant part of these costs is going towards paying exorbitant lawyers’ fees and transaction costs. And some injured plaintiffs are suffering because of weak State court systems and proportional cases. In fact, under the current U.S. tort system, less than 50 cents on the dollar finds its way to claimants, and only 22 cents compensate for actual economic loss.

And sometimes class members don’t receive cash at all. For example, in a settlement with Crayola, approved by a State court in Illinois, crayon purchasers in North Carolina and around the country received 75-cent coupons for the purchase of more crayons; their lawyers, however, received $600,000 in cash.

And in the Cheerios class action settlement, also approved by State court in Illinois, consumers in North Carolina and around the country received coupons for high-fructose corn-sweetener in a box of cereal, while lawyers got $1.75 million. I hardly think it’s in the best interest of the class member to actually have to purchase more of a product to receive any benefit. And it isn’t fair that class members are losing out while their attorneys are cashing in.

This legislation establishes a “Consumer Class Action Bill of Rights” that will ensure that class actions do not harm the intended beneficiaries—people who were actually harmed by the actions of a defendant. And it does nothing to prevent class members from having their cases heard—it just establishes that some of these cases may be heard in Federal court.

It is the right and proper thing to do, and it is the right thing to repair this broken system—for claimants in class action cases, for our Nation’s economy, businesses large and small, and for all Americans.

Mr. VINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of the Class Action Fairness Act, a bill to stop unfair and abusive class action lawsuits that ignore the best interests of injured plaintiffs. This legislation is sorely needed to help people understand their rights in class action lawsuits and protect them from unfair settlements.

It is also needed to reform the class action process, which has been so manipulated in recent years that U.S. companies are being driven into bankruptcy to escape the rising tide of frivolous lawsuits and has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector.

Unfortunately, not enough Americans realize that we are in a global marketplace and businesses now have choices as to where they manufacture their products. Many of our businesses are leaving our country because of the
To this end, a few years ago I worked with the American Tort Reform Association to produce a study entitled "Lawsuit Abuse and Ohio" that captured the impact of this rampant litigation on Ohio's economy, with the goal of educating the public on this issue. The study found that in 2002, in Ohio, the litigation crisis cost an Ohioan $836 per year, and every Ohio family of four $2,544 per year. These are alarming numbers. And this study was released on August 2, 2002—imagine how high these numbers have risen in 2½ years.

In tough economic times, families can not afford to pay over $2,500 to cover other people's litigation costs. Something needs to be done, and passage of this bill will help!

Mr. President, this legislation is intended to amend the federal judicial code to streamline and curb abuse of class action lawsuits, a procedural device through which people with identical claims are permitted to merge them and be heard at one time in court.

In particular, this legislation contains safeguards that provide for judicial scrutiny of the terms of class action settlements in order to eliminate unfair and discriminatory distribution of awards for damages and prevent class members from suffering a net loss as a result of a court victory.

This bill establishes a concept of diversity jurisdiction that would allow the largest interstate class actions into Federal court, while preserving exclusive State court control over smaller, primarily intrastate disputes. As several major newspapers—editorial boards—ranging from the Post to the Wall Street Journal—have recognized, enactment of such legislation would go a long way toward curbing unfairness in certain state court class actions and restoring faith in the fairness and integrity of the judicial process.

This bill is designed to improve the handling of massive U.S. class action lawsuits while preserving the rights of citizens to bring such actions. Class action lawsuits have spiraled out of control, with the threat of large, overreaching verdicts holding corporations hostage for years and years.

In total, America's civil justice system has a direct cost to tax payers in excess of $223 billion, or 2.23 percent of GDP. That is $809 per citizen and equivalent to a 5 percent wage tax. That's a 13.3 percent jump from the year before—a year when we experienced a 14.4 percent increase which was the largest percentage increase since 1986.

Now, some of my colleagues have argued that this bill sends mixed signals to state courts and deprives state courts of the power to adjudicate cases involving their own laws. They argue that the bill therefore infringes upon State sovereignty.

However, in one empirical study done by two attorneys from O'Melveny & Myers, their data indicated that this bill would not sweep all class actions into Federal court. Rather, the bill is a targeted solution that could result in moving to Federal court a substantial percentage of the nationwide or multi-State class actions filed in class action "mill" jurisdictions (like Madison County, while allowing State courts everywhere to try truly local class actions (the kinds of class actions typically filed in State courts that do not endeavor to become "magnets" for class actions with little or no relationship). There is just no evidence for the assertion that this bill deprives State courts of their power to hear cases involving their own laws. In fact, it is the present system that infringes upon state sovereignty rights by promoting a "false federalism" whereby some state courts are able to impose their decisions on citizens of other States regardless of their own laws.

Another argument against this bill is that it would unduly expand Federal diversity jurisdiction at a time when courts are overcrowded. However, State courts have experienced a much more dramatic increase in class action filings and have not proven to be any more efficient in processing complex cases.

In addition, Federal courts have greater resources to handle the most complex, interstate class action litigation, and are insulated from the local prejudice problems so prevalent under current rules.

Mr. President, I emphasize to my colleagues that this isn't a bill to end all class action lawsuits. It's a bill to identify those lawsuits with merit and to ensure that the plaintiffs in legitimate lawsuits are treated fairly throughout the litigation process.

It's a bill to protect class members from settlements that give their lawyers millions, while they only see pennies. In fact, over the past decade, State court class action filings increased over 1,000 percent. It's a bill to fix a broken judicial system.

I am a strong supporter of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JEFFDORS. Mr. President, I am pleased to support S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. I believe there are problems with our current class action system that should be addressed through Congressional action. These problems include:

- Cases and controversies that are national in scope and are currently being decided in State courts;
- Decisions or settlements that are determined in one State's court system, are being applied nationwide, and conflict with laws in other States; and
- Plaintiffs receiving little compensation, or in the most extreme example, actually owing money from the settlement of a lawsuit.

Class action lawsuits serve a useful purpose in our judicial system. Class actions allow individuals to merge a number of similar claims into one lawsuit, which can be an efficient use of judicial resources. Class action lawsuits enable individuals with small claims the ability to seek justice.

The legislation we are considering today will fairly determine whether a class action should be heard in a State court or a Federal court. Thus, the legislation will help ensure that issues that are national in scope are heard in federal court, while issues that are local in nature are heard in State courts.

The Class Action Fairness Act also provides some common sense reforms and oversights of the class action settlement process. These changes will help ensure that individuals who should be compensated receive fair compensation for their injuries, rather than worthless coupons, or actually owing money.

I cannot, and would not, support legislation that denies individuals their ability to pursue compensation in the legal system for damages they have suffered. The legislation before this body is a bipartisan compromise worked out over many years. It does not deny individuals their right to pursue justice through the legal system. Because I believe the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 fairly addresses the problems in our class action system, I will support its passage today.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to speak about S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act.

First and foremost, I want to commend both the Republican and Democratic Leaders for all the work they did to bring this bill before the Senate. In particular, I am pleased that the consent agreement allowed all relevant amendments to be offered and debated.

I believe many of these amendments would have improved the underlying legislation without this reform. In particular, I think we should have adopted the Feinstein-Bingaman amendment, which would have given federal judges clear guidance about how to apply state consumer laws in multi-state class action lawsuits. This would have permitted more multi-state consumer class actions to be certified in federal court and resolved on their merits.

After S. 5 is enacted into law, I believe we should rapidly revisit this issue and make sure that consumers are actually getting their day in court and not having their class action cases thrown out because Federal courts are deeming them too complex or unmanageable to certify.

That being said, I think this legislation benefited greatly from the negotiations entered into by Senators DODD, LANDRIEU and SCHUMER with the bill's major sponsors, Senators GRASSLEY, KOHL, HATCH and CARPER. Although S. 5 is not the bill I would have written, it addresses some of the well-documented problems created by overlapping class actions in State and Federal courts.
In particular, the Dodd-Landrieu-Schumer language included in S. 5 addressed some of my biggest concerns about moving class actions to Federal court. Many class actions involve only State law issues, are brought by plaintiffs geographically separated and have a defendant who is based within that same community. Moving these cases to Federal court is inappropriate, especially if they do not involve issues of national importance. In many cases, the judges who are best placed to make determinations about State law. The Dodd-Landrieu-Schumer compromise created a new exception for keeping cases like this in State court. Under the compromise, two-thirds of the plaintiffs are from a given State, the injury happened in that State and at least one significant defendant is from that same State, then the class action can remain in State court. I believe S. 5 ensures that “nationwide” class actions are separated from those that should continue to be heard in State courts.

I also believe that any attempt to stop forum shopping by plaintiffs should minimize forum shopping by defendants. The Dodd-Landrieu-Schumer compromise in S. 5 addressed this issue by making it clear that there is a firm 30-day deadline for the removal of national class actions to Federal court once the plaintiffs have filed papers that create conditions for removal.

I also am pleased that the Dodd-Landrieu-Schumer compromise dealt with coupon settlements. One of the most serious abuses in class action cases, certain types of conclusory coupon settlements. S. 5 clarified that if a settlement provides coupons as a remedy, attorneys’ fees will only be paid in proportion to the redemption of the coupons. A provision like this does not prohibit coupon settlements, but practically speaking, attorneys will not agree to such settlements unless the coupons are actually valuable. S. 5 also requires that a judge may deny a coupon settlement until a hearing is conducted to determine if the settlement terms are fair, reasonable, and adequate for class members.

Finally, I believed that is important to preserve the ability of the Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules, the U.S. Judicial Conference, and the Supreme Court to amend the class action rules or procedures to the extent necessary to accomplish their purposes more efficiently or to cure any unanticipated problems. S. 5 also included a provision saying that the Federal courts could make such changes as appropriate.

As a result of all of these improvements, I believe S. 5 is legislation that addresses serious problems in our nation’s class action system and will make the system fairer for both plaintiffs and defendants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes is to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He is absolutely right. You have the corporate interests, and this administration is closing courthouse doors—state of the few places where people can go that are not aligned with either the Republican or the Democratic Party; a place where they don’t need any political clout; a place where somebody can’t say they are going to contribute heavily to a political party because they will be heard, or something like that. There is one place they could go—whether they are a mechanic, a bus driver, a person raising a family, somebody who had been damaged by a product sold when the manufacturer knew of the flaw—the one place they could go would be the courthouse. They are not the rich, powerful, or well-connected. They could win. Or at least seek justice. We are going to close that door, too.

Over the days of the Senate has been considering this bill, there have been a few modest amendments that might actually keep the door open a tiny crack for the people who need it. There have been serious concerns raised by the Conference of State Legislatures of our 50 States, the National Association of State Attorneys General, prominent legal scholars, consumers, environmental groups, and civil rights organizations. They asked us to at least consider a few improvements but none of it was slammed shut. The Senate’s door was slammed shut.

For anybody watching this debate, they have figured out that by now the fix was in, despite these legitimate concerns.

After 31 years here I am disappointed that the Senate is now taking its marching orders for major legislation from corporate special interests and the White House.

We could have actually acted as an independent body and made some changes in this bill. Instead, we are saying—the 100 of us—to all 50 of the State legislatures that we know better than they do, that they are irrelevant, that we could close them off.

It is going to make it harder for American citizens to protect themselves against violation of State civil rights, consumer, health, environmental protection laws, to take these cases to State court.

Aside from being convenient, plaintiffs actually know where the local state courthouse is. These courthouses have experience with the legal and factual issues within their States. We are simply going to sweep these cases into Federal court, after we have already swept so much criminal jurisdiction there, and you can’t get a civil case heard anyway. We are erecting barriers to lawsuits, and we are placing new burdens on plaintiffs. They will languish.

The bill contains language that would reduce the delay that parties can experience when a case is removed to Federal court by setting a limit for appeals of remand orders. But we don’t say anything about how long the court can sit on the remand motion. They could sit on it for 10 years if they want to before they do a thing. Plaintiffs can discover witnesses can move away, memories could grow dim, and nothing happens.

Senator FEINGOLD offered a modest amendment to set a reasonable time for action on remand motions. The solution received praise from one of the sponsors of this legislation, but the corporate masters and the White House said no. So it was rejected by the Senate.

The biggest concern raised by legal scholars and agreed to by several Senate sponsors of the bill would address the recent trend in Federal courts not to certify class actions if multiple state laws are involved.

The way this is set up in the bill—a lot of the business groups behind this one could easily get a case dismissed by a Federal court.

Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BINGAMAN worked together to alleviate what was a legal Catch-22. The Federal court says if a case has complicated State laws in it, it can’t hear it. But you can’t bring it in State court either. The Federal court says the State laws are complicated and it should have been heard in the State court. But under this bill, it goes to the Federal court so, of course, the corporate interests win. We tried to change that.

Cynics might even speculate that is what the business groups behind this purported “procedural” change are really seeking, the dismissal of meritorious cases on procedural grounds by the federal courts. Naturally, the orders came down from the corporate masters and the White House: Don’t do it! And the door is going to allow us to keep things out of court. There it goes.

Anyone who reads this bill will notice that despite its title, it affects more than just class actions. Individual actions, consolidated by state courts for efficiency purposes, are not clear. Nor is the definition. Do we state that a similar provision was unanimously struck from the bill during the last Congress, mass actions reappeared in this bill this Congress. Federalizing these individual cases will no doubt delay, and possibly deny, justice for victims suffering real injuries. Senator DURBIN’s amendment sought to clarify the bill’s effect on these cases. I’m glad the debate this week served to clarify the narrow scope of this provision.

It is interesting because a similar provision was unanimously struck from the bill during the last Congress—unanimously but that wasn’t good enough for the corporate masters. It was slipped back into the bill this Congress.
Class action legislation had been criticized by nearly all of the State attorneys general in this country, Republicans and Democrats alike. The distinguished former attorney general, Senator Pryor of Arkansas, had a concern that S. 5 would limit their official powers and bring them in line with State courts against defendants. He wanted to put in minor clarifications to show they could do that. Although these attorneys general contacted their Senators—Republicans and Democrats alike—they were tossed out.

Senator Kennedy’s amendment to exempt civil rights, and wage and hour cases in the bill, was a sensible solution. Prominent civil rights organizations and labor advocates requested that the bill be modified to acknowledge the fact that many of our states have their own protective civil rights and employment laws. I was proud to cosponsor it and regret that with the fix being in, this amendment was rejected by the Senate. But the fix was in, and that is out.

What we have done here? I will give you an example of one class action suit that would have been impacted under this legislation—Brown v. Board of Education. That was ending segregation in our schools, a blight on the American conscience. And how did Brown v. Board of Education get to the Supreme Court? Not from the three Federal Board of Education get to the Supreme Court? No, it was after the fact. It was after the civil rights movement and the Brown decision. And how did they get the case to the Supreme Court? After the fact.

The so-called Class Action Fairness Act falls short of the expectation set by its title. It will leave many injured parties who have valid claims with no avenue for relief, and that is something that is not fair to the ordinary Americans who look to us to represent them in the United States Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll. The Senator from Wisconsin, Senator Specter. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the adjournment of the Senate be dispensed with, and I ask the Senate to adjourn at 3 o’clock this afternoon.

We took this bill up in the Judiciary Committee a week ago today. Although there was some conjecture we could not pass the bill out of committee, in the morning we did so. We started the floor debate Monday afternoon. I led off in my capacity as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. We had a number of amendments and we have worked the will of the Senate. A number of amendments have been divided, we've worked through a number of amendments have been defeated.

The Senator from Wisconsin, Senator Feingold, offered an amendment which would have imposed time limitations on the courts on their handling of class action cases. I told him I thought it was a good idea, but I was constrained to vote against it because we have an understanding—implicit or explicit, I am not quite sure which because I was not party to it—amendments that if we sent them a so-called clean bill without amendments, they would accept the Senate version. I told Senator Feingold as to his issue, I have had a number of complaints about delays in the administration of the courts. That is something the Judiciary Committee will take up.

I make it plain we will not deal with judicial independence or the court's discretionary functions, but when it comes to delays, that is a matter of congressional responsibility to decide how many judges there will be at all levels. That is an issue we will take up.

The Senator from South Carolina, Senator Lindsey Graham, had proposed an amendment on disclosure, on transparency, sunshine. There again, that is a good idea. We have worked through a colloquy. I have not seen the final form, but I was discussing it with Senator Specter again this morning and the staffs are working that out. I anticipate we will have that finished.

The Senator from Illinois, Senator Durbin, had a proposed amendment on mass actions. We had worked through a colloquy. It was something this morning. Mr. Specter, again this morning. That has not reached fruition. Senator Durbin has decided to withdraw. That is a complex matter which we took up in committee 2 years ago. We made some modifications in the bill, but it is very important as this bill moves forward to become law that it be dealt with as a procedural change, that there be substantive changes in the rights of the parties.

We have sought to move into the Federal courts out of aversion to forum shopping on judges or courts where there is some indication of a prejudicial predisposition. It is my hope as this class action bill is interpreted that it will not effect substantive rights.

There is a tender issue on application of State law where there are a number of States involved. There is a lot of commonality in our law injected through the uniform commercial code and interjected through the restatement of various of substantive matters such as torts, where class actions can be certified, so it is my hope this bill, this act, will not be interpreted to curtail a substantive right.

There is a great deal of wisdom in the Senate on this bipartisan bill which has received considerable support on the Democratic side of the aisle as well as very strong support on the Republican side of the aisle to move through without a conference where we might reconcile this bill with the House provision calls for retroactive application. That would upset a great many existing lawsuits. All factors considered, we have come to a wise conclusion.

Mr. Cornyn. Mr. President, I have spoken previously on this floor about my concerns that this legislation does not go far enough to address the scandal of litigation abuse that plagues our civil justice system. I stand by those concerns today. We can and should do more to reduce the burden of frivolous, expensive litigation. Our Nation’s economic competitiveness in the 21st century depends on it. We should consider additional measures that better level the playing field, that produce a good flow of information and transparency, and that provide a clear relationship between plaintiffs and their attorneys.

While I believe this modest legislation could do more, I believe that S. 5 is an important first step to reform—a step in the right direction.
By providing for removal of a greater number of class action lawsuits from State court to Federal court and by requiring that judges carefully review all coupon settlements and limit attorneys' fees paid to these settlements to the value actually received by class members, it sets the groundwork for a much needed reform.

In the spirit of bipartisan cooperation that drove this bill forward, I set aside my concerns for now and am proud to co-sponsor.

I thank my friend from Iowa, Senator Grassley, for his leadership and persistence on this issue. For five consecutive Congresses, dating back to 1997, Senator Grassley has taken up the mantle of class action reform and he deserves a great deal of credit for it.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman Specter and Senator Hatch for their continued stewardship. Without them, this bill would not have been in the Senate.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have a few minutes remaining on my 10 minutes. I notice the distinguished Democratic leader is here, but I said I would yield to the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania. One of the great pleasures over the past 24 years has been to serve with Arlen Specter in this body.

We are nearing the end of consideration of this bill.

I would like to spend just a few minutes on my thoughts on it.

First, a brief word about the process by which this bill has been considered by the Senate. I don’t think it is an overstatement to say that—aside from the details of the legislation itself—the most important factor in its expected passage is the unanimous consent agreement that was put into place at the onset of the Senate’s deliberations on the bill.

In that respect, the two leaders—Senator Frist and Senator Reid—are to be greatly commended. Either one could have refused to enter into such an agreement—which would have made the prospects for passage of this legislation far less certain.

As the bill heads to the floor, a determined minority of even one Senator can impede or block consideration of legislation in this body. Either Leader, by declining to enter into a consent agreement, could have paved the way for others to employ dilatory, delaying, and distracting tactics.

However, both Senators Reid and Frist agreed that only relevant amendments to the bill would be in order. No doubt, that agreement displeased some members in both caucuses. However, it helped ensure that the debate we have had on this bill has been substantive, orderly, and deliberative. It minimized the risk that this bill would be derailed by contentious issues wholly unrelated to the substance of the bill itself.

So the cooperation shown by the two leaders on this legislation cannot be overemphasized. Senator Reid is to be particularly commended in this regard, given that a majority of the members of his caucus do not appear to support the bill.

The consent agreement that he entered into with the majority leader demonstrates his commitment to working in as cooperative a manner as possible for the good of the Senate.

Allow me to spend a few moments thinking aloud at this point about this legislation. We have heard a lot of characterizations over the past few days to describe the bill and the problems it seeks to correct. I am among those who believe that our class action system is in need of reform. There are clear abuses and shortcomings that have not served the interests of the parties or the interests of justice. And this bill takes a number of significant steps to remedy those abuses and shortcomings.

To those who say that this legislation will have dire consequences on the quality of justice in our Nation, I must respectfully disagree. And I do so for a number of reasons.

First, it is important to view this legislation in a larger perspective. According to one estimate, 92 percent of all cases filed in Federal courts over the past three decades have been class actions. This point deserves special emphasis at this time. As of February 2002, less than one percent of all cases filed in the Federal courts of our Nation have been class actions.

Not all states compile similar data, so this figure is not complete. Nevertheless, for class actions, the percentage of all cases filed in State courts. However, there is every reason to believe that the percentage of class actions filed in state courts is at least as minuscule as the percentage filed in state courts. My point is simply this: that this legislation will affect only a very small percentage of all cases filed in our courts—less than 1 percent.

Some would argue that if even one just case were denied by this bill, that would be an unit result, and merit the defeat of this bill. I am not unsympathetic to that argument. Indeed, I agree wholeheartedly with it. Our system of justice is premised on the right to equal justice deserves opposition, at least in this Senator’s opinion.

Even one just cause unjustly denied offends our Nation’s commitment to justice and fair play. Any legislation that would deny to even one citizen the right to equal justice deserves opposition, at least in this Senator’s opinion.

But this bill does not deny such a right. It does not even come close. It will not close the courthouse door on a single citizen.

Moreover—unlike other legislation that has been considered by this body—it will not cap damages in a single case. It will not cap attorney’s fees for a single class action lawyer.

It will not extinguish or alter in any way a single pending class action.

Nor does it impose more rigorous pleading requirements. Senator Reid is to be commended in this regard, giving that a majority of the members of his caucus do not appear to support the bill.

If my colleagues might ask: if this bill will not do any of these things, then what will it do? First and foremost, it will put an end to the kind of abusive forum-shopping and notoriety over the past few years.

Opponents of this bill claim that, by in any way altering the procedural rules governing class actions, substantive rights will be denied.

However, this argument is trumped by a little document called the U.S. Constitution.

Article III of that document extends Federal jurisdiction to suits between “citizens of different States.” The purpose of extending this “diversity jurisdiction” to citizens is to prevent the citizens of one State from being discriminated against by the courts of another State.

However, over the years, this purpose has been increasingly thwarted by clever pleading practices of enterprising class action attorneys.

By adding a plaintiff or a defendant to a lawsuit solely based on their citizenship, they have been able to defeat efforts to move cases to Federal court—even cases involving multiple parties from multiple States. Likewise, by alleging an amount in controversy as a result of this and other provisions of different States. The purpose of extending this “diversity jurisdiction” to citizens is to prevent the citizens of one State from being discriminated against by the courts of another State.

However, over the years, this purpose has been increasingly thwarted by clever pleading practices of enterprising class action attorneys.

By adding a plaintiff or a defendant to a lawsuit solely based on their citizenship, they have been able to defeat efforts to move cases to Federal court— even cases involving multiple parties from multiple States. Likewise, by alleging an amount in controversy as a result of this and other provisions of different States. The purpose of extending this “diversity jurisdiction” to citizens is to prevent the citizens of one State from being discriminated against by the courts of another State.

However, over the years, this purpose has been increasingly thwarted by clever pleading practices of enterprising class action attorneys.

By adding a plaintiff or a defendant to a lawsuit solely based on their citizenship, they have been able to defeat efforts to move cases to Federal court—even cases involving multiple parties from multiple States. Likewise, by alleging an amount in controversy as a result of this and other provisions of different States. The purpose of extending this “diversity jurisdiction” to citizens is to prevent the citizens of one State from being discriminated against by the courts of another State.
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Federal court than State court. They may not be able to pick a class of plaintiffs that is as large as they can now, or that encompasses as many States. They may end up bringing cases in two or more courts that they might have preferred to bring in a single court. They will not find their cases dismissed.

As my friend and colleague from Utah, Senator Hatch, said earlier, good lawyers will find a way to do well under this bill. Good lawyers will do well in Federal courts, as they have done well in State courts. In that sense, then, this bill is exceedingly modest.

We write our laws on paper. We do not etch them in stone. I am confident that the bill we have written here is a good one. I believe that, if and when it becomes law, it will withstand the test of time. Likewise, I am confident that if in the future any shortcomings emerge, we will have the good sense to fix them.

By way of analogy, I remind our colleagues of another reform bill that was considered several years ago. The Senator from New Mexico, Senator Domenici, and I wrote a bill to address frivolous lawsuits directed primarily at high-tech companies. The bill was on the floor of the Senate for about 2 weeks, if I recall correctly. A number of amendments were offered. It ultimately became law, despite a Presidential veto.

There were those who predicted dire consequences as a result of that bill’s enactment. We were told that securities lawsuits would dry up, that harmed investors would have no recourse.

Well, here we are, about 9 years after enactment of that law, and there has been no appreciable drop-off in investor lawsuits and recoveries. In fact, some of the most vehement opponents of that law in the trial bar continue to be some of the most successful under the law.

In sum, we have written a good bill here. It deserves to become law. I hope that it will. I want to acknowledge those of our colleagues who are most responsible for bringing us to this point: Senators Frist and Reid, as I have already mentioned; as well as Senators Grassley, Kohl, Hatch, Feinstein, Carper, and others. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of their staff, who in some cases have worked on this legislation for a number of years.

So, to briefly reiterate, I thank my leader, Senator Reid, and the majority leader, as well. We would not be in the position we are in, I have said on several occasions over the last 3 or 4 days, had the Democratic leader—particularly because the minority always has unique rights in this Senate to delay or stop legislation moving at all.

Even though my colleague from Nevada has strong reservations, which I am sure he will express shortly, about the substance of this bill, as a result of his willingness to let a product move forward, we are here today about to adopt a piece of legislation. When I hear some of the comments being made about whether Democrats are willing to work on issues, even ones they disagree with, this bill is not the fact that the majority leadership is not responsible for us to be here to deal with all relevant, germaine amendments on this bill. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his efforts in allowing that to go forward.

There has been a lot of talk over the last several days. Classically, with a matter like this the opponents and proponents have a tendency to engage in, if I may say with all due respect, a little bit of hyperbole. But it’s important to stick to the facts. And one important fact that should shape how we view this legislation is that less than 1 percent of all cases filed in the Federal courts since 1972 have been class action cases. I searched very tirelessly to find that sort of data. I think it could not come up with an exact number. I am told by those knowledgeable the number of class actions filed in State courts as a percentage of all State actions is not substantially different than the Federal courts, and I am told that the number is likely to be even smaller given the large number of State cases filed generally. What is beyond dispute is that a very small percentage of the cases filed in our court systems are class actions.

Obviously, if anyone is denied access to the courts for any reason, because of the things we do here, then, obviously, justice is denied to someone who cannot make that case.

We have not done that. This system of class action is in need of reform. This is about money. Unfortunately, it is not about the money that legitimate plaintiffs get; it is about the money that is either saved by a defendant or made by the plaintiffs’ bar. That is what we are about. We are shopping around the country, finding the venue that gets you the best possible result for your particular point of view—not exactly what the Founders had in mind when they drafted the diversity provisions of article III of the Federal Constitution. If you want to change the Constitution and say that no longer should diversity apply, then you may try to do that. If that is what opponents of this legislation believe, then they can try to amend the Constitution and make this change in effect for their cases in State courts. But since the founding of this Republic, the diversity clause of article III of the Constitution has been very clear.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from across the country who worked on this legislation and we have draft of this in January of 2004 but did not do it. We have now, decided to work on this for the Senate’s consideration over a year. We have had good debate on some of these amendments, and we have drafted a pretty good bill. It is not written in marble; it is not written in granite; it is written in paper and it is going to provide equal access to the courts. It is going to provide a fairness to plaintiffs and defendants, to see that they get a just decision regarding the matters that are brought before the courts.

So to my colleagues who are strong opponents of all of this, believe me, this bill is a simple matter of court reform. It will help ensure that victims of wrongdoing get fair compensation for their injuries. It lines the pockets of those who either allegedly represent them or those who are on the defendant side who want to avoid some of the payments they would otherwise have to make.

You get anecdotal stories, hearing of one case or another. This bill is about court reform, getting a system right. It is long overdue. It does not mean that every tort reform measure that comes before us ought to be supported, but on this one, those of us who worked on this believe we have done a good job. We were asked to make four improvements in this bill. We made 12 of them over a year ago.

To the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. Reid, and Senator Frist, who struck a procedural agreement so the Senate could consider this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday on the Senate floor I expressed serious concerns about this legislation that is pending before the Senate. I explained at that time that the legislation, in my opinion, is one of the most unfair, anti-consumer pieces of legislation to come before the Senate in a long time. It slams the courthouse doors on two or more courts by preventing plaintiffs from having State law claims, and it limits corporate accountability at a time of rampant corporate scandals. Instead of turning up
the heat on corporate fraud, this bill lets corporate wrongdoers off the hook.

At the beginning of the debate yesterday, I said this is a bad piece of legislation, but there are going to be some amendments offered, amendments that will improve this bad bill. I hope legislation that would have made significant improvements. But my hope of these amendments passing was very short lived. It did not happen. Over the last 2 days, the Senate has turned away each and every one of these bills less offensive. Every single amendment—each a message of fairness—was debated and turned down. That is a shame. Proponents of this bill explained their opposition to the common sense amendments by describing the current bill as a “delicate compromise.” I have heard that so many times. I spoke to Congressman SENSENIBRENNER, the chair of the Judiciary Committee in the House, who is supposedly the gatekeeper on this legislation. He said: We are getting this legislation that is in keeping with what you did last time. Well, when he said, What you did last time, he was talking about the bill that came out of the Senate Judiciary committee and was here on the floor. These changes would not have dramatically altered that.

If you went downtown to see what K Street wanted with these amendments, of course they were against all of them because, in my opinion, this legislation slams the door on most everyone who wants to bring a case and use class action as the tool for coming to court.

The debate yesterday was characterized by two significant misunderstandings about the bill. First, proponents claimed that under this bill, class action lawsuits could stay in State courts as long as two-thirds of the plaintiffs are from a single State. Well, in fact, the bill reverses longstanding Federal court diversity rules by saying that no matter how many plaintiffs are from a single State, the case can still be removed to Federal court if the defendant corporation is incorporated in a different State. Keep in mind, of the Fortune 500 companies, 58 percent of them are incorporated in Delaware, so the majority of class action lawsuits would be removable just on that figure alone.

For example, in the State of Nevada, at the famous Yucca Mountain, the contract is such a rush, the Department of Energy was in such a rush to drill a hole in this mountain, they had a huge auger. The size of this auger was halfway to the top of the second story of this Chamber. It was a huge machine. It dug a hole almost as big as this Chamber—a big tool going right through that mountain. They knew they were coming to a formation there and that the toxic mineral dust from drilling the formation would cause people to get really sick with silicoisosis, that, but they would not even wet down this big tool to prevent the dust. They drilled dry, so to speak, and this toxic dust flew all over and the workers inhaled it. And today, as we speak, people are dying as a result of that.

Well, there has been a request for the case to be considered a class action—under the old law, in existence before this passage. I hope those workers to join together in a class action and have it certified. Even though well over two-thirds of the plaintiffs are residents of Nevada, the name was caused in Nevada, and the defendants were obviously in Nevada in Nevada, a defendant incorporated in a State other than Nevada could remove the case from Nevada State court. That is how this bill works. It is just unfair.

The second mischaracterization of this legislation is that supporters make it sound as though all we are talking about is venue: These cases will simply move from State court to Federal court and proceed just the same. That is simply not true. Under Supreme Court precedents that this bill does nothing to change. Federal judges routinely dismiss class action lawsuits based on State law. Those cases that are not dismissed go to the back of a very long line in the overburdened Federal court system.

One of the foremost experts on class actions is a man who is also an expert in antitrust law. He is a professor at Harvard Law School. His name is Arthur Miller. Here is what he said: Federal courts have consistently denied class certification in multi-state lawsuits based on consumer as well as other state laws... not a single Federal Circuit Court has granted class certification for such a lawsuit, and six Circuit Courts have expressly denied certification.

The rejection of the Feinstein-Bingaman amendment shows this bill's true colors. And I admire greatly Senator FEINSTEIN for having the courage to do the right thing. It has been one of the original pushers of this legislation, but what we are trying to do is unfair, and the Bingaman amendment should be adopted. She joined with him for the Feinstein-Bingaman amendment.

So, if the sponsors merely wanted federal court review of lawsuits with national implications, they would not object to an amendment making clear that federal judges may not dismiss these cases.

But without that change, the truth is plain to see: This bill is designed to bury class action lawsuits, to cut off the one means by which individual Americans ripped off by fraudulent or deceptive practices can band together to demand justice from corporate America.

What does this change mean in the real world? It means, for example, that cases like the one brought by Shaneen Wahl will not be able to go forward.

Shaneen is a 55-year-old woman, and was obviously doing business with the insurance company. Her health insurance company raised the rates on her insurance premiums from $194 a month to $1,800 a month—a little jump in price. She found out that her insurance company was improperly doing this for tens of thousands of other chronically ill patients. She got a lawyer, they banded together in a class action lawsuit, and they prevailed in state court. Under this legislation, the case would be dismissed.

Another breast cancer survivor also a Florida woman, is 48-year-old Susan Friedman. Susan's insurance company removed her case to federal court, where it was dismissed. She is an unlucky example of what will happen to more people under this legislation. The fate of many such class action lawsuits under the bill the Senate will soon pass.

Unfortunately, insurance companies are ripping people off all the time, and this legislation will give the biggest, best businesses in the world, the insurance companies, more money.

In the real world, this legislation means that when a phone company systematically bills services they had cancelled or a plumbing company routinely overcharges customers by $10, those practices will not be brought to light. The dollar amounts would be too small. Why should the plumbing company get an extra $10 from everyone? I guess what this legislation means is if you cheat a lot, you can take them to court, but if you cheat just a little bit, lots and lots of times, have at it, because no one can do anything about it. This is the 'cheat a little bit' legislation.

This legislation is not good. It will help the tobacco industry avoid accountability. It virtually guarantees that tobacco-related cases will end up in federal court where they won't be able to proceed. I had a person, Fritz Hahn, who lived on my property in Nevada, and he was diagnosed with cancer by some doctor. He was one of the original pushers of this legislation, but what we are trying to do is unfair, and the Bingaman amendment should be adopted. She joined with him for the Senate to reject this bill.

That is what class action is all about, joining together and going after those companies who do bad things to people. However, this legislation will make it so not more difficult. That is why numerous consumer groups, including the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the Consumers Union, the AFL-CIO, Public Citizen, and many others have urged the Senate to reject this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD scores and scores of companies that support my statement against this legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LEGISLATION AS OF MAY 21, 2004

AARP, ADA Watch/National Coalition for Disability Rights, AFL-CIO, Alliance for Health Reform, Alliance for Justice, Alliance for Retired Americans, American Association of University Women, American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Federation of Government Employees, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, American Lung Association, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Campaign to Counter Gun Violence, United with the Million Mom March, and Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids.

Center for Disability and Health, Center for Justice and Democracy, Center for Responsible Lending, Center for Women Policy Studies, Civil Justice, Inc., Clean Water Action, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, Communication Workers of America, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Earthjustice, Education Law Center, Environmental Working Group, Epilepsy Foundation, Families USA, Federally Employed Women, Friends of the Earth, and Gray Panthers.


GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO CLASS-ACTION LEGISLATION


Mr. REID. Organizations are against it. State court judges, Federal judges, many state Attorneys General, and the National Conference of State Legislators are against it. Officials in our home States are telling us not to do this. Fudging Fathers to revolt against King George were they couldn’t bring their grievances to a body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REID. What time is that? I will use leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REID. Thank the Chair. As I was saying, one of the grievances that inspired our Founding Fathers to revolt against King George was limited access to the civil courts. That was based on the rights secured in the year 1215, when King John signed the Magna Carta. King John couldn’t sign his name, so he put an X. From that day forward, one of the things that was brought over the ocean and is now in our common law, when the Founding Fathers developed our country, is that you bring to court your grievances. They had a jury that could sit down and talk about what was good and bad about your case. Access to the courts is a basic right in our democracy, and after today it will be a diminished right.

These rights are being denigrated, taken away from us with this legislation. It is too bad. A basic right that has been in existence since we have been a country, they are shipping away at.

I am going to vote against this ill-considered bill. I recognize it is going to pass. I think that is too bad. I can say this without any question: Downtown beat us. There is no question about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will be voting on the Class Action Fairness Act. We have before us truly a bipartisan bill that was introduced with 32 cosponsors, 24 Republicans and 8 Democrats. It was voted out of the Judiciary Committee on a strong bipartisan vote. Every vote on every amendment that has been offered has been bipartisan, if we look at the vote tallies. I do anticipate that in a few minutes our vote on final passage will be strongly bipartisan as well.

There are a few misconceptions about the bill that I would like to definitively dispel in these final moments. This bill does not close the courthouse doors to injured or aggrieved plaintiffs. It does not. This is court reform. It is designed to rein in lawsuit abuses, and it does just that. The plaintiff may end up in Federal court, yes, rather than State court, but no citizen will lose his or her right to bring a case—no citizen.

The Fairness Act will protect plaintiffs in interstate class action cases. No longer will predatory lawyers be able to negotiate deals that leave their clients with coupons while they take home millions. Plaintiffs will now be able to enjoy a summer bill of rights for the first time, a consumer bill of rights that will require lawyer’s fees for coupon settlements to be based either on the value of the coupons that are actually redeemed or on the hours actually billed. Take the case such as the one in my home State of Tennessee involving a Memphis car dealer. It was discovered that a dealership was instructing its employees to cheat car purchasers by as much as $2,000. Numerous residents felt so aggrieved so a class action suit was filed. The suit was eventually settled, and the plaintiffs received a coupon for $1,200, but that coupon could only be used if they went back to the same dealer who had cheated them in the first place and bought another car. Meanwhile, the trial attorneys who settled the suit received $1.3 million in legal fees. A number of customers were understandably upset that in order to receive any financial benefit, they would have to take their car and go back to the very same dealer, while at the same time the lawyers were able to take their money and put it right into their pockets. The legislation before us today will put a stop to such unfair practices.

Second, the class action bill will help end the phenomenon that we all recognize known as forum shopping. Aggressive trial lawyers have found that a few counties are lawsuit friendly, and in those select State courts, judges are quick to certify class actions while local juries are known to grant extravagant damage awards. Meanwhile, this same defendant can face copycat cases all
across the country, each jury granting a different result. These counties may have little or no geographic relationship to either the plaintiff or to the defendant, but the trial lawyers know that simply the threat of suing in these particular counties can lead to huge, extravagant cash settlements. One study estimates that virtually every sector of the U.S. economy is on trial in only three State courts.

The Class Action Fairness Act moves those large nationwide cases that genuinely involve interstate commerce into the Federal courts where they belong. The Class Action Fairness Act is a good bill. It is a fair bill. It is a significant first step in putting an end to the lawsuit abuses that undermine our legal system.

I commend my colleagues for their hard work. I thank, in particular, Senator Grassley, the bill’s lead sponsor, who has been working on this issue for a decade; Senator Specter, for leading who has been working on this issue for years; Senator Cornyn, who has been tireless in his presence and participation on this class action bill over the last several days; the bill’s Democratic supporters, especially Senator Kohl, Senator Dodd, Senator Carper, Senator Ben Nelson; all have worked in a real leadership manner—working with us to deal with the bill in a timely and expeditious manner on the floor.

The American people expect and deserve a government that works and leaders who work together. I think they have seen it play out very well on this bill. They did elect us to govern toward meaningful solutions. The bill, I believe, demonstrates we are accomplishing just that. We are meeting the challenge and we are moving America forward. I look forward to quick passage of the bill in the House and being able to send it to the President’s desk.

Mr. President, we will vote very shortly. So obviously Members can plan on their schedules, this upcoming vote on final passage of the class action fairness bill will be the last vote of the evening.

Following this vote, we will have a few Members making statements. We will remain in session for a short period today. The Senate will not be in session tomorrow and we will reconvene on Monday.

On Monday, the plans are to begin debate on the nomination of Michael Chertoff to be Secretary of Homeland Security. At closing today, we will reach an agreement that will provide for debate on the Chertoff nomination during Monday’s session, with a vote to occur on that nomination on Tuesday.

Therefore, I am prepared to announce we will not have any votes on Monday. I will have more to say about the precise timing of the debate and vote later today when we wrap up our business. Once again, I thank all Members for their cooperation and assistance throughout the debate on the class action bill. I believe we are ready for final passage.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Colman). Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MccONnell. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Santorum) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Sununu).

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

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Alexander  (C) Dole  (B)
Allard  DeWine  Lugar
Allen  Doles  McCain
Bayh  Domenici  McConnell
Bennett  Ensign  Morrison
Bingaman  Emsi  Nelson (NE)
Bond  Feinstein  Obama
Brownback  Feingold  Reed
Burns  Finegold  Roberts
Burr  Graham  Rogers
Cantwell  Hagel  Schmadr
Carper  Hatch  Sessions
Chafee  Hauser  Shelby
Chambliss  Inhofe  Smith
Cochran  Isakson  Snowe
Collins  Jefords  Specter
Cooper  Johnson  Stevens
Collins  Kyl  Thomason
Cornyn  Landrieu  Thune
Craig  Lieberman  Vitter
Crapo  Lott  Voinovich
DeMint  Lynn  Warner

NAYS—26

Akaka  Durbin  Mihalek
Baucus  Fendigold  Murray
Biden  Harkin  Nelson (FL)
Boxer  Inouye  Pryor
Byrd  Kennedy  Reid
Clinton  Kerry  Sarbanes
Curnyn  Landenberg  Stabenow
Dayton  Levy  Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Santorum  Sununu

The bill (S. 5) was passed, as follows: S. 5

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SEC. 3. CONSUMER CLASS ACTION BILL OF RIGHTS AND IMPROVED PROCEDURES FOR INTERSTATE CLASS ACTIONS.

(a) In General.—Part V is amended by inserting after chapter 113 the following:

"CHAPTER 114—CLASS ACTIONS"

"Sec.

"1711. Definitions.

"1712. Coupon settlements.

"1713. Protection against loss by class members.

"1714. Protection against discrimination based on geographic location.

"1715. Notifications to appropriate Federal and State officials.

"§ 1711. Definitions.

"In this chapter:

"(1) CLASS.—The term ‘class’ means all of the class members in a class action.

"(2) CLASS ACTION.—The term ‘class action’ means any civil action filed in a district court of the United States under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any civil action that is removed to a district court of the United States that was originally under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States that was authorized by law to provide for the disposition of judicial procedure authorizing an action to be brought by 1 or more representatives as a class action.

"(3) CLASS COUNSEL.—The term ‘class counsel’ means the persons who serve as the attorneys for the class members for a proposed or certified class action.

"(4) CLASS MEMBER.—The term ‘class member’ means the persons (named or unnamed) who fall within the definition of the proposed or certified class in a class action.

"(5) PLAINTIFF CLASS ACTION.—The term ‘plaintiff class action’ means a class action in which class members are plaintiffs.

"(6) PROPOSED SETTLEMENT.—The term ‘proposed settlement’ means an agreement regarding a class action that is subject to court approval and that, if approved, would be binding on some or all class members.

"§ 1712. Coupon settlements.

"(a) CONTINGENT FEES IN COUPON SETTLEMENTS.—If a proposed settlement in a class action provides for a recovery of coupons to a class member, the portion of any attorney’s fee award to class counsel that is attributable to the award of the coupons shall be based on the proportionate share of the claims of such class members that are redeemed.

"(b) OTHER ATTORNEY’S FEES IN COUPON SETTLEMENTS.—

"(1) GENERAL.—A proposed settlement in a class action provides for a recovery of coupons to class members, and a portion of the recovery of the coupons is not used to determine the attorney’s fee to be paid to class counsel, any attorney’s fee award shall be based upon the amount of time class counsel reasonably expended working on the action.

"(2) COURT APPROVAL.—Any attorney’s fee under this subsection shall be subject to approval by the court and shall include an appropriate attorney’s fee, if any, for obtaining equitable relief, including injunctive relief.

"(c) ATTORNEY’S FEES AWARDED ON A MIXED BASIS IN COUPON SETTLEMENTS.—If a proposed settlement in a class action provides for a recovery of coupons to class members and also provides for equitable relief, including injunctive relief, the attorney’s fee to be paid to class counsel that is based upon a portion of the recovery of the coupons shall be calculated in accordance with subsection (a); and

"(2) that portion of the attorney’s fee to be paid to class counsel that is not based upon a portion of the recovery of the coupons shall be calculated in accordance with subsection (b).

"(d) SETTLEMENT VALUATION EXPERTISE.—In a class action in which the awarding of coupons, the court may, in its discretion upon the motion of a party, receive expert testimony from a witness qualified to provide information as to the actual value to the class members of the coupons that are redeemed.

"(e) JUDICIAL SCRUTINY OF COUPON SETTLEMENTS.—In a proposed settlement under which class members would be awarded coupons, the court may approve the proposed settlement only after a hearing to determine whether the findings that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate for class members. The court, in its discretion, may also require that a proposed settlement agreement provide for the distribution of a portion of the value of unclaimed coupons to 1 or more charitable or governmental organizations, as agreed to by the parties. The distribution and redemption of any proceeds under this subsection shall not be used to calculate attorneys’ fees under this section.

"§ 1713. Protection against loss by class members.

"The court may approve a proposed settlement under which any class member is obligated to pay sums to class counsel that would result in a net loss to the class member only if the court makes a written finding that nonmonetary benefits to the class member substantially outweigh the monetary loss.

"§ 1714. Protection against discrimination based on geographic location.

"The court may not approve a proposed settlement that provides for the payment of greater sums to some class members than to others solely on the basis that the class members to whom the greater sums are to be paid are located in closer geographic proximity to the court.

"§ 1715. Notifications to appropriate Federal and State officials.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL OFFICIAL.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate Federal official’ means—

"(A) the Attorney General of the United States; or

"(B) in any case in which the defendant is a Federal depository institution, a State depository institution holding company, a foreign bank, or a non-depository institution subsidiary of the foregoing (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1313)), the person who has the primary Federal regulatory or supervisory responsibility with respect to the defendant, if some or all of the matters alleged in the class action are subject to regulation or supervision by that person.

"(2) APPROPRIATE STATE OFFICIAL.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate State official’ means the person in the State who has the primary regulatory or supervisory responsibility with respect to the defendant, or who licenses or otherwise authorizes the defendant to conduct business in the State, if some or all of the matters alleged in the class action are subject to regulation by that person. If there is no primary regulator, supervisor, or licensing authority, or the matters alleged in the class action are not subject to regulation or supervision by that person, then the appropriate State official shall be the State attorney general.

"(3) In General.—Within 10 days after a proposed settlement of a class action is filed in court, each defendant that is participating in the proposed settlement shall serve upon the appropriate State official of each State in which a class member resides and the appropriate Federal official, a notice of the proposed settlement;

"(i) a copy of the complaint and any materials filed with the complaint and any amended complaints (except such materials shall be required to be served if such materials are made electronically available through the Internet and such service includes notice of how to electronically access such material);

"(ii) notice of any scheduled judicial hearing in the class action;

"(iii) any proposed or final notice to class members of—

"(A) the members’ rights to request exclusion from the class action; or

"(B) a proposed settlement of a class action;

"(iv) any proposed or final class action settlement;

"(v) any settlement or other agreement contemporaneously made between class counsel and counsel for the defendant; and

"(vi) any final judgment or notice of dismissal;

"(2) Not later than 10 days after a proposed settlement of a class action is filed in court, the appropriate Federal official and the appropriate State official shall not be required to serve any notice required under subsection (a) if none of the requirements of this section are satisfied by serving the notice required under subsection (b) upon the person who has the primary Federal regulatory or supervisory responsibility with respect to the defendant, if some or all of the matters alleged in the class action are subject to regulation or supervision by that person.

"(2) STATE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—In any case in which the defendant is a State depository institution (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1313)), the notice requirements of this section are satisfied by serving the notice required under subsection (b) upon the bank supervisor (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1313)) of the defendant bank, which is the defendant, if the defendant is a subsidiary or affiliate of a State depository institution (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1313)) of the defendant bank, or the person who has the primary Federal regulatory or supervisory responsibility with respect to the defendant, if some or all of the matters alleged in the class action are subject to regulation or supervision by that person, and upon the appropriate Federal official.

"(d) FINAL APPROVAL.—An order giving final approval of a proposed settlement may not be issued earlier than 90 days after the date on which the appropriate Federal official and the appropriate State official are served with the notice required under subsection (b).

"(e) NONCOMPLIANCE IF NOTICE NOT PROVIDED.—

"(1) In General.—A class member may request copies of any materials described under subparagraph (A) to the court.

"(2) Any proposed or final notice to class members of—

"(A(i) the members’ rights to request exclusion from the class action; or

"(B) a proposed settlement of a class action;

"(3) In General.—Within 10 days after a proposed settlement of a class action is filed in court, each defendant that is participating in the proposed settlement shall serve upon the appropriate State official of each State in which a class member resides and the appropriate Federal official, a notice of the proposed settlement;
member demonstrates that the notice required under subsection (b) has not been provided.

(2) LIMITATION.—A class member may not refuse to join or to be bound by a settlement agreement or consent decree under paragraph (1) if the notice required under subsection (b) was directed to the appropriate official and to either the State attorney general or the person that has primary regulatory, supervisory, or licensing authority over the defendant.

(3) Rights created by this subsection shall apply only to class members or any person acting on a class member’s behalf, and shall not be construed to extend to third-party rights affecting a class member’s participation in the settlement.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to expand the authority of, or impose any obligations, duties, or responsibilities upon, Federal or State officials.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part V is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 113 the following:

“114. Class Actions ........................................ 1711”, SEC. 4. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION FOR INTERSTATE CLASS ACTIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL DIVERSITY JURISDICTION.—Section 1332 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

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

“(d) In this subsection—

(A) the term ‘class’ means all of the class members in a class action;

(B) the term ‘class action’ means any civil action filed under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or similar State statute as a rule of judicial procedure authorizing an action to be brought by 1 or more representative persons as a class action;

(C) the term ‘class certification order’ means an order issued by a court approving the treatment of some or all aspects of a civil action as a class action; and

(D) the term ‘class members’ means the persons (designated or identified) who fall within the definition of the proposed or certified class in a class action.

(2) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any class action in which the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is a class action in which—

(A) any member of a class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a State different from any defendant;

(B) any member of a class of plaintiffs is a foreign state or a citizen or subject of a foreign state and any defendant is a citizen of a State; or

(C) any member of a class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a State and any defendant is a foreign state or a citizen or subject of a foreign state.

(3) A district court may, in the interests of justice and looking at the totality of the circumstances, decline to exercise jurisdiction under paragraph (2) over a class action in which greater than one-third but less than two-thirds of the members of all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate and the primary defendants are citizens of the State in which the action was originally filed based on considerations that—

(A) whether the claims asserted involve matters of national or interstate interest;

(B) whether the claims asserted will be governed by laws of the State in which the action was originally filed or by the laws of other States;

(C) whether the class action has been pleaded in a manner that seeks to avoid Federal jurisdiction;

(D) whether the action was brought in a forum with substantial contacts with the class members, the alleged harm, or the defendants;

(E) whether the number of citizens of the State in which the action was originally filed in all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate is substantially larger than the number of citizens from any other State, and the citizenship of other members of the proposed class is dispersed among a substantial number of States; and

(F) whether, during the 3-year period preceding the filing of the class action, more other class actions asserting the same or similar claims on behalf of the same or other persons have been filed.

(4) A district court shall decline to exercise jurisdiction under paragraph (2)—

(A) over a class action in which—

(I) greater than two-thirds of the members of all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate are citizens of the State in which the action was originally filed;

(II) at least 1 defendant is a defendant—

(aa) from whom significant relief is sought by members of the plaintiff class;

(bb) whose alleged conduct forms a significant basis for the claims asserted by the proposed plaintiff class; and

(cc) who is a citizen of the State in which the action was originally filed; and

(III) prorogation of the filing of the complaint or any related conduct of each defendant were incurred in the State in which the action was originally filed; and

(III) during the 3-year period preceding the filing of that class action, no other class action has been filed asserting the same or similar factual allegations against any of the defendants on behalf of the same or other persons; or

(B) two-thirds or more of the members of all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate, and the primary defendants, are citizens of the State in which the action was originally filed.

(5) Paragraphs (2) through (4) shall not apply to any class action in which—

(A) the primary defendants are States, State officials, or other governmental entities against whom the district court may be foreclosed from exercising jurisdiction over;

(B) the number of members of all proposed plaintiff classes in the aggregate is less than 100.

(6) In any class action, the claims of the individual members shall be aggregated to determine whether the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

(7) Citizenship of the members of the proposed plaintiff classes shall be determined for purposes of paragraphs (2) through (6) as of the date of filing of the complaint or amended complaint, or, if the case stated by the initial pleading is not subject to Federal jurisdiction, as of the date of service of a plaintiff of an amended pleading, motion, or other paper, indicating the existence of Federal jurisdiction.

(8) This section shall apply to any class action before or after the entry of a class certification order by the court with respect to any proceeding.

(9) Paragraph (2) shall not apply to any class action that solely involves a claim—


(B) that relates to the internal affairs or governance of a corporation or other form of business enterprise and that arises under or by virtue of the laws of the State in which such corporation or business enterprise is incorporated or organized; or

(C) that relates to the rights, duties (including fiduciary duties) and liabilities of the members of a partnership, and that arises under or by virtue of the laws of the State in which such partnership is formed or that relates to or created by or pursuant to any security (as defined under section 2(a)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a(a)(1))) and that arises under or by virtue of the laws of the State in which the partnership is formed.

(10) For purposes of this subsection and section 1453, an unincorporated association shall be deemed to be a citizen of the State in which it has its principal place of business and the State under whose laws it is organized.

(b)(1) For purposes of this subsection and section 1453, a mass action shall be deemed to be a class action removable under paragraphs (2) through (10) if it otherwise meets the provisions of those paragraphs.

(b)(1) As used in subparagraph (A), the term ‘mass action’ means any civil action (except a civil action within the scope of section 1712(b)) in which monetary relief claims of 100 or more persons are proposed to be tried jointly on the ground that the plaintiffs’ claims involve common questions of law or fact, except that joinder of the plaintiffs’ claims shall exist only over those plaintiffs whose claims in a mass action satisfy the jurisdictional amount requirements under subsection (a).

(b)(1) As used in subparagraph (A), the term ‘mass action’ shall not include any civil action in which—

(I) all of the claims in the action arise from an event or occurrence in the State in which the action was filed, and that allegedly resulted in injuries in that State or in any State contiguous to that State;

(II) the claims are joined upon motion of a defendant;

(III) all of the claims in the action are asserted on behalf of the general public (and not on behalf of individual plaintiffs or members of a purported class) pursuant to a State statute specifically authorizing such action; or

(IV) the claims have been consolidated or coordinated solely for pretrial proceedings.

(b)(1) Any action(s) removed to Federal court pursuant to this subsection shall not thereafter be transferred to any other court pursuant to section 1407, or the rules promulgated thereunder, unless a majority of the plaintiffs in the action request transfer pursuant to section 1407.

(b)(1) This subparagraph will not apply—

(I) to cases certified pursuant to rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

(II) if plaintiffs propose that the action proceed as a class action pursuant to rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

(III) the limitations periods on any claims asserted in a mass action that is removed to Federal court pursuant to this subsection shall not be deemed tolled during the period that the action is pending in Federal court.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1332(a)(1) is amended by inserting “subsection (a) or (d) of” before “section 1332”.

(2) Section 1603(b)(3) is amended by striking “(d)” and inserting “(e)”.

(c) SEC. 5. REMOVAL OF INTERSTATE CLASS ACTIONS TO FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 89 is amended by adding after section 1452 the following:

“§ 1453. Removal of class actions

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘class’, ‘class action’, ‘class certification order’, and ‘class member’ shall have the meanings given such terms under section 1712(d)(1).

(2) IN GENERAL.—A class action may be removed to a district court of the United States in accordance with section 1446 (except that the 1-year limitation under section
144(b) shall not apply), without regard to whether any defendant is a citizen of the State in which the action is brought, except that such action may be removed by any defendant without the consent of all defendants.

"(c) Review of Remand Orders.—

"(1) In General.—Section 1447 shall apply to any motion under that section, except that notwithstanding section 1447(d), a court of appeals may accept an appeal from an order of a district court granting or denying a motion to remand a class action to the State court from which it was removed if application is made to the court of appeals not less than 7 days after entry of the order.

"(2) Procedure.—In the event that the court of appeals accepts an appeal under paragraph (1), the court shall complete all action on such appeal, including rendering judgment, not later than 60 days after the date on which such appeal was filed, unless an extension is granted under paragraph (3).

"(3) Extension of Time Period.—The court of appeals may grant an extension of the 60-day period described in paragraph (2) if—

"(A) all parties to the proceeding agree to such extension, for any period of time; or

"(B) it appears that the issues presented have not been adequately shown and in the interests of justice, for a period not to exceed 10 days.

"(d) Exception.—This section shall not apply to any class action that solely involves—


"(2) a claim that relates to the internal affairs or governance of a corporation or other form of business enterprise and arises under or by virtue of the laws of the State in which such corporation or business enterprise is incorporated or organized; or

"(3) a claim that relates to the rights, duties (including fiduciary duties), and obligations relating to or created by or pursuant to any security as defined under section 2(a)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a(1)) and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(b) Technical and Conforming Amendments.—Sections 1452 and 1453 are amended by adding after the item relating to section 1452 the following:

"1453. Removal of class actions.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS.

(a) In General.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States, with the assistance of the Director of the Federal Judicial Center and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on class action settlements.

(b) Content.—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

"(1) recommendations on the best practices that courts can use to ensure that proposed class action settlements are fair to the class members that the settlements are supposed to benefit;

"(2) recommendations on the best practices that courts can use to ensure that—

"(A) any amounts awarded to counsel in connection with a class action settlement appropriately reflect the extent to which counsel succeeded in obtaining full redress for the injuries alleged and the time, expense, and risk that counsel devoted to the litigation; and

"(B) the class members on whose behalf the settlement is proposed are the primary beneficiaries of the settlement; and

"(3) the actions that the Judicial Conference has taken and intends to take toward having the Federal judiciary implement any or all of the recommendations contained in the report.

"(c) Authority of Federal Courts.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the authority of the Federal courts to supervise attorneys’ fees.

SEC. 7. ENACTMENT OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amendments to rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which are set forth in the order entered by the Supreme Court of the United States on March 27, 2003, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act or on December 1, 2003 (as specified in that order), whichever occurs first.

SEC. 8. RULEMAKING AUTHORITY OF SUPREME COURT AND JUDICIAL CONFERENCE.

Nothing in this Act shall restrict in any way the authority of the Judicial Conference and the Supreme Court to propose and prescribe general rules of practice and procedure under chapter 131 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay this bill on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the staggering cost estimates for the Medicare prescription drug benefit, coupled with the small number of seniors who have signed up so far, has threatened the Medicare prescription drug program. And I do not want to see that happen, having voted for this program. I want to see the Senate take the steps to ensure that it works; that it delivers medicine to our seniors in a cost-effective way, and ensures that it reaches the hopes and expectations that millions of older people and their families have for this program.

The fact is, the Medicare prescription drug program now faces two very serious problems. The first is the skyrocketing costs. These are the costs we have been debating throughout the week, that have been far greater than anyone could have predicted. A second problem may also herald very big concerns. To date, a small number of older people have signed up for the first part of the drug benefit, the drug card. So what you have is a pretty combustible mix. The combination of escalating costs and a skimpy number of older people signing up thus far raises the very real problem that a huge amount of Government money will be spent on a very small number of people. That is a prescription for a program that cannot survive.

I do not want to see that happen. As someone who voted for this program and worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make this program work to meet the urgent needs of the Nation’s older people, I think the Senate ought to be taking corrective action and take corrective action now, in order to deal with what I think are looming problems.

As I said, we learned a bit about the escalating costs of the program. But when you couple that with low levels of participation by older people, that is particularly troublesome. I think it is fair to say, if the drug card debacle—the first part of the program and the small number of older people signing up for the drug card continues into the full benefit phase of the program, what you have is a situation where I believe people are going to say this program cannot be justified at a time of scarce Government resources.

I turn for a moment to the drug card part of the program that I don’t think has been discussed much lately, the choices are eye-glazing. There are more than 70 cards available; 39 you can get in any part of the country, the other 30-plus you can get only in some States. The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services reported in an informal survey that the program information was confusing and inadequate.

The remarkable is that a lot of folks who were looking at it are people who were relatives of HHS employees. So you have a situation where even folks connected with those who would know a fair amount about this program are having difficulty sorting through it.

I have come to the floor today to try to sound a wake-up call, to say those of us who voted for the program, like myself, and those who opposed it, we all want to see that happen, having voted for this program. I want to see the Senate take the steps to ensure that it works; that it delivers medicine to our seniors in a cost-effective way, and ensures that it reaches the hopes and expectations that millions of older people and their families have for this program.

The Medicare Program is pretty much like a fellow standing in the Price Club who buys one roll of toilet paper at a time. They are not shopping in a smart way. They are not using their purchasing power. I and Senator SNOWE have sought to correct that and
to take steps to use sensible cost containment strategies and ensure that the costs of this program are held down.

Second, I think we need to take steps to make sure that some of the mistakes we have avoided, or a new agency charged with dealing with this program, needs people with expertise to answer the questions of seniors and family members. There needs to be better information, on the net and elsewhere, that is not incomprehensible gobbledegook, so that people need information about real savings for each plan. Pie-in-the-sky projections, which is what they have gotten thus far, are not going to cut it. That is what we saw this week with respect to these cost estimates. Suffice it to say, the U.S. Congress is not satisfied.

I believe without effective cost containment and without good administration of the program, particularly as it moves into this next stage, we are going to see the bills continue to run up and we are going to see the participation of seniors continue to run down. That is a prescription for a Government program that cannot survive. I do not want to see that.

I think we need to get out in order to get that legislation passed. I believe it can survive. Congress needs to hustle, now, to mend it, to mend it with sensible bipartisan cost containment along the lines of what is used in the private sector; mend it with changes in the way the program is administered so it goes into the second phase without some of the problems we saw connected with the drug card. I just hope, as a result of what the Congress has learned this week, that there has been a real wake-up call as to how urgent it is that Congress take these corrective steps and that Congress move quickly. I believe this program now, because of the huge new cost estimates and the problems with getting folks signed up, could well be heading for life support. I want to see that. I think it would be a tragedy. I want the program to work here in the purchase of prescription drugs for Medicare recipients. It is certainly not new to the Federal Government. We have done this for almost 20 years in the Veterans Administration—for the VA contracts for the purchase of prescription drugs in bulk and, therefore, the cost of the drugs to the Veterans Administration is considerably less than retail price.

If it is good for the Department of Veterans Affairs, why isn’t it good for the rest of the Federal Government and Medicare to do it? But we were not allowed because the law specifically says we are going to violate the principle of free market enterprise, and you can’t negotiate the price of the prescription drugs down. It seems to me that not only violates the principle, it violates good common sense.

Now what do we do? The news has come out. No, the bill isn’t going to cost what was promised, $400 billion over 10 years; it is going to cost a minimum of $720 billion over 10 years. We are either misleading the Pbs and Qs or else we are going to continue to bankrupt this country by using faulty mathematics.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I consume.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 355 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

PHARMACEUTICAL MARKET ACCESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday I and 28 of my Senate colleagues introduced legislation allowing the re-importation of FDA-approved prescription drugs from Canada and other countries. We have introduced legislation of this type before, but we have been blocked from consideration in the Senate. We do not intend to be blocked this year. We intend to get the Senate on record. We believe there are sufficient votes in the Senate to pass a bill dealing with the re-importation of prescription drugs. We very much hope we can get a bill to the President and have that legislation signed.

The 29 Senators who have reached agreement on this broad bipartisan consensus in the Senate. That bipartisan group includes Senator SNOKE, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MCCAIN, Senator LOFT, Senator STABENOW, and many others. We believe it is in the best interest of Republicans and Democrats joining together to try to put downward pressure on prescription drug prices.

Let me show two pill bottles in the Senate. These bottles held the drug Lipitor, or a popular cholesterol-lowering drugs in America. Obviously, the Lipitor tablets that went into these two bottles are made by the same company. In each bottle, it is the same FDA-approved tablet, made in the same factory and the same plant and put in the same pill bottle. The only difference is price. This bottle was sent to a Canadian pharmacy that paid $1.01 per tablet; this one was sent to the United States pharmacy that paid $1.81 per tablet.

Why are the Americans charged nearly double for the same pill, put in the same bottle, made by the same company? Because the company can and does call the shots on the price. The price controls on prescription drugs in this country: it is the pharmaceutical industry that is controlling prices, and they have decided that the U.S. consumers should pay the highest prices in the world for prescription medications.

Many of us believe that should not be the case. Miracle drugs offer no miracles to those who cannot afford them. We have so many senior citizens living on fixed incomes in this country who need prescription drugs. Seniors are 12 percent of this country’s population. Yet they consume over one third of all the prescription drugs in our country. That is why this issue is so important.

The reimportation legislation we have introduced is again a broad bipartisan agreement between Republicans and Democrats, one we intend to push to a vote. We believe it is finally time that we have a vote in the Senate and the Senate and get a bill to the President. We understand the President has not supported this. We understand the Food and Drug Administration has been very strong and assertive in saying there are safety issues with this legislation.

That, of course, is patently absurd. We have had testimony before the U.S. Congress that in Europe, for 20 years, they have done reimportation. In Europe, they call it “parallel trading,” where if you are from France and want to buy a prescription drug from Germany, that is just fine. If you are from
Italy and want to buy a prescription drug from Spain, that is just fine. Parallel trading in pharmaceuticals has occurred for 20 years, and there has been no safety issue. We had a pharmaceutical company executive named Dr. Peter Rost, the vice president of marketing for a major drug company, who said:

The biggest argument against reimportation is safety. What everyone has conveniently forgotten to tell you is that in Europe, reimportation of drugs has been in place for 20 years.

This is an executive from the drug industry itself.

He said something else that is important:

During my time responsible for a region in northern Europe, I never once—nor once—heard the drug industry, regulatory agencies, the government, or anyone else saying that this practice was unsafe.

This is a big issue. This is not a small issue. The price of prescription drugs is on the march upward. Too many Americans cannot afford their medication. It is unfair to have the American people charged the highest prices in the world. We are talking only about importing FDA-approved drugs made in FDA-approved plants, in many cases put in identical bottles, shipped to two different locations. One location is to an American who will pay the highest price, and the other location is to other major countries around the world whose citizens are charged much lower prices.

We think that is unfair. We intend to try to put downward pressure on drug prices by unloading drugs. Let the American people benefit from this kind of trade.

Finally, if people wonder whether the price difference is just with respect to Lipitor, it is not. The unfair price discrepancy is significant for Prevacci, Zocor, Nexium, Zoflot— the list is very substantial.

For instance, Nexium is advertised a great deal on television. In the United States the price for 90 doses is $409. The price in Canada is $399. Or Zocor, a well-known football coach on television tells us how important Zocor is. As an American, he pays $383 for 90 doses; a Canadian pays 46 percent less. That describes the problem we are trying to correct.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I will mention one additional item today. That is the aggressive debate that is occurring and will continue to occur subject of Social Security. There is an array of issues that face this country—some big, some small, some of consequence, some not—and we tend, from time to time, to treat the serious too lightly and sometimes the light too seriously. But this issue of Social Security is a big issue.

I was reading something the other day about this from a Knight-Ridder columnist. The promises of Social Security retirement is a hoax. Taxes paid by workers are wasted by the government rather than prudently invested, and the so-called reserve fund is no reserve at all because it contains nothing but government IOUs.

Was that President Bush speaking? No, no. That was the Republican presidential candidate, Alf Landon, 1936 that was the message by people who never liked Social Security—those who never liked Social Security and fought against it when it was created never really quit.

In 1983, the Cato Institute published a paper that served as the manifesto for turning over some of Social Security to the private sector. It recommended the following: Consistent criticism of Social Security to undermine confidence in it. That was part of the strategy. Consistently criticize Social Security to undermine confidence. Build a coalition of supporters for private accounts, including banks and other financial institutions that would benefit from them.

They have done pretty well. This manifesto going back to Alf Landon, going to the Cato Institute in 1983—constantly criticize Social Security, undermine it, build a coalition of supporters, and others who would benefit from it. They have done pretty well because they now have an administration that says Social Security is in crisis.

It is not, of course. Social Security is a program that has lifted tens of millions of senior citizens out of poverty over many decades.

People are living longer and better lives, so we will have to make some adjustments. It does not require major surgery.

We will have to make some adjustments in Social Security if we do not get the kind of economic growth we had in the last 75 years. If we do get the kind of growth we had in the economy in the last 75 years, Social Security is fine for the next 75 years with no adjustments needed. But if we get only 1.9 percent economic growth, as the Social Security actuaries predict, we will have to make some adjustments—but not major adjustments and not major surgery.

The President and others are using terms such as “broke,” “bankrupt,” “flat busted,” in order to demonstrate that something has to be done with Social Security. Yet he is offering nothing that would address the solvency of Social Security. Nothing. He is proposing, instead, the creation of private accounts using a portion of the Social Security money. Unfortunately, this would increase the problem in Social Security.

We need to have and will have a very aggressive debate about this issue. My feeling is that we ought to do two things: One, we ought to preserve and protect Social Security. It is a program that has worked, and it continues to work well. It is the bedrock social insurance that the elderly rely upon when they reach retirement age. When they reach 75, they are no longer working and have diminished income. Social Security is what they can depend on to keep them out of poverty.

Some say: Let’s decide to put some of their money in the stock market. Well, I am all for private accounts, but not in the Social Security system. We have 401(k)s, IRAs, pension programs, and Keogh programs. We have done a lot to incentivize private accounts. We now provide about $140 billion per year in tax incentives to encourage the use of these retirement accounts.

We ought to continue providing these incentives, and even increase them, but not in Social Security. Social Security is an insurance trust fund. It is an insurance account. It has always been an insurance account.

A leading spokesperson on the far right said the following a couple of weeks ago: Social Security is the soft underbelly of the welfare state. Well, if you believe that, then I understand why you do not want Social Security, why you do not like Social Security, why you would like to take it apart. I understand that. I respect that view, even if it is dreadfully wrong. We need to respect different viewpoints. There is no reason for all of us to think the same thing all the time.

Someone once said: When everyone is thinking the same thing, no one is thinking very much. So I understand and respect people with different viewpoints. If you never liked Social Security, if you believe it is part of the welfare state as opposed to an enormously successful social insurance program that has worked for 70 years to lift the elderly out of poverty, if you really believe it is unworthy and you want to take it apart, I understand that. But I do not agree. I believe that it is a fight as hard as we can to oppose those who would dismantle Social Security.

It is safe to say that none of the people I have ever heard speak against Social Security will ever need it. None of them will ever need it. Almost all of them speak from a position of financial solvency. In most cases, they have the gift of a very solid financial background. Well, good for them.

Maybe they just do not understand there are a lot of folks in this country who reach those declining income years and do not have very much. They worked hard and led good lives, but they ended up with not very much.
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to 90 years old. He had a great life. He
was a wonderful man.

After his funeral, his wife sent me a
note. She said, very simply: Oscar al-
ways helped his neighbors, and he al-
ways looked out for those who were not
so well off. She said, he did it.

I thought, what a wonderful thing to
say about someone’s life. He always
helped his neighbors and always looked
out for those who were not so well off.
What a great life. He did not make a
lot of money, but he did not die with
a huge estate, but he had a great life.

So does Social Security— the social
insurance program that he and others
know will be there when they reach re-
tirement— enrich their lives, make their
lives better, allow them to depend
on something that will be there? You
bet it does. It is important.

I find it interesting that the chant
and the mantra in this town, from the
White House, yes, and from some of our
colleagues, is that the most important
thing that we have to do is to eliminate
the tax on inherited wealth. They say
you have to eliminate what they call the
death tax. But there is no death tax.
That is just something a polister came
up with.

My colleague Phil Gramm from
Texas was on the floor once, and I ex-
plained to him, were he to die, his wife
would own his entire estate, with no
tax. So he must be exempt. The fact is,
there is no death tax. When one spouse
dies, the other spouse has a 100-percent
exemption, and they own all those
assets.

There is, however, a tax not on death
but on inherited wealth, in certain cir-
cumstances. So what we have is a pro-
aposal to eliminate the tax on inherited
wealth, which would largely benefit the
folks who have accumulated the most
wealth in this country.

We have about half of the world’s bil-
lionaires living in the United States,
and it is not a good thing. Most of that
money accumulated by billionaires is a result of appreciation in
stocks, and has never been subjected
to a tax.

Our colleagues have created this
wonderful little description of the e-
state tax or the tax on inherited wealth.
They have now described it as a death
tax. And they are on the floor of the
Senate saying that when Donald
Trump, for example, passes on and
leaves his estate, his estate should not
be taxed. I would not normally use
that name, but Donald Trump is a won-
derful little description of the es-
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thanked Senator Frist, the Republican leader. I express my thanks to Senator HARRY REID for his willingness to allow this vote to go forward. The class action bill was not legislation that he endorsed, but he was willing to allow the debate to begin and for those who had amendments, that we would have plenty of time to debate them and to decide the amendments, and then with no kind of delaying tactics the Senate would go to final passage and take up the bill. Thank him for the very constructive and positive role he played in allowing this legislation to be passed today.

The House of Representatives has agreed to accept without change the legislation that the Senate has just passed. The Senate has agreed to accept without change the legislation that the House of Representatives has just passed. The Senate has agreed to accept without change the legislation that the House of Representatives has just passed. The Senate has agreed to accept without change the legislation that the House of Representatives has just passed.

I was saddened last night to be reading through my mail and to come across a 29-page document that I believe has been distributed by the Republican National Committee. There is a picture of Senator HARRY REID on the cover, along with our former leader, Senator Tom Daschle. The caption under the picture says: "Who is HARRY Reid?" And below that we read: "Sen. Majority Leader determined to obstruct President Bush's agenda." For the next 28, 29 pages, this document is an attempt to identify HARRY REID or to try to define who we are and who he is, from his values. I think it is 29 pages of something more akin to venom.

If we are interested in building on the bipartisanship that characterized this week's debate and today's vote on class action reform, those goals are not enhanced or strengthened by this kind of tactic.

I say to my Republican friends—and I don't believe this came from anybody in this Chamber, but it is from someone our Republicans know and work with, the work for the President or indirectly—if you want Democrats to work with you and find common ground on issues such as class action or energy or asbestos or other difficult issues, bankruptcy, this is not the way to do it. If you want to make sure that we have obstructionism, that we have a lack of bipartisanship, if you want to ensure that the climate of the last several years where we got so little done returns, this is the way to do it.

Whoever is responsible for this, let me just say: Shame on you. Republicans can do better than this. And to the extent that Democrats are responsible for this kind of behavior on our side, shame on us.

I came here 4 years ago from Delaware, which is a little State, such as the State of the Presiding Officer. In our State we have a history of Democrats and Republicans working across the aisle, trying to find common ground and make often than not, succeeding. This sort of thing would not be tolerated in my State by either Democrat or Republicans. This is not the way we do business. One of the reasons Delaware is so successful is because of that bipartisan tradition that is part of our fiber.

I hope that we won't see this kind of attack on our leader, and I certainly would not see it on the Republican leader. The Senate is a better than this. So are the Democrats. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. Craig pertaining to the introduction of S. 359 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Sen. KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On July 17, 2004, Donald Brockman, Darren Gay, Shawn Regan and an unidentified 16-year-old boy accompanied another man home after leaving a bar in Austin, TX. After arriving, the four men allegedly punched and kicked the victim as well as forced him to violate himself because they believed he was gay. The attackers described themselves as Aryan Nazis and later bragged about "beating up a gay man.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend the victims and their families from the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

FAREWELL TO JOE F. COLVIN

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the significant achievements of Joe F. Colvin, who is retiring as president and chief executive officer of the Nuclear Energy Institute, and acknowledge his many noteworthy contributions in building a strong future for nuclear energy, America's largest emission-free electric source.

As chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, it has been my distinct pleasure to work closely with Mr. Colvin and his organization. I can personally attest to his leadership in guiding the nuclear energy industry through a period of extraordinary renaissance.

Mr. Colvin has provided more than 40 years of service to our Nation, first as a submarine officer in the U.S. Navy and subsequently in the commercial nuclear energy industry.

When he took the helm at NEI in 1996, conventional thinking was that the industry was stagnant and nuclear power had no future in America's energy mix. He detected that view and tirelessly worked to advance nuclear energy's true capabilities—its proven safety, its contribution to our environment and its affordability.

After more than 20 years of debate, Congress passed legislation in 2002 designating Yucca Mountain as the site of Nation's used fuel repository giving our Nation clear direction for our used fuel management program.

Today, America's nuclear plants are now recognized as the significant assets they are, and the nuclear energy industry is more competitive than ever. In addition, several companies are testing an improved licensing process for new nuclear power plants.

I wish Mr. Colvin, a great University of New Mexico Lobo, all the best in his retirement from the Nuclear Energy Institute. He has earned a well-deserved respite.

PHARMACEUTICAL MARKET ACCESS AND FAIR TRADE ACT OF 2005

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the introduction of an important piece of legislation that will greatly aid Americans, both young and old, with their health care costs. I, along with a bipartisan group of Senators, have introduced the Pharmaceutical Market Access and Fair Trade Act of 2005. This legislation would provide much needed assistance for millions of Americans who are struggling to pay for their prescription drugs.

American consumers are currently charged 55 percent more, on average, for the same brand-name medicines sold in other major developed countries for a fraction of the price. The Pharmaceutical Market Access and Fair Trade Act of 2005 would allow American consumers to benefit from international price competition for prescription medicines through the reimbursement of FDA-approved prescription drugs. This legislation allows U.S.-licensed pharmacies and drug wholesalers to
import medications from Canada, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan and pass along the savings to their American customers. This approach would allow Americans to benefit from lower prices on their prescription drugs while still enabling them to use their local pharmacy. The bill also allows individual consumers to import prescription drugs for their own personal use.

One of the leading arguments against reimportation has been concerns over safety of the prescription drugs that are sold abroad. My colleagues and I have addressed this issue by providing strict safety measures in this legislation which are intended to guarantee that only safe, effective FDA-approved prescription drugs are imported. Such provisions would require pharmacies and drug wholesalers to register with the FDA and be subject to frequent, random inspections. It would allow only the importation of FDA-approved medicines with a “chain of custody” that can be traced all the way back to an FDA-inspected manufacturing plant. It would provide for the use of the anticytalking technology to identify safe, legal imported medicines, as well as give the FDA resources and authority it needs to ensure the safety of imported drugs and to stop those that are unsafe.

It is very important that the bill this Congress takes up and passes will not only become law but also ensure that reimportation is actually allowed to occur. The bills that have been introduced to address this issue have included features to prevent a drug company from blocking importation by making subtle changes to a drug, such as changing the color or the place of manufacture, so that it is no longer FDA approved.

It is about time that the Senate takes up this legislation and passes it. It has broad bipartisan support and has been subjected to intense discussion, review, and debate. We are now faced with health care costs nationwide that are spiraling out of control, and we need to take action to address this issue. Allowing the safe reimportation of prescription drugs is a step in the right direction. The majority of the American people support reimportation, and I hope the leadership of this body will listen to them and finally provide the relief our citizens need.

COMMISSION ON MEDICAID AND THE MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED

Mr. CHAFFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GORDON SMITH and others in the introduction of a bipartisan proposal that calls for the creation of a Commission on Medicaid and the Medically Underserved. This legislation recognizes the importance of assessing what aspects of the Medicaid program are working, which need reform, and how to improve service delivery and quality in the most cost effective manner possible. In this tight and quality in the most cost effective manner possible. In this tight

The Medicaid program. The future of Medicaid cannot be determined by cost alone.

This Medicaid commission would be charged with numerous duties, including reviewing and making recommendations on long-term goals of the program, including the need for financial sustainability, interaction with Medicare and the uninsured, and the quality of care provided. Medicaid is a critically important program that helps millions of care needs of a diverse population. Namely it serves as a source of traditional insurance for poor children and some of their parents, pays for an acute and long term care services for the elderly and disabled, wraps around coverage or assistance for low-income seniors and the disabled on Medicare, and serves as the primary source of funding for safety net providers serving Medicaid patients and the uninsured.

In recognition of the diverse population Medicaid serves, the Medicaid commission would be comprised of 23 members representing all the stakeholders in the Medicaid program. The commission has 1 year to hold public hearings, conduct evaluations and deliberations, and issue its report recommendations to the President, Congress and the public.

Like many of our Nation’s governors, I agree that the Medicaid program needs a careful assessment with an eye toward reform that will make the program financially sustainable. At the same time, I recognize the importance of the structure of program without the deliberation necessary to preserve aspects of the program that are working. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Senator Smith’s legislation to help bring Medicaid into the 21st century with reforms driven by efficacy, and not simply the cost of the program.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WEST KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I pay tribute and congratulate West Kentucky Community and Technical College, WKCTC, as one of the finalists for the prestigious Bellwether Award presented by the Community College Futures Assembly. Their recent recognition has given Kentucky reason to be proud.

As one of eight national finalists, WKCTC is recognized for its Realtime Captioning Technology program. This program, which was originally funded by a $475,000 Congressional award, creates a distance-learning format designed to greater prepare individuals for the workplace, while also providing broadcast captioning for the hearing impaired. With over 28 million deaf and hearing impaired Americans nationwide, I am sure that you will join me in recognizing the importance of providing such a service.

The Bellweather award was established in 1995 as integral part of the Community College Futures Assembly. This assembly primarily focuses on cutting-edge, trend setting programs, which often run the risk of being replaced by larger college legislation.

I hope that you will join me today in both recognizing and congratulating West Kentucky Community Technical College in their recent achievement. They serve as an example to the rest of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I wish them continued success in their program.

TRIBUTE TO ALISON NICHOLS, BRITTANY SALTIEL AND SARA SIEGAL

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I speak today to recognize three gifted students from the State of Illinois: Alison Nichols, Brittany Saltiel, and Sara Siegal, all students at Evanston High School in Lincolnshire, IL.

These three students created a National History Day project on the Mississippi Burning legal case, Alison, Brittany and Sara’s efforts to examine the circumstances of this case have led to not only a reopening of the case but also the overdue indictment of Edgar Ray Killen for the murder of three young civil rights activists: James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner.

As a former civil rights attorney and constitutional law lecturer, I know firsthand the importance of ensuring that justice and the Constitution are always upheld. I am proud to represent Alison, Brittany, and Sara in the Senate as they serve as a reminder of why all of us have committed our lives to public service. These students have demonstrated their tremendous potential in scholarship and leadership in public affairs. They serve as shining examples for our Nation’s young people of how a small group of committed individuals can truly change a community, nation, and the world. Alison, Brittany, and Sara deserve not only our congratulations; they deserve our gratitude for making this country stronger.

GRADING THE STATES ON GUN SAFETY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last month the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, in partnership with the Million Mom March and a number of State gun safety groups, released its 8th Annual Report Card on State Gun Laws Protecting Children. I applaud the efforts of these organizations to keep the pressure on State and local legislators to enact strong gun safety legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to review this report.

The Brady Campaign report assigns individual States a grade of A through F on seven types of laws that protect children from gun violence. “Extra credit” and “demerits” were also assigned for other State gun safety laws.
The Brady Campaign includes in its analysis such questions as: Is it illegal for a child to possess a gun without supervision? Is it illegal to sell a gun to a child? Are gun owners held responsible for leaving loaded guns easily accessible to children? Are guns required to have child-safety locks, loaded-chamber indicators and other childproof designs? Do cities and counties have authority to enact local gun safety laws? Are background checks required at gun shows? And, is it legal to carry concealed handguns in public?

Children around the country continue to be at great risk from gun violence. This year, the Brady Campaign awarded only six States an A rating in their report. Unfortunately, 31 States received grades of D or F. Only one State improved its grade from last year, while two others took actions that will make communities less safe from the threat of gun violence. However, I was encouraged that the number of “extra credit Sensible Safety Stars” for protecting children from gun violence more than doubled to 21, and that the number of “Time-Out Chair demerits” assigned for weakening State gun laws was cut from ten to six.

While some States have taken positive steps on the issue of gun safety in the last year, more than half are still receiving failing grades from the Brady Campaign. By passing legislation that reduces child firearm deaths, Congress can help to improve the grades of these States and give our children the tools to take up and pass common sense gun safety legislation that will close the gun show loophole, reauthorize the 1994 assault weapons ban, and improve child gun access prevention laws.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

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-664. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of State, Department of State, transmitting a report regarding management and security accomplishments of the U.S. Mission in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-665. A communication from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, Agency for International Development, transmitting pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator, Bureau Management, received on February 7, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-666. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the United States’ Competitive Sourcing Activities for Fiscal Year 2004, received January 25, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-667. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Embraer Model TKAZ-260 and 914F Series Reciprocating Engines” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-668. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier, pursuant to law, the 330F, 332, and 300F Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-669. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767-300 Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-670. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 757-200, 757-300, and 757-300ER Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-671. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Gulfstream International Inc. GTX 31, GTX 31D, GTX 330, and GTX 330D Mode S Transponders” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-672. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Garrett International Inc. GTX 31, GTX 31D, GTX 330, and GTX 330D Mode S Transponders” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-673. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: The Net, Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA 23 250, PA 23 250, and PA 23 250 Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-674. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Extra-Flugzeugbau GmbH Model EA 300 and EA 300/" (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-675. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD 10 10F, MD 20 10F, and MD 30 10F Aircraft” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-676. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767-200, 300, and 300F Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-677. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 222, 222B, 222U, 230, and 430 Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-678. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model C1 215 B11 and CL 215 B11 Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-679. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 222, 222B, 222U, 230, and 430 Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-681. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Pratt and Whitney JT8D-11 and JT8D-11A engines; Correction” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-682. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Pratt and Whitney JT8D-11 and JT8D-11A engines; Correction” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-684. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD 10 10F, MD 20 10F, and MD 30 10F Aircraft” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-685. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model C1 215 B11 and CL 215 B11 Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A320 Series Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-688. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767-300 and 767-300F Series Airplanes Equipped with GE or Pratt and Whitney Engines” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-689. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech 200 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-690. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 757-200 and 200 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-691. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Lockheed-Martin A-10 and F-16 Aircraft” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-692. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747-100, 100B, 100B SUD, 200B, 200F, and 300 Series Airplanes; and Model 747SP and 747SR Series Airplanes; Equipped with Pratt and Whitney JT9D-3 and -7 Series Engines or GE CFS-50 Series Engines with Modified LEAP Engine Strut” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-693. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A319 and A320 200 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-694. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Pratt and Whitney JT9D 200 series Turbofan Engines” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-695. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Correction: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica SA Model EMB 135 and 145 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-696. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Correction: Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-697. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 757-200, 200PF, 200CB, and 300 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-698. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Correction: Rolls Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 887, 887B, 890, 890E, 894 and 894E Engines” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-699. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Correction: Boeing Model 757-200, 200PF, 200CB, and 300 Series Airplanes” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-700. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Correction: Rolls Royce Deutschland TAY 611-8, TAY 611-10, TAY 651-15, and TAY 651-54 Series Turbofan Engines” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-701. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace; Correction, Sedalia, MO” (RN1219-AA64) received on February 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENZI, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 256. A bill to extend Federal funding for operation of State high risk health insurance pools.

S. 306. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

* A. Wilson Greene, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 31, 2012.
* Katina P. Strauch, of South Carolina, to be an Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BURDING, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 341. A bill to provide for the redesign of the reverse of the Lincoln 1-cent coin in 2009 in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. SNOWE, Mrs. FRENSTEN, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LUTZENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. COREZINE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. DAYTON):

S. 342. A bill to provide for a program of scientific research on abrupt climate change, to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven system of greenhouse gas tradeable allowances, to limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States and reduce dependence upon foreign oil, and ensure benefits to consumers from the implementation of such allowances; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 343. A bill to provide for qualified withdrawals from the Capital Construction Fund for fishermen leaving the industry and for
the rollover of Capital Construction Funds to individual retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBEN:
S. 345. A bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to establish vessel ballast water management requirements for certain vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):
S. 361. A bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to establish vessel ballast water management requirements for certain vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. Res. 47. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding trafficking in persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. Res. 48. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding trafficking in persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 3
At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3, a bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes.

S. 8
At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 8, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 17
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to extend the special post- age stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.

S. 29
At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 29, a bill to establish a coordinated national ocean exploration program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

S. 119
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to provide for the protection of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes.

S. 183
At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JACOBSEN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. JOHNSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKARA), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. SYEPRTEST) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to amend title IX of the Education Act of 1972 to provide families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medical program for such children, and for other purposes.

S. 239
At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to reduce the costs of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes.

S. 315
At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to stop taxpayer funded Government propaganda.

S. 359
At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

S. 360
At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study of the economic effects of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System on the Alaskan economy.

S. 365
At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 365, a bill to provide health care benefits for retired military personnel and their families.

S. 366
At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CANTWELL and Mr. REID:

S. 337. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for special payment eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service, to expand certain authorities to provide health care benefits for Reserves and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have long recognized that our country has an obligation to take care of the brave men and women who wear the uniform of the United States—and their families.

Sixty years ago we passed the GI Bill of Rights for the 16 million veterans who served in World War II. By providing new opportunities in housing and education, we helped them return to civilian life.

Our military forces have changed dramatically since then—but the benefits we offer to military families have kept pace with them.

Today our military relies on volunteers, and our security depends on recruiting and retaining good troops—including members of the National Guard and Reserves.

The Guard and Reserves serve at the command of state governors, but members are also available to be called to active duty by the President. And over the last 10 years, the role of the National Guard and Reserves in our military has steadily increased.

Today, reports indicate that almost half of the forces deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom come from the National Guard and the Reserves.

These Guardmen and Reservists are not only providing much-needed boots on the ground. They bring specific skills that our regular active military cannot duplicate.

For example, in my home state of Nevada, half of the pilots in the Nevada Air National Guard are civilian pilots. A majority of the Nevada National Guard military police, who are in the 22nd MP Company that just returned from Iraq, work as law enforcement officers in Las Vegas.

And the Nevada Army Guard’s 126th Medical Company an air ambulance
unit, which flew more than 174 traumatic medical evacuations in Afghanistan, is made up entirely of men and women who work as civilian paramedics.

So the National Guard and Reserve are strengthened by the fact that members hold civilian jobs as pilots, police officers, construction workers, and engineers.

The Guard and Reserves also provide the primary service—or the only service—in several crucial areas of national security, including: port security; airport security; civil support teams; and reconnaissance and Drug Air Interdiction.

Since we rely more than ever on members of our National Guard and Reserves, we need to modernize the benefits that are available to them—especially in the areas of retirement and health care.

Let’s start with health care. It’s true that service in the Guard and Reserve is a part time obligation—but it is unlike any other part-time job that a person might hold.

When the Guard and Reserves call, members must put their duty above their regular jobs and even their families. That means taking time off from their regular jobs...and foregoing many family activities because they are busy fulfilling their Guard or reserve duties.

And it means being ready for deployment at any time.

In short, we expect members to make the Guard and Reserves a top priority in their lives.

In return for that commitment...for the sacrifices they make at their regular jobs...we owe them the peace of mind of knowing that their families will receive quality medical care.

We need to offer medical care that leverages the existing military health care system. That is why TRICARE should be an option for all members of the National Guard and Reserves.

The lack of health care benefits for Guard and Reserve members is a serious problem. Currently, about 40 percent of the enlisted members don’t have any health care coverage.

This affects troop readiness. In recent mobilizations, 10 to 15 percent of the Guard and Reserve members could not be deployed due to health-related issues.

It also affects the state of mind of those who are training for dangerous deployments. A Reservist in training on the weekend shouldn’t be worried about whether his or her sick child will be able to see a doctor.

Providing better health care benefits to members of the Guard and Reserve is not only the right thing to do—it’s a matter of national security.

We just also upgrade the retirement benefits available to those who choose to serve for long periods of time.

A person who serves in the Guard or Reserve for 20 years is subject to being called up to active duty numerous times, disrupting his or her civilian career and retirement planning.

We must take this into account, and improve the retirement benefits for Guard and Reserve members.

The current reserve retirement system is 50 years old, and it doesn’t reflect the extent to which our nation now depends on the National Guard and Reserves.

This outdated system doesn’t allow members to receive retired pay or retire health benefits until they are 60 years old. We must update the system so those who serve can receive benefits at age 55, if they meet all the other requirements.

This change would recognize the importance of the Guard and Reserves in today’s military...and it would recognize the sacrifices that members make in their civilian careers in order to serve their country.

Once again, this is not only the right thing to do...it will make our country stronger and safer by encouraging and rewarding service in the National Guard and Reserves.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 341. A bill to provide for the redesign of the reverse of the Lincoln cent coin in 2009 in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to honor Abraham Lincoln in 2009, the bicentennial of his birth, by issuing a series of 1-cent coins with designs on the reverse that are emblematic of the 4 major periods of his life, in Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Washington, D.C. The bill would also provide for a longer-term redesign of the reverse of 1-cent coins so that after 2009 they will bear an image emblematic of Lincoln’s preservation of the United States as a single and united nation.

Abraham Lincoln was one of our greatest leaders, demonstrating true courage during the Civil War, one of the greatest crises in the Nation’s history.

Born of humble roots in Hardin County, Kentucky, on February 12, 1809, Abraham Lincoln rose to the Presidency through a combination of honesty, integrity, intelligence, and commitment to the United States.

(3) With the belief that all men are equal, Abraham Lincoln led the effort to free all slaves in the United States.

(4) Abraham Lincoln had a generous heart, with malice toward none and with charity for all.

(5) Abraham Lincoln gave the ultimate sacrifice for the country he loved, dying from an assassin’s bullet on April 15, 1865.

(6) All Americans could benefit from studying the life of Abraham Lincoln, for Lincoln’s life is a model for accomplishing the “American dream” through honesty, integrity, loyalty, and a lifetime of education.

(7) The year 2009 will be the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

(8) Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, grew to adulthood in Indiana, achieved fame in Illinois, and led the nation in Washington, D.C.

(9) The so-called “Lincoln cent” was introduced in 1909 on the 100th anniversary of Lincoln’s birth, making the obverse design the most enduring on the nation’s coinage.

(10) President Theodore Roosevelt was so impressed by Brenner’s talent that he was chosen to design the likeness of Lincoln for the coin, adapting a design from a plaque Brenner had prepared earlier. In the nearly 100 years of production of the “Lincoln cent,” there have been only two designs on the reverse: the original, featuring two wheat-heads, and the current representation of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC.

On the occasion of the bicentennial of Lincoln’s birth and the 100th anniversary of the production of the Lincoln cent, we should recognize his great achievement in ensuring that the United States remained one Nation, united and inseparable.

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

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

S. 341

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 “Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial 1-Cent Coin Redesign Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President, was one of the Nation’s greatest leaders, demonstrating true courage during the Civil War, one of the greatest crises in the Nation’s history.

(2) Born of humble roots in Hardin County, Kentucky, on February 12, 1809, Abraham Lincoln rose to the Presidency through a combination of honesty, integrity, intelligence, and commitment to the United States.

(3) With the belief that all men are created equal, Abraham Lincoln led the effort to free all slaves in the United States.

(4) Abraham Lincoln had a generous heart, with malice toward none and with charity for all.

(5) Abraham Lincoln gave the ultimate sacrifice for the country he loved, dying from an assassin’s bullet on April 15, 1865.

(6) All Americans could benefit from studying the life of Abraham Lincoln, for Lincoln’s life is a model for accomplishing the “American dream” through honesty, integrity, loyalty, and a lifetime of education.

(7) The year 2009 will be the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

(8) Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, grew to adulthood in Indiana, achieved fame in Illinois, and led the nation in Washington, D.C.

(9) The so-called “Lincoln cent” was introduced in 1909 on the 100th anniversary of Lincoln’s birth, making the obverse design the most enduring on the nation’s coinage.

(10) President Theodore Roosevelt was so impressed by the talent of Victor David
Brenner that the sculptor was chosen to design the likeness of President Lincoln for the coin, adapting a design from a plaque Brenner had prepared earlier.

(11) The nearly 100 years of production of the "Lincoln cent", there have been only 2 designs on the reverse: the original, featuring 2 wheat-heads in memorial style enclowning the current obverse representation of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C.

(12) On the occasion of the bicentennial of President Lincoln’s birth and the 100th anniversary of the production of the Lincoln cent, it is entirely fitting to issue a series of 1-cent coins with designs on the reverse that are emblematic of the 4 major periods of President Lincoln’s life.

SEC. 3. REDESIGN OF LINCOLN CENT FOR 2009.
(a) IN GENERAL.—During the year 2009, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue 1-cent coins in accordance with the following design specifications:
(1) OBVERSE.—The obverse of the 1-cent coin shall continue to bear the Victor David Brenner likeness of President Abraham Lin- coln.
(2) REVERSE.—The reverse of the coins shall bear 4 different designs each representing a different aspect of the life of Abraham Lincoln, such as—
(A) his birth and early childhood in Ken- tuckye;
(B) his formative years in Indiana;
(C) his professional life in Illinois; and
(D) his presidency, in Washington, D.C.
(b) ISSUANCE OF REDESIGNED LINCOLN CENTs IN 2009.—
(1) ORDER.—The 1-cent coins to which this section applies shall be issued with 1 of the 4 designs referred to in subsection (a)(2) beginning at the start of each calendar quarter of 2009.
(2) NUMBER.—The Secretary shall pres- cribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of 1-cent coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each calendar quarter of 2009.
(c) DESIGN SELECTION.—-The designs for the coins specified in this section shall be chosen by the Secretary—
(1) after consultation with the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts; and
(2) after consultation with the Citizens Coinage Ad- visory Committee.


The design on the reverse of the 1-cent coins issued after December 31, 2009, shall bear an image emblematic of President Lin- coln’s preservation of the United States of America as a single and united country.

SEC. 5. NUMISMATIC PENNIES WITH THE SAME METALLIC CONTENT AS THE 1909 PENNY

The Secretary of the Treasury shall issue 1-cent coins in 2009 with the exact metallic content as the 1-cent coin contained in 1909 in such a manner that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for numismatic purposes.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the original Victor David Brenner design for the 1-cent coin was a dramatic departure from previous American coinage that should be re- produced, using the original form and relief of the likeness of Abraham Lincoln, on the 1- cent coins issued in 2009.

By Mr. McCain (for himself, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Snowe, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Lautenberg, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Nelson of Flor- ida, Mr. Corzine, Ms. Cant- well, Mr. Kerry, and Mr. Day- ton):
S. 342. A bill to provide for a program of scientific research on abrupt climate change, to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven allowance system of tradable allowances, to limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States and re- duce dependence upon foreign oil, and ensure benefits to consumers from the trading in such allowances; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. McCaskill. Mr. President, I am pleased today to be joined with Senator Lieberman in introducing the Climate Stewardship Act of 2005. This bill is nearly identical to a proposal we offered during the 108th Congress. It is designed to begin a meaningful and shared effort among the emission-producing sectors of our country to ad- dress the world's greatest environ- mental challenge—climate change. The National Academy of Sciences reported:

Greenhouse gases are accumulating in the Earth’s atmosphere as a result of human ac- tivities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise. Temperatures are, in fact, rising. The changes observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activi- ties.

Again, "temperatures are, in fact, rising." Those are the words of the Na- tional Academy of Sciences, a body created by the Congress in 1863 to pro- vide advice to the Federal Government on scientific and technical matters. Those comments were written after much thoughtful deliberation and should not be taken lightly. The Acad- emy has a 140-year history and a strong reputation of service to the people of this great country.

In October, in response to the alarming changes in the climate that are being reported worldwide, we were joined by a number of other Senators in the first offering of our proposal for addressing climate change for Senate consideration. We had a hard-fought debate and found ourselves eight votes short of achieving a majority in pas- sage. Today, we resume what we finally can consider a worthy and necessary cause.

I state at the outset that this issue is not going away. This issue is one of transcendent importance outside the boundaries of the United States of America. If you travel to Europe today and visit with our European friends, you will find that climate change/ Kyoto treaty are major sources of dis- satisfaction on that side of the Atlant- ic with the United States of America and its policies. But far more impor- tant than that, the overwhelming body of scientific evidence shows that cli- mate change is real, that it is hap- pening as we speak. The Arctic and Antarctic are the "miner's canary" of climate change, and profound and ter- rible things are happening at the poles, not to mention other parts of the world.

Democrats usually respond to cri- ses when they are faced with them and, at least in the case of this Nation, we address problems and crises that con- front us and we move on. We are not very good at long-term planning and long-term addressing of issues that face us in the future. The divisions con- cerning the issue of Social Security are clearly an example of what I just said.

If we do not move on this issue, our children and grandchildren are going to pay an incredibly heavy price because this crisis is upon us, only we do not see its visible aspects in all of its enor- mity.

Prime Minister Tony Blair, assuming the stewardship of the G-8, has made it his highest priority. He has very aptly pointed out: Suppose that all of the sci- entific opinion is wrong; suppose that the ice that is breaking up in the Ant- arctic in huge chunks is just something which is temporary; suppose that the glaciers receding in the Arctic at a higher rate than at any time in history is something that is a one-time deal; suppose that the increased Tem- peratures are, in fact, rising. The changes observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activi- ties.

Again, "temperatures are, in fact, rising." Those are the words of the Na- tional Academy of Sciences, a body created by the Congress in 1863 to pro- vide advice to the Federal Government on scientific and technical matters. Those comments were written after much thoughtful deliberation and should not be taken lightly. The Acad- emy has a 140-year history and a strong reputation of service to the people of this great country.

In October, in response to the alarming changes in the climate that are being reported worldwide, we were joined by a number of other Senators in the first offering of our proposal for addressing climate change for Senate consideration. We had a hard-fought debate and found ourselves eight votes short of achieving a majority in pas- sage. Today, we resume what we finally can consider a worthy and necessary cause.

I state at the outset that this issue is not going away. This issue is one of transcendent importance outside the boundaries of the United States of America. If you travel to Europe today and visit with our European friends, you will find that climate change/ Kyoto treaty are major sources of dis- satisfaction on that side of the Atlant- ic with the United States of America and its policies. But far more impor- tant than that, the overwhelming body of scientific evidence shows that cli- mate change is real, that it is hap- pening as we speak. The Arctic and Antarctic are the "miner's canary" of climate change, and profound and ter- rible things are happening at the poles, not to mention other parts of the world.

Democrats usually respond to cri- ses when they are faced with them and, at least in the case of this Nation, we address problems and crises that con- front us and we move on. We are not very good at long-term planning and long-term addressing of issues that face us in the future. The divisions con- cerning the issue of Social Security are clearly an example of what I just said.

If we do not move on this issue, our children and grandchildren are going to pay an incredibly heavy price because this crisis is upon us, only we do not see its visible aspects in all of its enor- mity.

Prime Minister Tony Blair, assuming the stewardship of the G-8, has made it his highest priority. He has very aptly pointed out: Suppose that all of the sci- entific opinion is wrong; suppose that the ice that is breaking up in the Ant- arctic in huge chunks is just something which is temporary; suppose that the glaciers receding in the Arctic at a higher rate than at any time in history is something that is a one-time deal; suppose that the increased Tem- peratures are, in fact, rising. The changes observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activi- ties.

Again, "temperatures are, in fact, rising." Those are the words of the Na- tional Academy of Sciences, a body created by the Congress in 1863 to pro- vide advice to the Federal Government on scientific and technical matters. Those comments were written after much thoughtful deliberation and should not be taken lightly. The Acad- emy has a 140-year history and a strong reputation of service to the people of this great country.

In October, in response to the alarming changes in the climate that are being reported worldwide, we were joined by a number of other Senators in the first offering of our proposal for addressing climate change for Senate consideration. We had a hard-fought debate and found ourselves eight votes short of achieving a majority in pas- sage. Today, we resume what we finally can consider a worthy and necessary cause.

I state at the outset that this issue is not going away. This issue is one of transcendent importance outside the boundaries of the United States of America. If you travel to Europe today and visit with our European friends, you will find that climate change/ Kyoto treaty are major sources of dis- satisfaction on that side of the Atlant- ic with the United States of America and its policies. But far more impor- tant than that, the overwhelming body of scientific evidence shows that cli- mate change is real, that it is hap- pening as we speak. The Arctic and Antarctic are the "miner's canary" of climate change, and profound and ter- rible things are happening at the poles,
has been shrinking; that greenhouse gas concentration continues to rise; and even larger changes in climate are projected for the next 100 years; suppose they are right.

The observed warming is already having impacts on Arctic people and ecosystems. Much larger projected changes will result in even greater impacts on the people in the Arctic and beyond. Increasing coastal erosion threatens many Alaskan villages and is also affecting the oil industry. The number of days in which oil exploration and extraction activities on the tundra are allowed under Alaska Department of Natural Resources standards has been halved over the past 30 years.

The projected changes in Arctic climate will also have global implications. Amplified global warming, rising sea levels, and potential alterations in ocean circulation patterns that can have large-scale climatic effects are among the global concerns. Melting Arctic snow and ice cause additional absorption of solar energy by the dark land surface, amplifying the warming trend at the global scale.

Recent Australians have predicted that the Great Barrier Reef will be dead by 2050. What is the impact of coral reefs around the world being bleached and dying on the food chain? Dr. Lara Hansen, president of Polar Oceans Research Group, testified that mountain ranges flanking the southeastern boundary of the glacier, not visible 30 years ago, are emerging into full view. The amount of ice-free land along the entire southwest coast of Anver Island has been redefined by glacier retreat. Populations of the ice-avoiding Chinspawn and Gentoo penguins have increased by 55 to 90 percent.

The coral reefs are the most biologically diverse ecosystem of the ocean, as we all know. Almost 1,000 coral species currently exist. With the majority of human populations living in coastal regions, many people depend on living coral reef for food and protection from coastal surces.

Dr. Lara Hansen stated:

While the Great Barrier Reef is widely considered to be one of the best managed reef systems in the world, local conservation actions will not be sufficient to protect coral reefs from the effects of climate change. To date, studies indicate that the best chance for successful conservation in the face of climate change is to limit the temperature increase. . .

ADM James Watkins, who was chairman of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, testified that climate change impacts every topic in the report from the health and safety of humans, the health of environment and fisheries to the distribution of marine organisms, including pathogens. Admiral Watkins, former Chief of Naval Operations and former Secretary of Energy, not a renowned climatologist, warned that climate change is a serious problem, and it could affect all of the recommendations from the report.

There will be people who will come to this floor and say that climate change is a myth; it is not serious. They will find a scientist, they will find some study group, some of them funded by people with special interests here, but I hope that Prime Minister Blair, who has made climate change one of the two issues he hopes to address during his presidency of the G-8, this issue I believe is very well understood by a majority of the country.

I have a couple of pictures I will show. I see my colleague from Connecticut is in the Chamber.

Recently, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, the chairman of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, stated that he personally believes that the world has “already reached the level of dangerous concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.” He went on to say that climate change is for real. We have just a small window of opportunity, and it is closing rapidly. There is not a moment to lose.

The International Climate Change Task Force, chaired by Senator Snowe and the Right Honorable Stephen Byers, Member of Parliament of the United Kingdom, stated in 1 of its 10 recommendations concerning climate change that “all developed countries introduce mandatory cap-and-trade systems for carbon emissions and construct them to allow for future integration into a single global market.” That is already being done in Europe as we speak, which is the substance of Senator LIEBERMAN's and my legislation.

States are acting. Nine States in the East have signed on as full participants in this initiative to elevate climate mitigation strategies from voluntary initiatives to a regulatory program. The State of California has approved a new State regulation aimed at decreasing carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles. The States are way ahead of us. I believe one of the reasons for that is because special interests are less active in the States.

This is a chart that shows that the CO2 data has gone up from, as we can see, 1860 to 2001.

This is a picture of the Arctic sea ice loss. The red outline is 1979. This was the Arctic sea ice, which is outlined in red. We can see the size of the Arctic sea ice today. I made a visit with some of my colleagues to the Arctic. We took a ship and stopped at where that glacier was 5 years ago, traveling a number of miles and saw where that glacier is today.

I want to emphasize again, the Arctic and the Antarctic are the miner's canary of global warming because of the thinness of the atmosphere there. This chart is showing level changes in areas of Florida that would be inundated with a sea level rise. I usually have—it is probably not here—I usually have a picture of Mount Kilimanjaro, which is known to many of us.

This is a chart of coral bleaching which is taking place as we speak.

If I can add a little parochialism, if I can show a picture of Lake Powell in Arizona, it has been drying up since 1999, draining Lake Powell to well below its high watermark. It is at an all-time low in its seventh year. The lake has shrunk to 10 percent of its capacity.

The signs of climate change are all around us. We need to act. We need to develop technologies and make it economically attractive for industry to find it in their interest to develop technology which will reduce and bring into check the greenhouse gas emissions in the world.

We need to do a lot of things, but a cap and trade, which would put an end to the increase of greenhouse gases and a gradual reduction, is an integral part.

Finally, I would like to return to my other argument in closing.

Suppose the Senator from Connecticut and I are deluded, that all of this scientific evidence, all these opinions, people such as Admiral Watkins and others in the National Academy of Sciences, the literally hundreds of people in the scientific community with whom Senator LIEBERMAN and I have met and talked are wrong.

Here is the picture of Kilimanjaro in 1912, 1970, and 2000. Suppose we are deluded, that we are tree-hugging environmentalists who have taken leave of our senses and are sounding a false alarm to the world, and we go ahead and put in a cap and trade, we encourage technologies to be developed and funded, some by the Federal Government in the form of pure research, and we do put a cap on the greenhouse gases, we negotiate an alternate Kyoto Treaty with our friends throughout the world—140 nations are signatories to the Kyoto Treaty—and we are doing all that the U.S. and China have to be included and other provisions which we have every right to demand, and we start moving forward on this issue and we are wrong, that the year after next, everything is fine in the world? Then we will have made probably a significant contribution to the betterment of the world and the Earth by reducing greenhouse gases, by developing cleaner technologies, by doing good things, and then Senator LIEBERMAN and I will come to the floor and apologize for sounding this alarm.

But suppose, Mr. President, that we are right. Suppose the National Academy of Sciences is right. Suppose the eight-nation research council that is deeply alarmed at these effects in both the Arctic and Antarctic is wrong; suppose Admiral Watkins is wrong; suppose the Australian Government is wrong when it says the Great Barrier Reef is going to be dead by 2050, and we have done nothing? We have done nothing. We need additional data and make reports. That is what the U.S. national policy is today: gather information and make reports. I
would argue that is a pretty heavy burden to lay on future generations of Americans. I welcome the participation, friendship, and commitment of my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an article entitled “Arid Arizona Points to Global Warming as Culprit,” and a response to Senator INHOFE’s floor statement on January 4, 2005.

The statement of the majority leader, Mr. Finkenauer was as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 2005]

Arid Arizona Points to Global Warming as Culprit

(Blind Reading)

Reese Woodling remembers the mornings when he would walk the grounds of his ranch and come back with his clothes soaked with dew, moisture that fostered enough grass to feed 500 cattle and their calves.

But by 1993, he says, the dew was disappearing—around Cascabel—his 2,700-acre ranch borders New Mexico and Arizona—and shrubs were taking over the grassland. Five years later Woodling had sold off half his cows, and by 2004 he had sold the ranch.

Reese Woodling, in white, used to own a 2,700-acre ranch, but lack of rain reduced the grassland—his main source of cattle feed.

When the rain stopped coming in the 1990s, he and other ranchers began to suspect there was a larger weather pattern afoot. “People started talking about how we’ve got some major problems out here,” he said in an interview. “Do I believe in global warming? Absolutely.”

Dramatic weather changes in the West—whether it is Arizona’s decade-long drought or this winter’s torrential rains in Southern California—have pushed some former skeptics to reevaluate their views on climate change. A number of scientists, and some Westerners, have concluded that global warming is the best explanation for the higher temperatures, rapid precipitation shifts, and accelerated blooming and breeding patterns—changes that are long past the Southwest, one of the nation’s most vulnerable ecosystems.

In the face of shrinking water reservoirs, massive forest fires and temperature-related disease outbreaks, several said they now believe that warming is transforming their daily lives. Although it has rained some during the past few months, the state is still struggling with a persistent drought that has cut its economy, costing cattle-related businesses $3.6 billion in 2002.

“Every drought from Missouri: When you see it, they believe it,” said Gregg Garfin, who has assessed the Southwest’s climate for the federal government since 1996. “When we used to talk about climate, eyes would glaze over. . . . Then the drought came. The phone started ringing off the hook.”

Jonathan Overpeck, who directs the university- and government-funded Institute for the Study of Planet Earth at the University of Arizona, said current drought and weather disruptions signal what is to come over the next century. Twenty-five years ago, he said, scientists produced computer models of the drought that Arizona is now experiencing.

“If you want to get warmer, we’re going to have more people, and we’re going to have more droughts more frequently and in harsher terms,” Overpeck said. “We should be at the forefront of demanding action on global warming because we’re at the forefront of the impacts of global warming. . . . In the West we’re seeing it now.”

There are dissenters who say it is impossible to attribute the recent drought and higher temperatures to global warming. Sherwood Idso, president of the Tempe, Ariz.-based Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, said he does not believe the state’s drought has “anything to do with global warming.”

But the region experienced more-severe droughts between 1800 and 1800. Idso, who also said he did not believe there is a link between human-generated carbon dioxide emissions and climate change, declined to say who funds his center.

The stakes are enormous for Arizona, which is growing six times faster than the national average and must meet mounting demands for water and space with scarce resources. Gov. Janet Napolitano (D) is urging Arizonans to embrace “a culture of conservation” with water, but some conservationists and scientists wonder whether that will be enough.

Dale Turner of the Nature Conservancy tracks changes in the state’s mountain top “sky islands”—a region east and south of Phoenix that houses plants and animals. Human activities over the past century have degraded local habitats, Turner said, and now climate change threatens to push these species over the edge.

The Mount Graham red squirrel, on the federal endangered species list since 1987, has been at the center of a long-running fight between environmentalists and politicians who co-wrote the study in Science, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who co-wrote the study in Science concluded that higher temperatures could cause serious long-term drought over western North America.

C. Mark Eakin, a paleoclimatologist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who co-wrote the study in Science, said historical climate records suggest the current drought could just be the beginning. “When you’ve got an increased trend toward drought in a region that’s already stressed, then you’re just looking for trouble,” Eakin said. “Weather is like rolling the dice, and climate change is like loading the dice.”

Still, Arizona politicians remain divided on how to address global warming. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) has led the national fight to block mandatory carbon dioxide emissions that are linked to warming, though his bill remains stalled.

“We’ll win on this issue because the evidence continues to accumulate,” McCain said in an interview. “The question is how much damage will be done until we do prevail.”

But other Arizona Republicans are resistant. State Sen. Robert Blendu, who opposed a bill last year to establish a climate change study committee, said he wants to make sure politicians “avoid the public knee-jerk reaction before we get sound science.”

That mindset frustrates ranchers such as Woodling, who is raising 10,000 feed-cows on a leased pasture. At age 69, he will never be able to rebuild his herd, he said, but he believes politicians have an obligation to help reverse the environment.

“Man has been a great cause of this, and man needs to address it,” he said.

U.S. Delegation at COP10: Jeff Fiedler, Natural Resources Defense Council; Scientific Consensus; Brenda Eckwurzel, Julie Anderson Union of Concerned Scientists; and Costa: Amie Miller, Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative.

For more information or with any questions, contact: Lee Hayes Byron, U.S. Climatic Change Initiative. lhbyron@climatenetwork.org, 202-513-6230.
withdrawn from the Kyoto Protocol, and having proclaimed domestic action to reduce GHG emissions, despite the fact that U.S. Senators already desiring emissions reductions. That statement, however, is illustrative of his and the Bush administration’s true goals: to prevent the rest of the world from making progress in reducing GHG emissions. What Senator Inhofe failed to mention in his diatribe was that the Bush administration in Buenos Aires not only demurred from participating in discussions, but also actively worked to prevent the rest of the world’s countries from beginning those discussions even in the absence of U.S. participation. Without objection from the United States, the October 2002 discussions could have begun, and would have allowed some ideas and suggestions for the post-2012 period to be presented to the next meeting of the UNFCCC in November, 2005. But Under Secretary Dobriansky and the Bush administration objected and threw up every possible obstacle to allowing other countries to have those discussions, with or without the U.S. The result is that one multiple-day meeting, with a narrowly defined agenda to discuss post-2012 strategies was agreed upon. The meeting was cut short due to a lack of discussions, and the ability of the meeting’s participants to report to the UNFCCC in November 2005 was a matter of disagreement even at this late date. It is highly likely that the meeting itself will be contentious, for these reasons. But the real question is why the U.S. insists on blocking the rest of the world from moving on, even if it chooses not to? Senator Inhofe would better serve his constituents and his colleagues to accurately and completely report the Administration’s actions at the meeting.

Similarly, the Senator reported that there was discussion but no resolution at the meeting on addressing emissions from developing countries. He claimed that developing countries, “most notably China, remained adamant in Buenos Aires in opposing any mandatory greenhouse gas reductions, now or in the future.” Again, his material omission is significant. The United States remained adamant in Buenos Aires in opposing any mandatory greenhouse gas reductions, now or in the future. And the United States urged China and India to do the same. The Bush administration’s duplicity—claiming the Kyoto Protocol to be a failure while, at the same time, refusing to participate in discussions and the ability of the meeting’s participants to report to the UNFCCC in November 2005 was a matter of disagreement even at this late date. It is highly likely that the meeting itself will be contentious, for these reasons. But the real question is why the U.S. insists on blocking the rest of the world from moving on, even if it chooses not to? Senator Inhofe would better serve his constituents and his colleagues to accurately and completely report the Administration’s actions at the meeting.

In criticizing the “hockey stick” temperature record, Senator Inhofe charges that the Mann analysis has been criticized in the pages of Geophysical Research Letters (GRL), a respected, peer-reviewed journal, as “just bad science.” This quote does actually appear in GRL in a commentary by Chapman et al. (2004), but Inhofe’s citation is quite misleading. The criticism leveled by Chapman et al. did not apply to the “hockey stick”—that is, the 1000-year temperature reconstruction by Mann and others. Rather, the Chapman et al. criticism was leveled at a totally different, much more narrow and technical modeling study by Mann and others in 2003 about borehole reconstructions.

In contrast to Senator Inhofe’s contention that “most EU member states will not meet their Kyoto targets and have no real intentions of reducing GHG emissions,” a recent analysis by the European Environment Agency (EEA) concluded that the EU is in fact on track to meet its Kyoto targets. This analysis examined existing policies and plans, as well as the use of the Kyoto emissions trading measures.
(1) Temperature trends and sea ice trends shown in the Arctic report are century long trends, from 1900-2000. Therefore, Senator Inhofe’s attack on the scientific integrity of the Arctic impact assessment is inappropriate.

(2) Arctic researchers concluded that the recent warming, in contrast to the earlier warming in the 1930s and 1940s as they are now, is overwhelmingly due to human activities involved in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. The conclusion that the Arctic is now experiencing a stronger, longer, and more widespread warming trend, linked with the resulting temperature, sea ice retreat, glacial melting, and increasing permafrost temperatures. For example, the century-long sea ice record clearly shows a strong retreat in sea ice extent in recent decades, whereas no such trend is evident during the earlier warm period.

Scientists have employed observations and models to analyze these two pronounced twentieth-century warming events, both amplified by human activities. Scientists have found that the earlier warming was due to natural internal climate-system variability and was not as widespread as today’s, whereas the recent warming is linked to human activities.

Furthermore, earlier periods of warming either this century or in past centuries do not preclude a human influence on the current warming trend. Just as a way of analogy, because wildfires are often caused by lightning does not mean that they cannot also be caused by a careless camper. The same can be said for natural variability in sea level rise as often claimed by IPCC and related groups. Yet we still hear of a future world overwhelmed by floods due to global warming. The same is true of the false popularization with science. As Sweden’s Mörner puts it, “there is no fear of massive future flooding as claimed in most global warming scenarios.”

(1) Research and observation has solidly established that sea level is rising. Our longest historical records come from tide gauge measurements kept along the world’s coastlines. These measurements indicate that the globally averaged coastal sea level rose at the rate of 3.5 inches per century from 1860 to 1990. Since 1993, satellites have continuously measured sea level over the entire ocean, not just along the shoreline as do tide gauges. Satellite measurements can monitor global sea level with a greater accuracy, and they record a higher global sea-level rise rate of about 1 inch per decade.

Given the short record of these satellite measurements, scientists cannot yet conclude if the last decade was unusually high or if it represents an acceleration of sea level rise.

(2) Sea level rise is primarily the result of expansion of seawater as it warms plus meltwater from land-based ice sheets and land-based mountain glaciers. Many factors contribute to sea level rise, and scientific efforts continue to refine our understanding of the relative contribution of each to the observed sea-level rise. As the climate warms, we expect to see two different effects in the ocean. First, sea level rises as the ocean temperature increases. Just as a gas expands as it is heated, sea water also expands as its temperature rises. Second, the amount of water entering the ocean increases as land-based ice sheets and glaciers melt, and the melting of higher latitude freshwater into the ocean and increases sea level, just like adding water to a bathtub. This influx of freshwater also lowers the ocean’s salinity and density. All continental sources added the equivalent of about 2.7 inches of fresh water over 50 years to the ocean.

(3) Rising sea levels increase the impacts from coastal hazards. Because of the steady rising seas we can expect increased damage to coastal communities around the world. (4) Rising sea levels increase the impacts from coastal hazards. Because of the steady rising seas we can expect increased damage to coastal communities around the world.

Senator Inhofe claimed that Kyoto-like policies harm Americans, especially the poor and minorities. This statement is a false scare tactic directed at our most vulnerable communities. The well-documented truth is that not taking action to slow global warming harms Americans, especially the poor and minorities.

Global warming is already hurting Americans, especially the poor, its Indigenous Peoples, and people of color, and is projected to get worse if we don’t act now.

People of color cause considerable—already burdened with poor air quality and twice as likely to be uninformed as whites will become even more vulnerable to climate change related illnesses and death, and illness from insect-carried diseases.

Scientists have determined that the ice in Alaska and the Arctic region is melting so rapidly that much of it could be gone by the end of the century. The results could be catastrophic for indigenous peoples and animals, while low-lying lands as far away as Florida could be inundated by rising sea levels.

We found that scientific observations and those of Indigenous people over many generations are meshing . . . Sea ice is retreat, glaciers are reducing in size, permafrost is thawing, all [these indicators] provide strong evidence that it has been warming rapidly in the Arctic in recent decades.”—Susan Joy Hassol, global warming analyst and author of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) synthesis report Impacts of a Warming Arctic.

Floodings and erosion affects 184 out of 213, or 86 percent, of Alaska Native Villages to some extent. While many of the problems are long-standing, various studies indicate that coastal villages are becoming more susceptible to flooding and erosion caused in part by rising temperatures. Four villages—Kivalina, Koyukuk, Newtok, and Shishmaref—are in imminent danger and are planning for relocation. The cost for relocation could be high—from $100-$400 million per village.

Every village is under threat. Our homes are tied to ice storms and melting permafrost, our livelihoods are threatened by changes to the plants and animals we harvest. Even our lives are threatened, as traditional travel routes become dangerous.”—Alaska Chickaloon Village Chief Gary Harrison of the Arctic Athabaskan Council.

The recent study in Los Angeles found that if we don’t act now to slow global warming, L.A. residents will face significant heat-related mortality increases. Under a high emissions scenario, heat-related mortality rates could increase sixteen-fold for Blacks, fourteen-fold for Asians, twelve-fold for Hispanics, and eight-fold for Whites, by 2090.

Reduced dependence on foreign oil, strengthening national security, and the poor may be disproportionately impacted by these changes, due to the higher fraction of incomes spent on food and energy.

“We are long past the point where global warming is considered a myth. We are seeing its effects all around us—especially in my hometown of New Orleans, Louisiana, which is expected to experience an increased incidence of flooding that would likely destabilize its economy and dampen its populace.”—Rep. William Jefferson, (D-LA)

“African Americans and other vulnerable populations live disproportionately in areas highly exposed to toxic waste, air pollution, and other environmental hazards. Now we learn, through this report, that global warming will expose these communities to further environmental hazards that will continue to have a devastating impact on their health and economic conditions. We must involve all of the various stakeholders and continue to push forward-green, air pollution reduction policies by boosting job growth, saving money for consumers, and strengthening national security.”

Policies to reduce global warming can boost job growth, save money for consumers, and strengthen national security (Hoerner and Barrett). How America benefits: 1.4 million additional jobs created; Average household saving on energy bills of $1,275 per year; and Reduced dependence on foreign oil, strengthening national security for all Americans.

“It is a travesty that we live in a country where African Americans expend more of their income on energy costs than the most negatively impacted by energy byproducts such as carbon emissions. In the current scenario, African Americans are paying a premium for poor health due to air pollution and climate change. We must mobilize and energize our policymakers to enact legislation that will mitigate the un-

unjust effects of global warming.”—Reverend L. Jackson, Sr., Rainbow Push Coalition

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am honored to rise with my friend and colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, to introduce the Climate Stewardship Act, an urgent need. I was thinking of one clause that I could remove from Senator McCaIN’s comments. He said: Suppose Senator LIEBERMAN and I are deluded.

It struck me that probably many times in the battles that we have fought together or individually, people have thought we were deluded. If I was going to be deluded, I would rather be deluded in the company of John McCain than anybody else I can think of. But let me say this: We are not deluded in our battle to get the U.S. Government to assume a leadership role in stopping this planet of ours from warming, with disastrous consequences for the way we live and certainly our children and grandchildren will be forced to live. Because global warming is real and dangerous keeps pouring in to no end.

When Senator McCaIN and I first started to work with people in the field, the scientists, the businesspeople, the environmentalists, we had a pretty clear picture of what was going on. Sometimes we had to rely on scientific models and assume their accuracy in terms of the worst consequences. That is over.

As Senator McCaIN’s charts and pictures show, we can see with our eyes the effects of global warming already. The planet is warming. The polar ice caps are melting. One can see that with their own eyes. The sea level is rising in coastal areas already, and in other areas the water is diminishing, declining, as in the great State of my compatriot, Arizona, and the State of the distinguished occupant of the Chair, Nevada. Forest fires are increasing. The evidence is clear that the problem is here, and that is why we have to do something about it. Do nothing is no longer an option. We have reached a point where the intractable must yield to the inevitable. The evidence that climate change is real and dangerous keeps pouring in and piling up. What this legislation is all about is pushing, cajoling, and convincing the politics to catch up with the science.

I will give real market-based evidence to back up what Senator McCaIN and I are trying to convince the political leaders that the science is. The leading insurance companies in the world—are we not talking about environmentalists—are now predicting that climate-driven disasters will cost global financial centers an additional $150 billion a year within the next 10 years. That is $150 billion of additional costs for the world as a result of climate-driven disasters.

Just a couple of weeks ago, at an international conference, the head of the International Panel on Climate Change, Dr. R. K. Pachauri, said that we are already at “a dangerous point” when it comes to global warming, and “immediate and very deep cuts in greenhouse gases are needed if humanity is to survive.” Let me repeat those last words: “If humanity is to survive.”

It should be noted that Dr. Pachauri is no wild-eyed environmental radical. In fact, he is lobbied heavily for Dr. Pachauri’s appointment to the IPCC leadership because it considered him a more cautious and pragmatic scientist than the other leading candidates.

To say global warming simply an environmental challenge is almost to diminish it or demean it with a kind of simplicity that puts it alongside a host of other environmental challenges that we face. Global warming is both a moral and an economic security challenge, as well as an environmental challenge.

I start with what I mean by calling it a moral challenge. Greenhouse gases stay in the atmosphere for about 100 years, so failure to take the prudent actions that will call for—market-based, moderate, with caps—will force children still unborn to take far more drastic action to save their world as they know it and want to live in it.

There is just no excuse for this. We know that the melting glaciers, the coastal communities damage, the increased rate of forest fires. Previously, on this floor I have talked about the fact that a robin appeared in the north of Alaska and Canada among the Inuits native tribe, and they had no word in their 10,000-year-old civilization and vocabulary for robin.

Robins now linger longer into the winter in Connecticut, my State. Why? Because it is getting warmer.

Polar bears may soon be listed as an endangered species. Let me put it another way. We know that a petition will be filed soon to ask that polar bears be listed as an endangered species, because global warming is removing their habitat. It is wreaking havoc in the arctic climates where they live and grow. So to spoil the Earth for generations to come when we know what we were doing and could have stopped it would be a moral failing of enormous and, I might add, biblical proportions.

This time, it would be mankind that condemned itself, if I may put it again this way, to no longer living in the garden.

The challenge of solving global warming also presents our Nation with untold opportunities to reshape our world and assert our moral, economic, and environmental leadership. There is a moral challenge, an opportunity to enhance our energy security, and therefore our national security, by placing a price on greenhouse gas emissions, which is what our legislation will do.

Polar bears may soon be listed as an endangered species. Let me put it another way. We know that a petition will be filed soon to ask that polar bears be listed as an endangered species, because global warming is removing their habitat. It is wreaking havoc in the arctic climates where they live and grow. So to spoil the Earth for generations to come when we know what we were doing and could have stopped it would be a moral failing of enormous and, I might add, biblical proportions.

This time, it would be mankind that condemned itself, if I may put it again this way, to no longer living in the garden.

The challenge of solving global warming also presents our Nation with untold opportunities to reshape our world and assert our moral, economic, and environmental leadership. There is a moral challenge, an opportunity to enhance our energy security, and therefore our national security, by placing a price on greenhouse gas emissions, which is what our legislation will do.

Our Nation’s best energy options will become more cost competitive with foreign oil. It will make economic sense for dramatic growth in clean coal, alternative energy, and energy efficiency. It will be an opportunity for economic development in rural communities. By placing a price on carbon, it will create new value for range lands, farms, and forests by compensating landowners for the carbon they can store. It is an opportunity to innovate clean energy technologies for a growing global market. By placing this price on carbon, it will create new value for range lands, farms, and forests by compensating landowners for the carbon they can store. It is an opportunity to innovate clean energy technologies for a growing global market. By placing this price on carbon, it will create new value for range lands, farms, and forests by compensating landowners for the carbon they can store. It is an opportunity to innovate clean energy technologies for a growing global market.

Looking at the recommendations of the International Climate Change Task Force, the National Commission on Energy Policy, and the National Academy of Sciences Workshop on Technologies and Policies for a Low Carbon Future, there are a number of consensus provisions that could help the U.S. transition to these technologies of the future.

That is what the Climate Stewardship Act that Senator McCaIN and I are introducing today will do. It will provide the incentives. It will create a cap and let the market do the rest of the work, a real opportunity for change. I am very pleased to tell you that a very comprehensive study being released today by the NRDC applying a method of evaluating which is advocated by the Energy Information Administration of our own Government says the Climate Stewardship Act will add 800,000 jobs to our economy by the year 2025. So it will not cost jobs, it will add them.

Over the last few years, we have seen our colleagues grappling with the challenge of global warming. So many of them seem to be of the same mind, feeling that something needs to be done but still unsure what should be done and how. Senator McCaIN and I want our legislation to work for them so they can come forward and join us in this effort. This is an opportunity to invest in our future and face this challenge, an opportunity to enhance our energy security, and therefore our national security, by placing a price on greenhouse gas emissions, which is what our legislation will do.

Our Nation’s best energy options will become more cost competitive with foreign oil. It will make economic sense for dramatic growth in clean coal, alternative energy, and energy efficiency. It will be an opportunity for economic development in rural communities. By placing a price on carbon, it will create new value for range lands, farms, and forests by compensating landowners for the carbon they can store. It is an opportunity to innovate clean energy technologies for a growing global market. By placing this price on carbon, it will create new value for range lands, farms, and forests by compensating landowners for the carbon they can store. It is an opportunity to innovate clean energy technologies for a growing global market.
global market someday soon. It is an opportunity, as Senator McCaIN said, to improve our relations with our allies and the rest of the world and gain a stronger voice and ability to bring in developing nations.

With a trigger carbon, these opportunities disappear. Our bill provides that price for carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions. We know it is not the entire answer. A lot of people think it is too moderate and holds greenhouse gas emissions at today’s levels.

By the end of the decade, it is less demanding than the Kyoto Protocol, which goes into effect as a result of Russia’s ratification next week, but it is a cap that major utilities have told us they could meet. It may not be strong enough to reduce U.S. emissions as much as some would like, but it will be strong enough to start turning America around in the direction of dealing with global warming, reasserting our world environmental leadership and putting our economy in the right direction. We cannot afford to be as shortsighted as we have been up until now. We cannot afford anymore to allow the special interests, who will also resist change because change is unnerving and sometimes more costly, to prevail.

We have to assert the public interest of ourselves and all those who will follow us on this Earth and in this great country to do something about global warming while we still can. Before its consequences are disastrous. This is an enormous political challenge.

I go back to where I began. When we started, we had just models, so we were trying to portray what might happen over the horizon and ask our colleagues to join us in doing something now. It is not easy to do that because the crisis always seems further away than the immediacy of the changes a solution requires, but now we can see it. Shame on us if we do not do something about it.

I begin this battle today with Senator McCaIN and other cosponsors with not only a sense of commitment but a sense of encouragement and optimism that people ultimately are too reasonable and responsible to ignore the facts and do nothing about this looming disaster for humankind.

Senator McCaIN and I begin this battle again, and we are not going to stop until we win.

I ask unanimous consent that several articles on climate be printed in the RECORD.

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

MICHAEL CRICHTON AND GLOBAL WARMING

By David B. Sandalow

How do people learn about global warming? That—more than the merits of any scientific argument—is the most interesting question posed by Michael Crichton’s State of Fear.

The plot of Crichton’s 14th novel is notable mainly for its nuttiness—an MIT professor fights a well-funded network of eco-terrorists trying to kill thousands by creating spectacular “natural” disasters. But Crichton uses his book as a vehicle for making two important points: Crichton’s high profile and ability to command media attention, these arguments deserve serious inquiry.

First, Crichton argues, the scientific evidence for global warming is weak. Crichton rejects many of the conclusions reached by the National Academy of Sciences and Intergovernmental Panel Change—for example, he does not believe that global temperature increases in recent decades are most likely the result of human influences. In challenging the scientific consensus, Crichton rehashes points familiar to those who follow such issues. These points are unpersuasive, as explained below.

Second, Crichton argues that concern about global warming is best understood as a fad. In particular, he argues that many people concerned about global warming follow a herd mentality, failing critically to examine the data. Crichton is especially harsh in his portrayal of other members of the Hollywood elite, though his critique extends more broadly to the news media, intelligentsia and general public. This argument is more interesting and persuasive, though ultimately unpersuasive as well.

1. Climate Science

Crichton makes several attempts to cast doubt on scientific evidence regarding global warming and the “urban heat island effect.” Crichton explains that cities are often warmer than the surrounding countryside and implies that observed temperature increases during the past century are the result of urban growth, not rising greenhouse gas concentrations.

This issue has been examined extensively in the peer-reviewed scientific literature and dismissed by the vast majority of earth scientists as an inadequate explanation of observed temperature rise. Ocean temperatures have climbed steadily during the past century, for example—yet this data is not affected by “urban heat islands.” Most land glaciers around the world are melting, far away from urban centers. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, using only peer-reviewed data, concluded that urban heat islands account for only 0.05% of the increase in global average temperatures during the period 1900–1990—roughly one-tenth of the increase during this period. In contrast, as Crichton is happy to point out, there are numerous “unconstrained scientific peer-reviewed papers” to support the view that “the heat island effect accounts for much or nearly all warming recorded by land-based thermometers.”

Second, Crichton argues that global temperatures decline from 1940–1970, or at least cast doubt on, scientific conclusions with respect to warming. Since concentrations of greenhouse gases were rising during this period, says Crichton, the fact that global temperatures were falling calls into question greenhouse gas concentrations and temperatures.

Crichton is correct that average temperatures declined from 1940–1970, or at least cast doubt on, scientific conclusions with respect to warming. Since concentrations of greenhouse gases were rising during this period, says Crichton, the fact that global temperatures were falling calls into question greenhouse gas concentrations and temperatures. (Think of a game of tug-of-war, in which the number of players on each team changes frequently.) For example, the average temperature rise from 1940–1970 reflects the relative weight of cooling factors during that period, not the absence of a warming effect from man-made greenhouse gases.

Should we at least be encouraged, recalling the decades from 1940–1970 in the hope that cooling factors will outweigh greenhouse warming in the decades ahead? Hardly. Greenhouse gas concentrations are now well outside levels previously experienced in the planet’s history. Unless we change course, the relatively minor warming caused by man-made greenhouse gases in the last century will be dwarfed by much greater warming in the next century. There is no basis for believing that cooling factors such as those that dominated the temperature record from 1940 to 1970 will be able to outweigh greenhouse warming in the decades ahead.

Third, Crichton offers graph after graph showing temperature declines during the past century that he represents in popular arenas (Chile), Greenville (South Carolina), Ann Arbor (Michigan), Syracuse (New York) and Navacerrada (Spain). But global warming is an increase in global average temperatures. Nothing about specific local temperature declines is inconsistent with the conclusion that the planet as a whole has warmed during the past century, or that it will warm more in the next century if greenhouse gas concentrations continue to climb.

Crichton makes other arguments but a point-by-point rebuttal is beyond the scope of this paper. (A thoughtful rebuttal of that kind can be found at www.realclimate.org.) Climate change science is a complex topic, not easily reduced to a fad. But a useful contrast with Crichton’s science-argument-within-an-action-novel is the sober perspective of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. The opening paragraph of a 2001 National Academy report responding to a request from the Bush White House reads: “Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth’s atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise. Temperatures are expected to continue through the 21st century. Secondary effects are suggested by computer model simulations and basic physical reasoning. These include increases in rainfall rates and increased susceptibility of some regions to drought. The impacts of these changes will be critically dependent on the magnitude of the warming and the rate with which it occurs.”


Time will tell whether this report or Crichton’s novel will have a greater impact on public understanding of global warming.

2. Climate Fad

This raises the second, more interesting argument in Crichton’s novel. Crichton argues that concern about global warming has become a fad embraced by media elites, entertainment moguls, the scientific establishment and general public. In Crichton’s view, media coverage is driven by the critical analysis of the vast majority of those who have views on this issue.

On the last point, fair enough. There are instances where people have been driven through the minutiae of climate change science than have opinions on the topic. In this regard, global warming is like Social Security reform with care for the elderly, the budget and many other complex public policy issues. As Nelson Polsby and Aaron Wildavsky once wrote, “Most people don’t think about most issues most of the time.” When forming opinions on such matters, we all apply certain predispositions or instincts...
and rely on others whose judgment or expertise we trust.

Of course this observation applies as well to the economics of climate change. The perception is that in many circles that reducing greenhouse gas emissions will be ruinously expensive. How many of those who hold this viewpoint have evaluated their opinions to critical analysis? Crichton never musters outrage on this topic.

Crichton’s complaints are particularly striking in light of the highly successful efforts to provide policymakers and the public with analytically rigorous, non-political advice on climate science. Since 1983, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has convened thousands of scientists, economists, engineers, and other experts to review and distill the peer-reviewed literature on the climate system. The IPCC has produced three reports and is now at work on the fourth. In addition, the National Academy of Sciences has provided advice to the U.S. government on this topic, including the report cited above.

Crichton’s view that the American media provides a steady drumbeat of scary news on global warming is especially hard to dismiss. Solid data are scarce, but one 1996 analysis found that the rock star Madonna was mentioned more often in global warming in the Lexis-Nexis database. Certainly one could watch the evening news for weeks on end without ever seeing a global warming story.

Furthermore, the print media’s “on the one hand, on the other hand” convention tilts many global warming stories strongly toward Crichton’s point of view. As Crichton would concede, the vast majority of the world’s scientists believe that global warming is happening as a result of human activities and that the consequences of rising greenhouse gas emissions could be very serious. Still, many news stories on global warming include not just this mainstream view but also the “contrarian” views of a very small minority of climate change skeptics, giving roughly equal weight to each. As a result, public perceptions of the controversy surrounding these issues may be greatly exaggerated.

Crichton’s most serious charge is that “open and frank discussion of the data, and of the consequences of rising greenhouse gas emissions,” has been suppressed in the “scientific community. As “proof,” he offers the assertion that many critics of global warming are required professors no longer granting grants. While there is some basis for the assertion, it is unclear, if so Crichton should back up his claims with more than mere assertions in the appendix to an action novel.

Indeed Crichton should hold himself to a higher standard with regard to all the arguments in this book. He is plainly a very bright guy and, famously, a Harvard Medical School graduate. A millionaire many times over, he doesn’t need to be seeking grants. If he has something serious to say on the science of climate change, he should say so in a work of nonfiction and submit his work for peer review. The result could be instructive—for him and us all.

ARCTIC TEMPERATURE CHANGE—OVER THE PAST 100 YEARS

This note has been prepared in response to questions and comments that have arisen since the publication of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment overview document—“Impacts of a Warming Arctic.” It is intended to provide clarity regarding some aspects relative to the material from Chapter 2 Arctic Climate—Past and Present that will appear in the publication of the ACIA scientific report in 2005 and has now been posted on the ACIA website.

There are several possible definitions of the Arctic depending on, for example, tree line, continuous permafrost, and other factors. It was decided for purposes of this analysis to define the Arctic region as north of the Arctic Circle as the southern boundary. Although somewhat arbitrary, this is no more arbitrary than choosing 62° N, 67° N or any other latitude. Since the Arctic is very small minority of climate change skeptics believe that global warming is happening in the Lexis-Nexis database. Certainly one could watch the evening news for weeks on end without ever seeing a global warming story.

The analysis showed that the annual land-surface air temperature variations in the Arctic (north of 60° N) from 1900 to 2002 using the GHCN and the CRU datasets led to virtually identical time series, and both documented a statistically significant warming trend of 0.09 °C/decade during that period. In view of the high correlation between the GHCN and CRU datasets, it was decided to focus the presentation in Chapter 2 on analyses of the GHCN datasets only. The need to be stressed that the spatial coverage of the region north of 60° N is quite limited. During the period (1900–1945), there were few observing stations in the Alaska/Canadian Arctic West Greenland sector and more in the North Atlantic (East Greenland/Iceland/Scandinavia) and Russian sectors. The coverage has improved since 1945 and is now fairly uniform. Based on the analyses of the GHCN and CRU datasets, the annual land-surface air temperature from 60–90° N, smoothed with a 5-year running mean near decadal averages, was warmer in the most recent decade (1990s) than it was in the 1930–1940s period. It should be noted that other analyses (Polyakov et al. 2002; Lugina et al. 2004) give comparable estimates of Arctic warming for these two decades that, however, lay within the error margins of possible accuracy of the zonal mean estimates (Vinnikov et al. 1990; Vinnikov et al., 1987). The major source of this uncertainty is the data deficiency in the North American sector prior to 1850s in all databases.

Least-squares linear trends in annual anomalies of the land-surface air temperature from the GHCN (updated from Peterson and Vose, 1997) and CRU (Jones and Moberg, 2003) datasets for the period 1900–2002 were calculated. This is consistent with the analysis of Polyakov et al. (2002) and confirmed with satellite observations over the whole Arctic, for the past 2 decades (Comiso, 2000). Chapter 3 of the ACIA report, entitled “The Changing Arctic: Indigenous Perspectives” documents the traditional knowledge of Arctic residents and indicates that substantial changes have already occurred in the Arctic and supports the evidence that the most recent decade is different from those of earlier centuries.

The modeling studies of Johannessen et al. (2004) showed the importance of anthropogenic forcing over the past half century for modeling sea-ice extent. This suggested strongly that whereas the earlier warming was natural internal climate-system variability, the recent SAT (surface air temperature) changes are a response to anthropogenic forcing.

In the context of this report, the authors agree with Crichton’s statement of October 1993. A conclusion termed as “very probable” is to be interpreted that the authors were 90–99% confident in the conclusion. The term “probable” is used to convey that there is 70–90% confidence in the conclusion.

The conclusions of Chapter 2 were that: “Based on the analysis of the climate of the 20th century, it is very probable that the Arctic has warmed over the past century, although the warming has not been uniform. Land stations north of 60° N indicate that the land-surface air temperature increased by approximately 0.09 °C/decade during the past century, which is greater than the 0.06 °C/decade increase averaged over the Northern Hemisphere. This is in agreement with the polar amplification theory. It is to be certain of the variation in mean land/surface temperature over the first half of the 20th century because of a scarcity of observations over the Arctic. However, it is probable that the past decade was warmer than any other in the period of the instrumental record.”

This information refers to the relative rates of warming in the Arctic versus other latitude bands. The conclusions of Chapter 2 were that: “Evidence of polar amplification depends on the timescale of examination. Over the past 100 years, it is possible that there has been polar amplification, however, over the past 5 years it is probable that polar amplification has occurred.”
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Michael Crichton's new novel State of Fear is about global-warming hysteria ginned up by a Global Warming Foundation NGO on behalf of eco-terrorists... or by evil eco-terrorists on behalf of a self-important NGO. It's not quite clear. Regardless, the message of the book is that global warming is a non-problem. A lesson for our times? Sadly, no.

In between car chases, shoot-outs, canibalistic rites, and other assorted derring-do done to address scientific issues, but is selective (and occasionally mislabeled) about the basic science involved. Some of the issues Crichton raises are real and already well-appreciated, while others are red herrings used to confuse rather than enlighten.

The fictional champion of Crichton's climate science is Dr. Michael Knepper, an Ivy academic-turned-undercover operative who runs intellectual rings around two other characters—the actor (a rather dim-witted chump) and the lawyer (a duped innocent), neither of whom know much about science.

So, for the benefit of actors and lawyers everywhere, I will try to help out.

FORCINGS MAJEURE

Early in the book, a skeptical character points out that while carbon dioxide was rising between 1940 and 1970, the globe was cooling. What, then, makes us so certain that global warming is not a non-problem?

Good question. Northern-hemisphere mean temperatures do appear to have fallen over that 30-year period, despite a rise in CO2, which if all else had been equal should have led to warming. But were all things equal? Actually, no.

In the real world, climate is affected both by internal variability (natural internal variability processes within the climate system) and forcings (external forces, either natural or human-induced, acting on the climate system). The well-known and exhaustively studied urban heat island effect—countryside due to the built-up surroundings and intensive energy use—is also raised several times. But in fact, a recent study by David Parker published last year in the journal Nature found no residual effect in the surface temperature record once corrections were made for this undisputed phenomenon. Crichton makes much of it, there's no there there.

AUTHORIAL INATTENTION

At the end of the book, Crichton offers a somber ending to his novel, reiterates the main points of his thesis: that there are some who push claims beyond what is scientific based—no matter what global warming is said to be doing. It's a sad commentary. By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH)

S. 343. A bill to provide for qualified withdrawals from the Capital Construction Fund for fishermen leaving the industry and for the rollover of Capital Construction Funds to individual retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Fi

MICHAEL CRICHTON

State of Fear

TALL, DARK, AND RANSEN

Even more troubling is some misleading commentary regarding climate-science pioneer James Hansen. In his congressional testimony in 1988, Dr. Hansen overestimated [global warming] by 300 percent, says our hero Knepper.

Hansen's testimony did indeed spread awareness of global warming, but not because he exaggerated the problem by 300 percent. In a paper published soon after that testimony, Hansen presented three model simulations, each following a different scenario for the growth in CO2 and other trace gases and forcings. Scenario A, which had a modest business-as-usual assumption, and scenario B, with the model did a reasonable job. In fact, in his congressional testimony Hansen only showed results from scenario B, and stated clearly that it was the most probable scenario.

The claim of a “300 percent” error comes from noted climate skeptic Patrick Michaels, who in testimony before Congress in 1998 debated warming that the models were unreliable. Thus a significant success for climate modeling was presented as a complete failure—a willful distortion that Crichton adopts uncritically.

The well-known and exhaustively studied “urban heat island effect”—for cities to be warmer than the surrounding countryside due to the built-up surroundings and intensive energy use—also raised several times. But in fact, a recent study by David Parker published last year in the journal Nature found no residual effect in the surface temperature record once corrections were made for this undisputed phenomenon. Crichton makes much of it, there's no there there.

The book also shows, through the selective use of weather-station data, a number of single-station records with long-term cooling trends. In particular, characters visit Punta Arenas, at the tip of South America, where the station record on the wall shows a long-term cooling trend (though slight warming since the 1970s). “There’s your global warming,” one of Crichton’s good guys declares dismissively.

Well, no. Cooling. Global warming is defined by the global mean surface temperature. No one has or would claim that the globe is warming uniformly. Had the characters visited the nearby station of Santa Cruz Aeropuerto, the poster on the wall would have shown a positive trend.
McClellan said the number would be reduced to $724 billion after seniors pay their premiums and the Federal Government is reimbursed by States for coverage of their Medicaid populations, it is still much higher than originally thought. As recently as September, Mr. McClellan said this program would only cost $534 billion.

Remember this program? This was President Bush’s Medicare prescription drug program. Now, we need to understand that Medicare did not cover prescription drugs. Seniors need that coverage because drugs are so expensive, and drugs are essential for them to maintain their health and stay independent and strong for a long period of time. But when we got into this debate on the floor of the Senate about creating this program, the pharmaceutical companies lined the hallways around the Senate with men in expensive three-piece suits and Gucci loafers and said: Whatever you do, don’t touch the profits of the pharmaceutical companies.

Now is the time to help those fishermen who wish to do so to leave the fleet. In Oregon, the amounts in CCF accounts range from $10,000 to over $200,000. This legislation changes current restrictions to allow fishers to remove money from their CCF for purposes other than buying new vessels or upgrading current vessels, without losing up to 70 percent of their CCF funds in taxes and penalties. This legislation changes the CCF so fishers who want to opt out of fishing are not penalized for doing so.

This bill takes a significant step towards making the commercial fishing industry sustainable by amending the CCF to allow non-fishing uses of investments. This bill amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the Internal Revenue Code to allow funds currently in the CCF to be rolled over into an IRA or other type of retirement account, or to be used for the payment of an improved vessel, or for a fishery capacity reduction program, without adverse tax consequences to the account holders. This bill will also encourage innovation and conservation by allowing fishermen to use funds deposited in a CCF to develop or purchase new gear that reduces bycatch.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 345. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would speak for a moment, if I could, on an issue which is near and dear to not just seniors but their families.

Last night, CMS Administrator Mark McClellan acknowledged the cumulative cost of the Medicare prescription drug program between 2006 and 2015 will reach $1.2 trillion. Although Mr. McClellan said the number would be reduced to $724 billion after seniors pay their premiums and the Federal Government is reimbursed by States for coverage of their Medicaid populations, it is still much higher than originally thought. As recently as September, Mr. McClellan said this program would only cost $534 billion.

I have gone through some basic drugs on this chart, but I want to tell my friends who are following this debate, this is no surprise. Those of us who voted against the bill said exactly this would happen: If you do not contain the cost of drugs, you cannot afford this program. And the Department of Health and Human Services’ own reports during the outyears, and future Members of Congress and Presidents will decide to cut back on the benefits under the program rather than face the reality of what we did in passing this legislation.

The prescription drug benefit premium will increase from $35 a month under the President’s plan in 2006 to $68 a month in 2015. Deductibles will increase. I think we are at a point where we have to acknowledge the obvious.

Let me say a word about pharmaceutical companies. We want the pharmaceutical industry to be strong and profitable because in their profits is the money for research for new drugs. Those profits are essential for the health and the world’s health. But what we find now is that pharmaceutical companies in America are spending more money on advertising than they are on research. You cannot turn on the television without finding for another drug. Why? Because they want the consuming public to walk into their doctor’s office and say: Doctor, I beg you, give me the little purple pill. And doctors do. It is an expensive pill. It may not be the drug they required pill, but doctors do it. And if you sell more of those little purple pills, the pharmaceutical companies do quite well.

Take a look at the profitability of the Fortune 500 drug companies versus the profits of all Fortune 500 companies in the year 2002. When you take a look at the drug companies on these red bars, and the other companies on the yellow bars, you can see exactly the difference. Profits: 17 percent for drug companies, 3.1 percent for other companies. Profits as a percentage of equity: 27.6 percent for pharmaceutical companies, 10.2 percent for the rest of the Fortune 500 companies.

They are extremely profitable companies. We want them to make profits, but not at the expense of seniors who cannot afford to pay.

Mr. President, I want to give my colleague an opportunity to speak here. I would say the most important thing I can tell you today is there is an answer. I am reintroducing a bill today that I believe will go a long way to reducing the cost of prescription drugs. The Medicare Prescription Drugs Savings and Choice Act instructs the Secretary of HHS to offer a nationwide Medicare-delivered prescription drug benefit in addition to the current PDP and PPO plans available in the 10 regions. It instructs the Secretary of HHS to set a uniform national premium of $35 for uniform benefits, and it instructs the Secretary of HHS to negotiate group purchasing agreements on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.
This is the way to lower the costs of drugs. I am honored that my proposal, the legislation which I am introducing, has been endorsed by the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Public Health Association, the American Nurses Association, Campaign for America's Future, Center for Medicare Advocacy, Consumers Union, Families USA, and a host of other groups. It is an indication to me that they know, for their membership and seniors and Americans in general, this legislation is going to be an important step forward.

I invite my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation so we can bring the cost of drugs within the reach of senior citizens and keep a prescription drug program that is affordable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I commend you for your leadership on this issue. As I travel around my State, as he does his, too, the No. 1 issue I hear about from people is the cost of health care today.

We had an opportunity when we passed the Medicare prescription drug bill to deal with that issue. We did not. He has introduced legislation today that will focus on that incredibly important issue for our country. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 345

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 “Medicare Prescription Drug Savings and Choice Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part D of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1860D–11 the following new section:

“MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION

‘‘S. 1860D–11A. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary shall offer one or more medicare operated prescription drug plans as defined in section (c) with a service area that consists of the entire United States and shall enter into negotiations with pharmaceutical manufacturers to reduce the purchase cost of covered part D drugs for eligible part D individuals in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) NEGOTIATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 1860D–11(b), the purposes of offering a medicare operated prescription drug plan under this section, the Secretary shall negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers with respect to such purchase cost of covered part D drugs and shall encourage the use of more affordable therapeutic equivalents to the extent such practices do not override medical necessity as determined by the prescribing physician. To the extent practicable and consistent with the previous sentence, the Secretary shall implement strategies similar to those used by other Federal purchasers of prescription drugs, and other strategies, to reduce the purchase cost of covered part D drugs.

(c) MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘‘medicare operated prescription drug plan’’ means a prescription drug plan that offers qualified prescription drug coverage and access to negotiated prices described in section 1860D–2(a)(1)(A). Such a plan may offer supplemental prescription drug coverage in the same manner as other qualified prescription drug coverage offered by other prescription drug plans.

(d) MONTHLY BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—

(1) QUALIFIED PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A qualified prescription drug plan offered in 2006 shall be uniform nationally. Such premium shall be uniform nationally. Such premium shall be uniform nationally.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1860D–3(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–103(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF THE MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A medicare operated prescription plan defined in section 1860D–11A(c) shall be offered nationally in accordance with section 1860D–11A.

(B) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A medicare operated prescription drug plan shall be offered in addition to any qualifying plan or fallback prescription drug plan offered in a PDP election that meets the requirements of this subsection.

(2) DESIGNATION AS A FALLBACK PLAN.—

Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may designate the medicare operated prescription drug plan as the fallback prescription drug plan for any fall- back service area (as defined in section 1860D–11(g)(3)) determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 101 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173; 117 Stat. 2071).

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 346. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the importation of Canadian municipal solid waste without State consent; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Canadian Waste Import Ban Act of 2005, to address the rapidly growing problem of Canadian waste shipments to Michigan. Michigan has been known for its beautiful waters, lush forests, and now unfortunately as a top importer of international trash.

My colleagues may be surprised to learn that the biggest source of waste to Michigan is not from another State, but from our neighbor to the north, Canada. The rapid increase in waste shipments is stunning. In 2003, 180 trash trucks crossed the Ambassador and Blue Water bridges into Michigan. Today, that number has more than doubled to 415 trucks per day. You can see these trucks lined up for miles waiting to cross into Michigan, polluting the air and creating traffic congestions. The city of Toronto alone sends over 1 million tons of trash annually to Michigan.

This waste dramatically decreases Michigan’s own landfill capacity, and has an incredible negative impact on Michigan’s environment and the public health of its citizens. The waste also poses a tremendous homeland security threat, as trucks loaded with garbage are a great threat to inspectors at traditional cargo inspection.

I fought and was successful in the installation of radiation equipment at these crossings. As a result of this equipment, the Blue Water Bridge port customs reports that three to four Canadian trash trucks per week are being turned back at the border for containing dangerous radioactive materials such as medical waste. But we need the trash shipments to stop completely.

Michigan already has protections contained in an international agreement between the United States and Canada, but are being ignored. Under the Agreement Concerning the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste, which was entered into in 1989, shipments of waste across the Canadian-U.S. border require government-to-government notification. The
Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, as the designate authority for the United States would receive the notification and then would have 30 days to consent or object to the shipment. Not only have these notification provisions not been enforced, but the EPA has indicated it would not object to the municipal waste shipments.

Michigan citizens have spoken loud and clear on this issue. More than 165,000 people signed my on-line petition urging the EPA to use their power to stop the Canadian trash shipments. Residents from all 83 Michigan counties have signed the petition—an unprecedented response. I've presented these signatures to both former EPA Administrator Mike Leavitt and Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge. But despite these efforts, EPA has not stopped these trash shipments.

That is why I'm reintroducing my bill today. The Canadian Waste Import Ban of 2005 would stop the Canadian trash shipments by placing an immediate Federal ban on the importation of Canadian municipal solid waste. Any State that wishes to receive Canadian trash can opt out of the ban by giving notice to the EPA. The ban will be in place only until the EPA enforces the notice and consent provision contained in the binational agreement.

This legislation would also give Michigan residents the protection they deserve from these shipments. In enforcing the agreement, the EPA would have to obtain the consent of the receiving State before consenting to a Canadian municipal solid waste shipment. So if the State of Michigan says no, the EPA must object to the trash shipment.

The EPA would also have to consider the impact of the shipment on homeland security, environment, and public health. These waste shipments should no longer be accepted without an examination of how it will affect the health and safety of Michigan families.

Michigan residents deserve the protections provided by this international agreement and should be provided the ability to stop these dangerous and unhealthy trash shipments. I urge my colleagues to support the Canadian Waste Import Ban of 2005.

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

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

S. 346

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 “Canadian Waste Import Ban Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON CANADIAN MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.

(a) In General.—Subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 4011. CANADIAN MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.

"(a) Definitions.—In this section:

"(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ‘Agreement’ means—

"(A) the Agreement Concerning the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste between the United States and Canada, signed at Ottawa on October 28, 1986 (TIAS 11098) and amended on November 25, 1992; and

"(B) any regulations promulgated to implement and enforce that Agreement.

"(2) MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—The term ‘Canadian municipal solid waste’ means municipal solid waste that is generated in Canada.

"(3) MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘municipal solid waste’ means—

"(i) material discarded for disposal by—

"(a) businesses (including single and multifamily residential; and

"(b) public lodging such as hotels and motels; and

"(ii) material discarded for disposal that was generated by commercial, institutional, and industrial sources, to the extent that the material—

"(I) is essentially the same as material described in clause (i); or

"(II) where it is collected and disposed of with material described in clause (i) as part of a normal municipal solid waste collection service; and

"(III) is subject to regulation under sub-section C.

"(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘municipal solid waste’ includes—

"(i) appliances;

"(ii) clothing;

"(iii) consumer product packaging;

"(iv) cosmetics;

"(v) debris resulting from construction, remodeling, repair, or demolition of a structure;

"(vi) disposable diapers;

"(vii) food containers made of glass or metal;

"(viii) food waste;

"(ix) household hazardous waste;

"(x) office supplies;

"(xi) paper; and

"(xii) yard waste.

"(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘municipal solid waste’ does not include—

"(I) solid waste identified or listed as a hazardous waste under section 3001, except for household hazardous waste;

"(II) solid waste, including contaminated soil and debris, resulting from—

"(a) a response action taken under section 104 or 106 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9604, 9606);

"(b) a response action taken under a State law with authorities comparable to the authorities contained in either of those sections; or

"(c) a corrective action taken under this Act;

"(iii) recyclable material—

"(A) that has been separated, at the source of the material, from waste destined for disposal;

"(B) that has been managed separately from waste destined for disposal, including scrap rubber to be used as a fuel source;

"(C) a material or product returned from a distributor or distributor to the manufacturer or an agent of the manufacturer for credit, evaluation, and possible potential reuse;

"(D) generated by an industrial facility; and

"(E) transported for the purpose of treatment, storage, or disposal to a facility (which facility is in compliance with applicable State and local land use and zoning laws and regulations) and

"(aa) that is owned or operated by the generator of the waste;

"(bb) that is located on property owned by the generator of the waste or a company with which the generator is affiliated; or

"(cc) the capacity of which is contractually dedicated exclusively to a specific generator;

"(D) medical waste that is segregated from or not mixed with solid waste;

"(E) sewage sludge or residuals from a sewage treatment plant;

"(F) combustion ash generated by a resource recovery facility or municipal incinerator; or

"(G) waste from a manufacturing or processing (including pollution control) operation that is not essentially the same waste normally generated by households.

"(b) BAN ON CANADIAN MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), until the date on which the Administrator promulgates regulations to implement and enforce the Agreement (including notice and consent provisions of the Agreement), no person may import into any State, and no solid waste management facility may accept, Canadian municipal solid waste for the purpose of incineration or the Canadian municipal solid waste.

"(2) ELECTION BY GOVERNOR.—The Governor of a State may elect to opt out of the ban under paragraph (1), and consent to the importation and acceptance by the State of Canadian municipal solid waste before the date specified in that paragraph, if the Governor submits to the Administrator a notice of that election by the Governor.

"(D) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Beginning immediately after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall—

"(A) perform the functions of the Designated Authority of the United States described in the Agreement with respect to the importation and exportation of municipal solid waste under the Agreement; and

"(B) implement and enforce the Agreement (including notice and consent provisions of the Agreement).

"(2) CONSENT TO IMPORTATION.—In considering whether to consent to the importation of Canadian municipal solid waste under article 3(c) of the Agreement, the Administrator shall—

"(A) obtain the consent of each State into which the Canadian municipal solid waste is to be imported; and

"(B) consider the impact of the importation on homeland security, public health, and the environment.

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 4010 the following:

"Sec. 4011. Canadian municipal solid waste”.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER).

S. 347. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve access to information about individuals’ health care operations and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decisionmaking so that individuals’ wishes are known should they become unable to speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about legal and assistance with execution of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues and cosponsors Senators JAY ROCKEFELLER and RICHARD LUGAR as well as Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER and RICHARD LUGAR.

February 10, 2005

unwanted medical treatment, Washington v. Glucksburg and Vacco v. Quill, 1997, but it also stressed that advance directives are a means of safeguarding that right should adults become incapable of deciding for themselves.

Fortunately, situations like Ms. Schiavo’s are rare. Of the 2.5 million people who die each year 83 percent are Medicare beneficiaries. In fact, 27 percent of Medicare expenditures cover care in the last year of life. Remember, everyone who enrolls in Medicare will die on Medicare. The Advance Directives Improvement and Education Act encourages all Medicare beneficiaries to prepare advance directives by providing a free physician office visit for the purpose of discussing end-of-life care choices and other issues around medical decision-making in a time of incapacity. Physicians will be reimbursed for spending time with their patients to help them understand situations in which an advance directive would be most useful, the Medicare hospice benefit and other concerns. The conversation will also enable physicians to learn about their patients’ wishes, fears, religious beliefs, and life experiences that might influence their wishes.

In 1990, most states also have enacted the Patient Self Determination Act passed by Congress, and Senator COBURN, of course. We can’t legislate good medical care or compassion. What we can do, what I hope we will do, is to enact this bill so that citizens can have a medical opportunity to participate in improving end-of-life care. First, by filling out their own advance directives and talking to their families about them; and by raising their voices to demand that our health care systems honor their wishes and treat the way they care for people who are near the end of life. If we can do that, we will have done a great deal.

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

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

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 “Advance Directives Improvement and Education Act of 2005”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.
Sec. 3. Medicare coverage of end-of-life planning consultations.
Sec. 4. Improvement of policies related to the use and portability of advance directives.
Sec. 5. Increasing awareness of the importance of end-of-life planning.
Sec. 6. GAO studies and reports on end-of-life planning issues.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

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

(1) Every year 2,500,000 people die in the United States. Eighty percent of those people die in institutions such as hospitals, nursing homes, and other facilities. Chronic illnesses, such as cancer and heart disease, account for 2 out of every 3 deaths.

(2) In January 2004, a study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association concluded that many people dying in institutions have advanced directives that are poorly constructed, and who have given copies of the directives to their loved ones, health care providers, and legal representatives.
at home with hospice services were more likely to report a favorable dying experience. (3) In 1997, the Supreme Court of the United States, in its decisions in Washington v. Glucksberg and Washington v. Vance, held that the liberty interest of competent adults to refuse unwanted medical treatment in those cases, the Court stressed the use of advance directives. In those decisions, health care providers tell patients about advance directives that right should those adults become incapable of deciding for themselves. (4) A study published in 2002 estimated that the prevalence of advance directives is between 15 and 20 percent of the general population, despite the passage of the Patient Self-Determination Act in 1990, which directs health care providers to tell patients about advance directives.

Competent adults should complete advance care plans stipulating their health care decisions in the event that they become unable to speak for themselves. Through the execution of advance directives, including living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care according to the laws of the State in which they reside, individuals can protect their right to express their wishes and have them respected.

The purposes of this Act are to improve access to information about individuals’ health care options and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decision-making so that individuals’ wishes are known should they become unable to speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about and assisting in the preparation of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. MEDICARE COVERAGE OF END-OF-LIFE PLANNING CONSULTATIONS.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(aa)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(aa)(2)), as amended by section 642(a) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173; 117 Stat. 2322), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (Y), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) in subparagraph (Z), by inserting “and” at the end; and
(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Z) in the case of end-of-life planning consultations (as defined in subsection (aa)(2)).”

(b) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—Section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l), as amended by section 229 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173; 117 Stat. 2339), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:—

“End-Of-Life Planning Consultation

(‘‘bb’’ The term ‘‘end-of-life planning consultation’’ means physicians’ services—

(1) consisting of a consultation between the physician and an individual relating to the individual’s medical care; (A) the importance of preparing advance directives in case an injury or illness causes the individual to be unable to make health care decisions on his or her own behalf; (B) the situations in which an advance directive is likely to be relied upon; (C) the reasons that the development of a comprehensive end-of-life plan is beneficial and the reasons that such a plan should be updated periodically as the health of the individual changes; (D) the implication of resources that an individual may use to determine the requirements of the State in which such individual resides so that the treatment wishes of that individual are honored if that individual is unable to communicate those wishes, including requirements regarding the designation of a surrogate decision maker (health care proxy); and

(2) that are furnished to an individual on an annual basis or immediately following any major change in an individual’s health condition, and a nondirective consultation (whichever comes first).”.

(c) WAIVER OF DEDUCTIBLE AND COINSURANCE.—

(1) DEDUCTIBLE.—The first sentence of section 1833(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(6);” and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (7) such deductible shall not apply with respect to an end-of-life planning consultation (as defined in section 1861(bb)).”

(2) COINSURANCE.—Section 1833(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in clause (N), by inserting “(or 100 percent in the case of an end-of-life planning consultation, as defined in section 1861(bb)) after ‘‘30 percent’’; and

(B) in clause (O), by inserting “(or 100 percent in the case of an end-of-life planning consultation, as defined in section 1861(bb))” after “30 percent”.

(d) PAYMENT FOR PHYSICIANS’ SERVICES.—

Section 1848(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(b)(3)), as amended by section 611(c) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173; 117 Stat. 2304), is amended by inserting “(2)(AA),” after “(2)(W),”.

(e) FREQUENCY LIMITATION.—Section 1861(aa)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(aa)(1)), as amended by section 613(c) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173; 117 Stat. 2396), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (L);

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (M) and inserting “, and”;

and

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

“(N) in the case of end-of-life planning consultations (as defined in section 1861(bb)), which are performed more frequently than is covered under paragraph (2) of such section;”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to services furnished on or after the first day of January of 2004.

SEC. 4. IMPROVEMENT OF POLICIES RELATED TO THE USE AND PORTABILITY OF ADVANCE DIRECTIVES.

(a) MEDICARE.—Section 1902(w) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

B) The provisions of this paragraph shall preempt any State law to the extent such law is inconsistent with such provisions. The provisions of this paragraph shall not preempt any State law that provides for greater patient rights, more freedom of conscience, or more latitude in determining a patient’s wishes.
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(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to provider agreements and contracts entered into, amended, renewed, or otherwise affected under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), and to State plans under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), after such date as the Secretary of Health and Human Services specifies, but in no case may such date be later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROVISION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—In the case of a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by subsection (b), the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of which is considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature, determine the effective date for the purposes of any provision of this Act in the case of the State that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. INCREASING AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF END-OF-LIFE PLANNING.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART R—PROGRAMS TO INCREASE AWARENESS OF ADVANCE DIRECTIVE PLANNING ISSUES"

"SEC. 399Z-1. ADVANCE DIRECTIVE EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS AND INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSES.

(a) ADVANCE DIRECTIVE EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—The Secretary shall, directly or through grants awarded under subsection (c), conduct a national public education campaign—

(1) to raise public awareness of the importance of planning for care near the end of life;

(2) to improve the public’s understanding of the various situations in which individuals may find themselves if they become unable to express their health care wishes;

(3) to explain the need for readily available legal documents that express an individual’s wishes, through advance directives (including living wills, comfort care orders, and other advance directives), taking into consideration the feasibility of a national registry for advance directives, and the constraints created by the privacy provisions enacted as a result of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act;

(4) to educate the public about the availability of hospice care and palliative care.

(b) INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.—The Secretary, directly or through grants awarded under subsection (c), shall provide for the establishment of a national, toll-free, information clearinghouse as well as clearinghouses that the public may access to find out about information regarding advance directive and end-of-life decisions.

(c) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use at least 60 percent of the funds appropriated under subsection (d) for the purpose of awarding grants to public or nonprofit private entities (including States or political subdivisions of a State, or a consortium, or a combination of any of such entities, for the purpose of conducting education campaigns under subsection (a) and establishing information clearinghouses under subsection (b)).

(2) PERIOD.—Any grant awarded under paragraph (1) shall be for a period of 3 years.

(d) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000.

SEC. 6. GAO STUDIES AND REPORTS ON END-OF-LIFE PLANNING ISSUES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH ADVANCE DIRECTIVE REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER ADVANCE PLANNING DOCUMENTS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of making sure patients’ wishes known and honored by health care providers.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General of the United States determines to be appropriate.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ADVANCE DIRECTIVE REGISTRY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the implementation of the amendments made by section 3 (relating to medicare coverage of end-of-life planning consultations).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General of the United States determines to be appropriate.

(c) STUDY AND REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ADVANCE DIRECTIVE REGISTRY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the feasibility of a national registry for advance directives, taking into consideration the constraints created by the privacy provisions enacted as a result of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General of the United States determines to be appropriate.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 348. A bill to designate Poland as a program country under the visa waiver program established under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator MIKULSKI, a bill that would designate Poland as a program country under the Visa Waiver Program under section 217 of the Immigration Nationality Act.

As we celebrate an historic period of the American Revolution. Polish historical figures, such as Pulaski and Tadeusz Kosciuszko during the American Revolution. Polish history provides pioneering examples of democracy and religious tolerance, and this is reflected in their constitution that states, “Freedom of faith and religious belief shall be ensured to everyone.”

The Soviet Union’s communist stranglehold is a more recent example of their dedication to freedom. They are a prime example of Ronald Reagan’s vision to end the Cold War. Last year, when I met with Lech Walesa, the tenacious leader of Poland’s Solidarity movement and former President of Poland, I was reminded of the profound struggle the country endured to bring democracy to their people.

In addition to Poland’s efforts as a global ally, its people have contributed greatly within our borders. Nearly nine million people of Polish ancestry live in the United States. Polish immigrants have played an integral role in the growth of industry and agriculture in Pennsylvania and throughout the United States.

Currently, the United States administers the Visa Waiver Program to citizens of twenty-seven countries. The program allows citizens from Visa Waiver Program countries to visit the United States as tourists, and Poland has earned the right to participate. I believe Poland deserves to be the twenty-eighth country to participate in the program. The 100,000 Polish citizens who visit the United States annually must currently pay a $100 fee to apply for a visa. Many of these applicants are visiting family, often for wedding celebrations or funerals. In an expression of good faith, in 1991 the Polish government unilaterally repealed the visa requirement for U.S. citizens traveling to Poland for less than 90 days.

I am aware of past concerns about Polish visa refusal rates. A closer look shows that refusal rates can be an inaccurate measure because they are based on decisions made by a very short interview process rather than the actual behavior of non-immigrants. Of course, refusal rates do reflect the propensity of nationals from that country to overstay their visas. More importantly, Poland’s refusal rate does not reflect a high propensity for terrorism. The State Department has made no indication that the potential for terrorism in Poland significantly exceeds that of the 27 countries currently participating in the Visa Waiver
Program. Please be assured that I am sensitive to arguments that have concerns about our national security at the core. However, our past history with Polish citizens visiting the United States does not favor this argument.

For all Polish citizens and Polish Americans, I ask through this legislation that Poland be deemed a designated program country for the purposes of the Visa Waiver Program. I ask my colleagues for their support.

I am pleased to have formed a bipartisan partnership with Senator SANTORUM to reintroduce our bill to get it done.

Last fall, Senator SANTORUM and I met with a hero of the Cold War, Lech Walesa. When he jumped over the wall of the Gdansk shipyard, he took Poland and the whole world with him. He told us that the visa issue is a question of solidarity with the father of Solidarity by extending the Visa Waiver program to Poland.

This morning, I had the honor of hosting Poland’s Foreign Minister, Professor Adam Rotfeld. We reaffirmed and strengthened the close ties between the Polish and American peoples. Senator SANTORUM and I heard loud and clear that the visa waiver program remains a high priority for Poland.

My friends, Poland is not some commonality. It is not a country of this world begging for a handout. The Cold War is over. Poland is a free and democratic nation. Poland is a NATO ally and a member of the European Union. But America’s visa policy still treats Poland as a second-class citizen. That is just wrong.

Poland is a reliable ally, not just by treaty but in deeds. Warsaw hosted an international conference on Combating Terrorism less than two months after the September 11 attacks. Poland continues to modernize its Armed Forces so they can operate with the Armed Forces of the U.S. and other NATO allies, buying American F-16s and Shadow UAVs andhumvees.

More importantly, Polish troops have stood side by side with America’s Armed Forces. Polish ships participated in Desert Shield and Desert Storm during the 1990–91 Gulf War. Poland deployed to Bosnia as part of UNPROFOR and IFOR. Poland sent troops as part of the international coalition in Afghanistan.

Polish troops fought alongside American and British and Australian troops from the very end of the war. They are there because they want to be reliable allies. Because they are ready to stand with us even when the mission is risky and unpopular. Today, Poland still commands multinational forces in the South Central region of Iraq. They are there because they want to be reliable allies. Because they are ready to stand with us even when the mission is risky and unpopular.

So why are Singapore and San Marino among the 27 countries in the Visa Waiver program, but Poland is not?

President Kwasniewski raised this issue with President Bush last year and again this week. The President has said this is a matter for Congress. It’s time for us to act.

The bill Senator SANTORUM and I are introducing today will add Poland to the list of designated countries in the Visa Waiver program. That will allow Polish citizens to travel to the U.S. for tourism or business for up to sixty days without needing to stand in line to get a visa. That means it will be easier for Poles to visit family and friends or do business in America. Shouldn’t we make it easier for the Pulaskis and Kosciuszkos and Marie Curies of today to visit our country?

We know that our borders will be no less secure because of these Polish visitors to our country. But we know that our alliance will be more secure because of this legislation.

I urge our colleagues to join us in support of this important bill.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 349. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the district of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that continues my efforts to address a significant problem in the state of New Mexico, a problem that the Judicial Conference of the United States has previously described as a “crisis.” According to the latest survey by the Judicial Conference, the weighted caseload for the District of New Mexico is now the fourth highest in the Nation. This is in spite of the fact that in 2002 Congress approved a temporary judgeship for New Mexico which the President has filled.

Based on the court’s workload, the Judicial Conference recently recommended 2 additional permanent judgeships, as well as an additional temporary judgeship for New Mexico; only 2 districts in California, one in Florida, and one in New York were recommended to get more judgeships than New Mexico. The legislation I have introduced today reflects this recommendation.

In the 12-month period ending on June 30, 2002, the number of criminal filings per judge increased from 22 to 320. This is compared to the national average of 81. You don’t have to be a mathematical genius to figure out that this is just short of four times the national average. During the same time period, the number of weighted filings increased from 673 per judge to 739. The national average is 504 and the Judicial Conference has set the benchmark at 430 weighted cases per judgeship. The District of New Mexico is clearly in need of relief from this crisis.

The Sixth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees the right to a speedy trial in all criminal cases. The United States Supreme Court has called this guarantee “one of the most basic rights preserved by our Constitution.” 386 U.S. 213. We must ensure that our States have the proper judicial resources to guarantee the basic right promised to Americans more than 200 years ago.

The bill that I am introducing provides such necessary resources to New Mexico.

Without additional judges, this problem will only continue to grow as the country focuses more intently on the security of our borders. I hope that my colleagues will act quickly to authorize these necessary additional judgeships for New Mexico.

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

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

S. 349

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO.

(a) PERMANENT DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 2 additional district judges for the district of New Mexico.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table under section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to New Mexico and inserting the following:

“New Mexico ...................................... 8.”

(b) TEMPORARY JUDGESHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the district of New Mexico.

(2) VACANCY NOT FILLED.—The first vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Mexico occurring more than 10 years after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created by this subsection, shall not be filled.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 350. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Assistance for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Developing Countries Act of 2005.

On October 7, 2004, I introduced S. 2939, a bill to improve our ability to provide assistance to orphans and vulnerable children in developing countries. Because of the gravity and urgency of the growing AIDS orphans crisis, I am reintroducing my bill.

The unprecedented AIDS orphan crisis in sub-Saharan Africa has profound
implications for political stability, development, and human welfare that extend far beyond the region. Sub-Saharan African nations stand to lose generations of educated and trained professionals who can contribute meaningfully to their countries’ development. Orphans who have been orphaned by AIDS, many of whom are homeless, are more likely to resort to prostitution and other criminal behavior to survive. Most frighteningly, these uneducated, poorly socialized, and stigmatized young adults are extremely vulnerable to being recruited into criminal gangs, rebel groups, or extremist organizations that offer shelter and food and act as “surrogate” families. It is imperative that the international community respond to this crisis.

An estimated 110 million orphans live in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is rapidly expanding the orphan population. Currently an estimated 14 million children have been orphaned by AIDS, most of whom live in sub-Saharan Africa. This number is projected to soar to more than 25 million by 2010. The pandemic is orphaning generations of African children and is compromising the overall development prospects of their countries.

Most orphans in the developing world live in extremely disadvantaged circumstances. Poor communities in the developing world struggle to meet the basic food, clothing, health care, and educational needs of orphans. Experts recommend supporting community-based organizations to assist these children. Such an approach enables the children to remain connected to their communities, traditions, rituals, and extended families.

My bill seeks to improve assistance to orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries. It would require the United States Government to develop a comprehensive strategy for providing such assistance and would authorize the President to support community-based organizations that provide basic care for orphans and vulnerable children.

Orphans are less likely to be in school, and more likely to be working full time. Yet only education can help children acquire the knowledge and develop the skills they need to build a better future for themselves.

For many children, the primary barrier to an education is the expense of school fees, uniforms, supplies, and other costs. My bill aims to improve enrollment and access to primary school for orphans by supporting programs that reduce the negative impact of school fees and other expenses. It also would reaffirm our commitment to international school lunch programs. Studies have shown that school food programs provide an incentive for children to go to school. School meals provide basic nutrition to children who otherwise do not have access to reliable food.

Many children who lose one or both parents often face difficulty in asserting their inheritance rights. Even when the inheritance rights of women and children are spelled out in law, such rights are difficult to claim and are seldom enforced. In many countries it is difficult for widows, orphans, and even if she has small children—to claim property after the death of her husband. This often leaves the most vulnerable children impoverished and homeless. My bill seeks to support programs that protect the inheritance rights of orphans and widows with children.

The AIDS orphan crisis in sub-Saharan Africa has implications for political stability, development, and human welfare that extend far beyond the region, affecting governments and people worldwide. Every 14 seconds another child is orphaned by AIDS. Turning the tide on this crisis will require a coordinated, comprehensive, and swift response. I am hopeful that Senators will join me in backing this legislation.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations I Committee, Senator LUGAR, in reintroducing the Assistance for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Developing Countries Act. Today, we are reintroducing a bill that we worked on together in the 108th Congress—a bill that will help those most vulnerable to the HIV/AIDS pandemic throughout the world.

An estimated 14 million children have lost one or both parents to HIV/AIDS. By the year 2010, it is estimated that this number will grow to 25 million. The pandemic has created an orphans crisis, especially in sub-Saharan Africa where this crisis is most severe. The struggle of those orphaned by this pandemic is heartbreaking. These children face the trauma of watching their parents die. They are forced at a very young age to care for their younger siblings while suffering from deep poverty, hunger, and disease. A girl from Uganda who lost her parents to HIV/AIDS at age 11 told the BBC:

‘‘When my mother died we suffered so much. There was no food, and there was no one to look after us. We didn’t even have money to buy soap and salt. We wanted to run away to the other grandparents, but we didn’t have transport to get there. I tried to be positive, but it was difficult. I missed my mother because I loved her so much.’’

Picture this story repeated 14 million times throughout the world. We cannot stand by and allow this suffering to continue.

The Lugar-Boxer legislation that is being introduced today is designed to help these orphans and other vulnerable children who have been affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

First, our bill would authorize the President to provide assistance to orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries. Specific authorization is provided in the areas of basic care, HIV/AIDS treatment, school food programs, protection of inheritance rights, and education and employment training assistance.

Second, this legislation calls on the President to use U.S. foreign assistance to support programs that eliminate school fees. Throughout the world, many orphans and other vulnerable children do not attend school because they cannot afford to pay school fees or are forced to financially support their families or care for sick relatives.

And, third, our bill would require the President to develop and submit to Congress a strategy for coordinating, implementing, and monitoring assistance programs for orphans and vulnerable children.

This strategy must include measurable performance indicators to ensure that our policies are effective in helping orphans and vulnerable children.

Once again, Mr. President, I thank Chairman LUGAR for working with me on this bipartisan legislation. I also thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on this issue in the House of Representatives. I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this important bill.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LAUGENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. REED):

S. 351. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protection by limiting the number of mandatory overtime hours a nurse may be required to work in certain providers of services to which payments are made under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join my colleagues, Senators KERRY, CLINTON, SARBANES, CORZINE, MIKULSKI, DODD, LEVIN, LIEBERMAN, FEINGOLD, INOUYE, and AKAKA in introducing the Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act.

Current Federal safety standards limit work hours for pilots, flight attendants, truck drivers, railroad engineers and other professionals, in order to protect the public safety. However, no similar limitation currently exists for the nation’s nurses, who care for so many of our most vulnerable citizens.

The Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act will limit mandatory overtime for nurses in order to protect patient safety and improve working conditions for nurses. Across the country, the widespread practice of mandatory overtime means that over-worked nurses are often providing care in unacceptable circumstances. A recent study from the University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing found that nurses who work 40 or more hours a week are three times more likely to commit an error than nurses who work a standard shift of eight and a half
hours or less. Restrictions for mandatory overtime will help ensure that nurses are able to provide the highest quality of care to their patients.

Some hospitals have already taken action to deal with this serious problem. Over the last few years in Massachusetts, Brockton Hospital and St. Vincent Hospital agreed to limit mandatory overtime as part of negotiations following successful strikes by nurses. These limits will protect patients and improve working conditions for the nurses involved in the recruitment and retention of nurses in the future.

Job dissatisfaction and harsh overtime hours are major factors in the current shortage of nurses. Nationally, the shortfall is expected to rise to 20 percent in coming years. A major goal of the Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act is to improve the quality of life for nurses, so that more persons will enter the nursing profession and remain in it.

Improving conditions for nurses is an essential part of our ongoing effort to reduce medical errors, improve patient outcomes, and encourage more Americans to become and remain nurses. The Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act is a significant step that Congress can take to support better quality care for all Americans, and improve working conditions for our nation’s nurses, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. REED, Mr. DAYTON, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 352. A bill to revise certain requirements for H-2B employers and require certain information regarding H-2B non-immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation that is desperately needed by small and seasonal businesses all over the Nation. These businesses are in crisis. They need seasonal workers before the summer so that they can survive. For many years they have relied on the H-2B Visa Program to meet these needs, but this year they can’t participate in the H-2B program because winter employers get all of the visas for the winter and half for the seasonal help. These are family businesses and small businesses in small communities in Maryland, on the Eastern Shore, in Ocean City or working the Chesapeake Bay. Many of our businesses use the program year after year. They hire all the American workers they can find, but they need additional help to meet seasonal demands. The cap was reached so early this year, for the second year in a row, summer employers face a disadvantage. They can’t use the program, so they can’t meet their seasonal needs and many will be forced to lay-off permanent U.S. workers or, worse yet, close their doors.

But its not just seafood companies that have a long history on the Eastern Shore. It’s companies like J.M. Clayton, what they do is more than a business, it’s a way of life. Started over a century ago and run by the great grandsons of the founder, J.M. Clayton works the waters of the Chesapeake Bay, supplying crabs, crabmeat and other seafood, including Maryland’s famous oysters, to restaurants, markets, and wholesalers all over the Nation. It is the oldest working cranial in the world and by employing 65 H-2B workers the company can retain over 30 full-time American workers.

This legislative fix keeps that visa process, prove they need the seasonal help and only after that are returning employees exempt from the cap. Employers must be those who have left the U.S. and are requesting a new H-2B visa to come back for another season. This new system rewards those who have played by the rules, worked hard and successfully participated in the program. And the bill gives a helping hand to businesses by allowing them to retain workers who they may have already trained to do their seasonal jobs.

Next, this bill creates new anti-fraud provisions. To make sure that everyone is playing by the rules and that no one is misusing the program. And it gives government some teeth to prevent fraud and enforce our nation’s immigration laws. A $150 anti-fraud fee ensures that government agencies processing the H-2B visas will get added resources to detect and prevent fraud. This new bill also prevents anyone who misrepresents facts on a petition further strengthens DHS’s enforcement power. This section also sends a strong message to employers—don’t play games with U.S. jobs. Our bill reserves the highest penalties for employer actions which harm U.S. workers.

And, this bill creates a fair allocation of visas. Now, summer employers lose out because winter employers get all the visas. This bill makes the system fair for all employers. We reserve half of the visas for the winter and half for the summer. Allocating visas ensures that, until a long-term solution is reached, all employers will have an
equal chance of getting the workers that they need.

Finally, the bill adds some simple reporting requirements. So that DHS gives Congress the information it needs to make informed decisions about the H-2B program in the future.

This is a quick and simple fix. It lasts just 2 years—the rest of this year and next. And it does not get in the way of comprehensive immigration reform.

I worked with my colleagues to get a bill with strong bipartisan support, a bill that would work.

This bill is realistic. It provides a temporary solution because immediate action is needed to help these small and seasonal businesses stay in business. Yes, we need to help them now. Their seasons start soon. And if they don't get seasonal workers this year, there may not be any businesses around next year to help.

Every Member of the Senate who has heard from their constituents—whether they are seafood processors, landscapers, resorts, timber companies, fisheries, pool companies or carnivals—knows firsthand in their voices, knows the immediacy of the problem and knows that the Congress must act now to save these businesses. I urge my colleagues to join this effort, support the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act, and push this Congress to fix the problem today.

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

S. 352

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 “Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS ON H-2B WORKERS.
(a) In General.—Section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(a) In General.—Section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit, on an annual basis, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate—

"(A) information on the countries of origin of, occupations of, and compensation paid to aliens who were issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) during the previous fiscal year;

"(B) the number of aliens who were provided nonimmigrant status under such section during both such fiscal year and the preceding fiscal year;

"(C) information maintained by state if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that information maintained by the Secretary of State is required to make a submission described in paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary of State shall provide such information to the Secretary of Homeland Security upon request."

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 352, the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act. This legislation, which I'm proud to co-sponsor, would provide emergency relief to thousands of small and seasonal businesses across the country, many of which are significant employers in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague from Virginia, Senator GEORGE ALLEN. I particularly would like to thank Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI and Senator JUDD GREGG, the sponsors of this bipartisan bill, for their leadership in this area.
Our legislation is simple. It makes common-sense reforms to our H-2B visa program that will allow our small and seasonal companies an opportunity to remain open for business. Without these modifications, these employers will continue to struggle in their efforts to keep the necessary employees to keep their businesses running.

The H-2B visa program is designed to allow nonagricultural businesses to supplement their workforce with non-immigrant workers when American workers are not available. The cap is set at 66,000 per fiscal year, which begins on October 1 of each year. Employers can only apply for a visa 120 days before the work is needed.

For each of the last two years, this statutory cap was reached soon after the fiscal year began. In 2004, the cap was reached on March 20. As a result, many businesses, mostly summer employers, were unable to obtain the temporary workers they needed because the cap was filled prior to the day they could even apply for the visas.

Consequently, these businesses sustained significant economic losses. This year the H-2B visa cap was reached on January 3, 2005. Now, even more importantly, especially in the seafood industry which has a long history in Virginia and the Chesapeake Bay, are susceptible to significant losses.

The hardships in these and other businesses are very real. Many in the seafood industry who came to my office, looked me straight in the eye, and told me that their businesses aren’t going to make it another year if something isn’t done. Only through passage of this legislation can this deteriorated cycle be interrupted and these businesses be saved.

There are three main criticisms of this program which I am certain some will raise: these H-2B workers are taking jobs away from Americans; automation makes H-2B workers unnecessary; and finally, these workers come into the U.S. under the guise of returning home after they’ve finished, but they never do. In my view, these criticisms of the H-2B program simply do not reflect the reality.

Believe me, I am a strong supporter of efforts to help those Americans who want to work get the skills they need to be successful in the workforce. But these H-2B workers are not taking jobs from Americans. They are filling in the gaps left vacant by Americans that don’t want them. The jobs we are talking about here are seasonal, labor-intensive, and require a certain amount of skill, mainly in the areas of oyster and crab harvesting, seafood processing, landscaping, landscaping, and seasonal resorts and other hospitality services.

Furthermore, most of these jobs cannot be automated. What kind of machinery will you use to fully landscape a yard, to arrange and plant flowers? Some in the seafood industry already tried to automate parts of crab harvesting, but it was a complete failure. The machines failed to remove most of the bits of crab shells from the meat, and the consumers flat out rejected it.

As for the criticism that these temporary workers won’t leave, a long review of the management of this program reveals the employers have successfully ensured that the workers return to their home country. If they don’t, employers aren’t able to participate in the program next year, and neither are the workers. Most conclude in their home countries require the sea on a personal level to prove that they have returned home.

The future success of the H-2B visa program rests on the ability of businesses to participate in it, but right now, many will be denied access to the program for the second year in a row. The bill introduced today helps fix this problem by focusing on three main objectives to help make the H-2B program more effective and fair.

First, I’ve been told that good workers and employers by exempting from the cap H-2B workers who have participated in the program successfully in one of the past three years. These are companies and employees that have faithfully abided by the law, and they have a successful track record of working together.

Second, the bill will make sure that the government agencies processing the H-2B visas have the resources they need to detect and prevent fraud. Starting on October 1, 2005, employers participating in the program will pay an additional fee that will be placed in a Fraud Prevention and Detection account. The Departments of State, Homeland Security, and Labor can use these funds to educate and train their employees to prevent and detect fraudulent visas.

Finally, the bill implements a visa allocation system that is fair for all employers. One-half of the visas will be reserved for employers needing workers in the winter and the other half will be reserved for companies needing workers for the summer. This provision allows both winter employers and summer employers an equal chance to obtain the workers they desperately need.

These seasonal businesses just can’t find enough American workers to meet their business needs. And ultimately, that’s why this program is important. Without Americans to fill these jobs, these businesses need to be able to participate in the H-2B program. The current system isn’t treating small and seasonal businesses fairly and must be reformed if we want these employers to stay in business.

In closing, I strongly support this legislation, and I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join with me to help these small and seasonal businesses by passing this legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am proud to be a strong supporter and original cosponsor of the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act, which is being introduced today. This legislation will ensure that the seasonal businesses in our country have the workers they need to support our economy and enable the economy to flourish.

I would first like to thank Senators MIKULSKI and GREGG for bringing such a large, bipartisan group of Senators together to create this legislative solution. Last year, the Citizenship and Immigration Services announced in March that they had received enough petitions to meet the cap on H-2B visas. As a result, they stopped accepting petitions for these temporary work visas halfway through the Federal fiscal year. This announcement was a shock to many businesses around the country that depend on foreign workers to fill their temporary and seasonal positions.

Tourism is the largest sector of Vermont’s economy and as a result, many Vermont businesses hire seasonal staff during their winter, summer or fall foliage seasons. Last year, I heard from many businesses that they were unable to employ foreign workers for their summer and fall seasons because the cap had been reached. Not only was this unexpected, but many of the employees were people who had been returning to the same employer year after year. These employers lost essential staff and, in many cases, well trained, experienced staff.

Many employers told me it is extremely difficult to find Americans to fill these seasonal positions, especially in areas of Vermont where the unemployment rate is less than 2 percent. One Vermont resort only survived Vermont’s fall foliage season because of the dedication of their permanent employees. Instead of 35 housekeeping staff, they made do with 8. Staff was asked to work 12 to 14 hours per day, 6 or 7 days per week. At this particular resort, the vice president, general manager, agriculture, farm technology, managers, and marketing manager all cleaned rooms. While they are proud of the work of their staff, they believe their business and their personnel will suffer if they are not able to employ seasonal foreign workers again this year. They foresee a devastating effect on the family business they have owned and operated for the past 40 years if they are not able to bring in foreign workers.

I have also heard from Vermont businesses that had to lay off or not hire American workers because they could not find enough employees to fill their crews. Without the workers to complete projects, they could not hire or maintain their year-round staff. They also could not bid on projects and many had to scale back their operations. In these instances, the lack of seasonal workers had a direct effect on their economy and it would not hire or maintain their year-round staff. They also could not bid on projects and many had to scale back their operations. In these instances, the lack of seasonal workers had a direct effect on their economy and it would not hire or maintain their year-round staff.
given the opportunity to fill jobs and strengthen our nation’s workforce. However, the companies I have referred to today, and all of the others that have contacted me, did their utmost to find Americans for the positions available. Efforts to find workers included: working closely with the State of Vermont’s Employment and Training office; increasing wages and benefits; and implementing aggressive year-round recruiting.

What I emphasize is that employers are not permitted to hire these foreign workers unless they can prove that they have tried, and failed, to locate available and qualified American workers through advertising and other means. As a safeguard, current regulations require the U.S. Department of Labor to certify that such efforts have occurred before CIS will process the visa applications. In Maine, as in other States, our state Department of Labor takes the lead in ensuring that employers try in vain to find local workers to fill the positions. Unless and until more H-2B visas are made available, many seasonal jobs will remain unfilled and American businesses will suffer.

The current situation that faces Maine’s forest products industry, which contributes approximately $5.6 billion annually to Maine’s economy. In 2003, more than 600 temporary workers—mostly from Canada—were employed as for-}

--

Mr. President, the shortage of non-immigrant temporary or seasonal workers is a problem that must be addressed, and soon. I believe that this anti-fraud fee serves a worthy goal, and that the government agencies should have the resources they need to ensure the integrity of the H-2B visa application process. However, I am concerned about the impact that a fee of this size, in addition to the filing fees that employers already pay, may have on many smaller businesses. I intend to examine this issue further in order to ensure that smaller businesses are not unfairly impacted by this provision.

We must act quickly on this legislation, or we will be too late to help thousands of American businesses that need our help now. We cannot be content to say: ‘It’s too late for this year; maybe next year.’ It is true that comprehensive, long-term solutions may be necessary, but we have immediate needs as well. This problem demands immediate attention.

In my home state of Maine, the economic impact of this visa shortage will be harmful and widespread. When people think of Maine, what often comes to mind is its rugged coastline, picturesque towns and villages, and its abundant lakes and forests. Not surprisingly, tourism is the state’s largest industry. Temporary and seasonal workers play an important role in this very important industry.

Unfortunately, there are not enough American workers willing and able to fill the thousands of jobs necessary to provide the level of service that Maine’s visitors have come to expect. Over the years, seasonal workers have filled this gap, becoming an integral part of Maine’s tourism and hospitality industry. In Fiscal Year 2003, the last time Maine’s employers were able to fully utilize the H-2B program, Maine employers hired more than 3,000 seasonal workers. The majority of these individuals worked in the State’s resorts, inns, hotels, and restaurants. Many are people who have returned to the same employer summer after summer.

Mr. President, the shortage of non-immigrant temporary or seasonal worker visas is a problem that must be addressed, and soon. I believe that this legislation offers a workable short-term solution, and I urge us to move forward. We must resist the tendency to let this problem, and the people who are affected by it, become entangled in the larger debate about our Nation’s
immigration policies. This is not about the number of immigrants we should allow to come to the United States each year, or what to do with those who violate our immigration laws. It is about temporary workers who, for the most part, do not violate our laws, go home at the end of their authorized stay, and in many cases, return again next year to provide services that benefit our Nation's economy. It is about American businesses that rely on these workers to take jobs that many Americans do not want. It is about the economic impact that will be felt across the Nation if these businesses are unable to hire temporary workers. We need to solve this problem now, before it is too late and our economy is harmed and jobs lost.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act being introduced by Senator Mikulski today. This legislation provides a welcome opportunity to provide needed relief to the many small businesses that have been struggling to find enough employees to operate during seasonal spikes in workload. Small businesses that are seasonal often need a large number of employees for a short portion of the year, but cannot afford to retain the same number of people as full-time, year-round employees. They instead must rely on temporary workers to fill the gap in their high season. In my home State of Maryland, for example, our seafood processors are busy in the summer and early fall, but have very little work in the winter. To accommodate this changing need, they hire college students and local residents as extra workers in the summer. But even with those workers they often find themselves short-staffed. So they turn to temporary employees who are willing to leave their home countries for a few months to come to the U.S. and work. Specifically, the bill being introduced today will allow anyone who has had an H-2B visa for one of the last 3 years to return this summer or next if an employer petitions for them to do so. Importantly, employers still must demonstrate that they have tried and failed to find available, qualified U.S. citizens to fill these jobs before they file an H-2B visa application. In addition, the bill would ensure that our summer employers are not disadvantaged by half of the 66,000 visas to be allocated in the first half of the year. Finally, the bill imposes antifraud fees on employers who willfully misrepresent any statement on their H-2B petition and requires the Department of Homeland Security to file reports on the demographics of those utilizing the H-2B program.

Any changes to our immigration laws must balance the interests of U.S. citizens and our economy while providing a fair legal framework for those seeking to come to our Nation from other countries. For example, our current immigration laws already contain several general reasons an alien seeking admission into the United States may be denied entry: security and terrorist concerns, health-related grounds, criminal history, public charge, i.e., indigence, seeking to work without proper labor certification, illegal entry and lack of proper documents, ineligibility for citizenship, and previous removal. Ensuring the safety of our country requires preserving these categories.

This legislation would leave this existing framework intact. It simply provides a fair and equitable means of distributing a very scarce number of visas so that all employers who require extra assistance during one season of the year may obtain that assistance. We must resist the temptation to let the H-2B situation and the small businesses affected by it become entangled in the larger debate over immigration reform. Workers who use H-2B visas come to the U.S. for a temporary period of time and are required to leave when that time period has run. These workers respect our laws, work hard, provide services that benefit our economy, and then return to their families at the end of the season. For their sake and that of the small, seasonal businesses that rely on them, we need to resolve this H-2B crisis soon.

Without this fix, our seafood processors cannot operate at full capacity. That becomes a problem for the rest of the seafood industry, including our watermen, who will be forced to curtail their fishing because of an insufficient number of locations to process their catches. In the end, the people who suffer are not the seafood processors or the temporary workers but the watermen who cannot feed their families. This bill provides the assistance necessary to keep our watermen, seafood processors, and a number of other industries such as landscapers, pool operators, and summer camps working at full capacity for that period of time and are required to leave when that time period has run. These workers respect our laws, work hard, provide services that benefit our economy, and then return to their families at the end of the season. For their sake and that of the small, seasonal businesses that rely on them, we need to resolve this H-2B crisis soon.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 353. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to direct the Secretary of the Army to provide assistance to design and construct a project to provide a continued safe and reliable municipal water supply system for the city of Devils Lake, ND, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a new municipal water supply system for the city of Devils Lake, ND. This project is very important to the reliability of the water supply for the residents of Devils Lake and is needed to mitigate long-term consequences from the rising flood waters of Devils Lake. As many of my colleagues know, the Devils Lake region has been plagued by a flooding disaster since 1993. During that time, Devils Lake, a closed basin lake, has risen 25 feet, consuming land, destroying homes, and impacting vital infrastructure. As a result of this disaster, the city of Devils Lake faces a significant risk of losing its water supply. Currently, six million or approximately one-third of the city’s 40-year-old water transmission line is covered by the rising waters of Devils Lake. The submerged section of the water line includes numerous gate valves, air relief valves, and blow-off discharges.

The city is in the process of accessing a new water source due both to the threat of a transmission line failure and the fact that its current water source exceeds the new arsenic standard that will take effect in 2006. The city has worked closely with the North Dakota State Water Commission in identifying a new water source that will not be affected by the rising flood waters and will provide the city with adequate water to meet its current and future needs.

The bill I am introducing today will authorize the Corps to construct a new water supply system for the city. I believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist communities mitigate the adverse consequences resulting from this ongoing flooding disaster. In my view, the Corps should be responsible for addressing the unintended consequences of this flood and mitigate its long-term consequences. This bill will help the Federal Government live up to its responsibility and ensure that the residents of Devils Lake have a safe and reliable water supply. I urge my colleagues to review this legislation quickly so we can pass it this year.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 355. A bill to require Congress to impose limits on United States foreign debt, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there are many issues we confront these days that are significant and serious. I wanted to bring one to the attention of the Chamber as I introduce legislation. I send a bill to the desk and ask for its appropriate referral on behalf of myself and Senator CLINTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this legislation deals with trade. Let me describe what was announced this morning by the administration.

Last year's trade deficit was $618 billion. You can see from this chart what has happened in the last 8 or 9 years. Our trade deficit has gone in the red by a dramatic amount, ending up at $618 billion for 2004.

What does that mean? That means we purchased from other countries $618 billion worth of goods more than we sold to other countries. In other words, every single day, 7 days a week, $1.8 billion leaves this country and goes into foreign hands to pay for goods that we purchased from abroad.

As a result, foreign entities have $2.5 trillion worth of claims against our assets, our property, our stocks, and our assets. We are, with our trade policies, selling America.

With China alone, we have a $161 billion trade deficit. This is unbelievably out of balance. We purchase China's trinkets, trousers, shirts, and shoes. Now they're making plans to ship Chinese cars to this country.

By the way, as I told my colleagues before, in the last trade agreement with China we agreed they could charge a tariff on imported U.S. cars which is 10 times higher than the tariff we can charge on Chinese cars sold in the United States.

Who did that? I don't know; some trade negotiator.

It is the same old story with cars from thin cars from Korea, wheat to China, beef to Japan. It is the same old story.

I mentioned to my colleagues many times what Will Rogers said in the 1930s: "The United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference." He said we can't send negotiators to Costa Rica and come back with our shirts on. He surely must have been thinking about the people who had been negotiating trade agreements that have pushed our workers into the kind of despair.

Now our trade deficit on a yearly basis is over 5 percent of our gross domestic product. Who holds this debt? Japan holds $715 billion of asset claims against our country, and China, $191 billion.

Does anybody think this is healthy for our country? This kind of trade deficit and combined trade debt is going to injure America's future economic growth and continue to accelerate the movement of jobs overseas. That is what is behind all of these numbers.

American corporations in recent decades have discovered that you can move technology and capital at the speed of light. And they have discovered that you can move hundreds of millions of people in other parts of the world who are willing to work for 30 cents an hour. When you can ship technology and capital to someone overseas willing to work for 30 cents an hour, you begin to hollow out the manufacturing sector in this country.

The news this morning of the largest trade deficit in the history of this country is sober news. This town will sleep through it once again. The White House will sleep through it, and so will the Congress. It doesn't matter much to most people.

We have a debt limit in this country that when we go over it, we have to have a debate, and vote on it. Otherwise, you can't go any further.

But there is no trade debt limit. Whatever the trade debt is, it is, Katy bar the door, no matter how high it is. There is no requirement to do anything about it.

The legislation I introduced, along with my colleague Senator CLINTON, will establish a trade debt limit and a trade deficit limit. When the trade deficit exceeds 5 percent of our gross domestic product, then it requires certain things. It is an alarm clock that requires the administration's trade review group to have an emergency meeting, and within 45 days the administration and Congress have to submit to Congress a plan to reduce the trade deficit.

Somebody somewhere, someday, some way has to decide the current situation can't continue. This is all about jobs and future opportunity. This is real, and it is immediate. And we have to do something about it.

That is why we have introduced this legislation. This country has been in a deep sleep about an abiding trade problem in our other countries in bilateral agreements. In almost every case these are not mutually beneficial. Instead, the agreements are beneficial to them and detrimental to us. Yet, we have people on street corners chanting "free trade."

I think trade is fine, I think fair trade is important, and I think expanding trade is valuable. But I believe free trade, if it means a trade agreement which undercuts this country's ability to compete, free trade which pulls the rug out from under our workers, and establishes conditions under which we cannot compete, is wrong for this country.

I will not go through again the list of issues of potato flukes going to Korea, beef to Japan, wheat to China. I could go through dozens of them. I will not do that again today. My point is that at some point somebody has to have the backbone and the will to reverse the course of this country's economic interests. That has not been done for a long while. It needs to be done now because this trade deficit has reached crisis proportions.

One final chart: Some said that last month the trade deficit was actually a little better than the month before. This is a town of warped reality on a lot of issues. Let me describe what has happened to our trade deficit month by month since 1998. It does not take a sharp eye to see what is happening.

This trade deficit is dangerous. It is dangerous to the long-term economic interests of this country. We have to do something about it.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. MAITREZ):

S. 357. A bill to expand and enhance post baccalaureate opportunities at Hispanic-Serving Institutions; to create a demonstration program for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the next generation of Hispanic Serving Institutions legislation. This legislation is critical if we, as a Nation, are going to continue to compete in a global economy. Education is the key to building a strong and dynamic economy, and therefore, it is our obligation to ensure quality educational opportunities for all Americans. That is why I am introducing, along with my colleague Senator HUTCHISON, the Next Generation Hispanic Serving Institutions Act of 2005.

This legislation is supported by the Hispanic Education Coalition, an ad hoc coalition of national organizations dedicated to improving educational opportunities for more than 40 million Hispanics living in the United States, including groups like National Council of La Raza, HACU, and MALDEF. Senators BILL NELSON and CLINTON have joined in this effort as cosponsors.

According to Census Bureau data, Hispanic population in the United States grew by 25.7 million between 1990 and 2000 and continues to grow at a very brisk pace. The most recent census data puts the Hispanic population at over 40 million, representing approximately 14 percent of the U.S. population and making it the Nation's largest minority group.

Estimates project that the Hispanic population will grow by 25 million between 2000 and 2020. By the year 2050, 1 in 4 Americans will be of Hispanic origin.

Currently, Hispanics make up about 13 percent of the U.S. labor force. While the overall labor force is projected to slow down over the next decades as an increasing number of workers reach retirement age, the Hispanic labor force is expected to continue growing at a fast pace. It will expand by nearly 10 million workers between now and 2020, through a combination of immigration and native-born youth reaching working age.

Our Nation's economic and social success tests, in large part, the level of skills and knowledge attained by our Hispanic population.

I was one of the authors and lead supporters of the original Hispanic Serving Institutions proposal when it was enacted as part of the Higher Education Act in 1992 in order to increase educational opportunities for Hispanic students. Since then, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, HSIs, have made significant strides in increasing the number of Hispanic students enrolling in and completing from Hispanic-serving institutions account for only 5 percent of all institutions of higher education in the United States,
HSIs enroll over half, 51 percent, of all Hispanics pursuing higher education degrees in the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

While Hispanic high school graduates go on to college at higher rates than they did even ten years ago, Hispanics still lag behind their non-Hispanic peers in postsecondary school enrollment. In 2000, only 21.7 percent of all Hispanics ages 18 through 24 were enrolled in postsecondary degree-granting institutions in the United States. This is 11 percentage points below the national average. While the percentage of Hispanics attending college has increased significantly over the past few years, Hispanic students are disproportionately enrolled in 2-year colleges, and are much less likely to finish college than their non-Hispanic peers. In 2001, only slightly more than 1 in 10 Hispanics ages 25 years and over had received a bachelor’s degree or higher.

According to the Department of Education, Hispanics only earned 6 percent of all bachelor’s degrees awarded, 4 percent of all master’s degrees, and only 3 percent of all doctorates. But the pace of bachelor’s degrees or higher earned by Hispanics is accelerating according to the Department of Education. Therefore, we must keep pace. We must increase the capacity of our institutions of higher education to serve the increasing number of Hispanic students.

The Next Generation HSI bill does just that. Simply, this legislation will improve educational opportunities for Hispanic students by establishing a competitive grant program to expand post-baccalaureate degree opportunities at HSIs, and by eliminating unnecessary and burdensome administrative requirements HSIs must contend with.

Current law only provides support for 2-year and 4-year Hispanic Serving Institutions. This legislation will support graduate and postgraduate services for graduate students, facilities improvement, faculty development, technology and distance education, and collaborative arrangements with other institutions. This legislation will build capacity and establish a long overdue graduate program for HSIs.

In addition, current law places a number of unnecessary, burdensome administrative and regulatory barriers at the gates of our HSIs. If our goal is to improve educational opportunities for all students, and particularly Hispanic students, then we must eliminate bureaucratic barriers that impede access.

Accordingly, this legislation removes a 2-year period in which HSIs must wait before becoming eligible to apply for another grant under title V of the Higher Education Act. This 2-year wait period obstructs the efforts of many HSIs to implement continuing programs and conduct long range planning. We must maintain the capacity of our institutions in educational programming. We should be creating opportunities to improve the quality of education, and eliminating this wait-out period is a step in the right direction.

In addition, this bill eliminates another onerous requirement on HSIs that other minority-serving institutions do not require to follow. Currently, in order to be eligible as an HSI, the institution must serve “needy students”—meaning at least 50 percent of the degree students are receiving Federal need-based assistance or the Pell Grant recipient exceeds the median percentage for similar institutions receiving Pell Grants. Also, to be eligible, 25 percent of the full time, undergraduate population must be Hispanic. However, unlike other grant programs in the Higher Education Act, HSIs must also show that 50 percent of the Hispanic population is low income.

This last requirement is particularly burdensome, as it is duplicative and unfair, and, in many cases, prevents Hispanics from providing vital educational services to Hispanic students. This provision requires the institutions to collect information and data that is not readily available or easily acquirable. It requires the schools to come up with “data that is currently not readily available or easily acquirable. Further, there is no other requirement in Federal law for institutions to collect this type of data. As a result, many institutions with large Hispanic student populations must divert critical resources and staff to acquire this information, or they simply do not qualify as an HSI.

To ensure that the institution continues to serve low-income students, the Next Generation HSI Act maintains the requirement that the institution serve needy students, but eliminates the additional requirement that the school demonstrate that 50 percent of its Hispanic students are low-income. The elimination of this requirement will ease the administrative burdens placed on our schools, and further our goals of increasing access and improving quality.

Finally, this bill facilitates the transition of Hispanic students from 2-year colleges to 4-year colleges. As I noted earlier, Hispanics are disproportionately enrolled in 2-year colleges as compared to their non-Hispanic peers. To encourage and support these students to continue their education, this legislation adds an authorized activity programs that assist a student’s transfer from a 2-year institution to a 4-year institution.

Hispanic students now account for nearly 17 percent of the total kindergarten through grade 12 student population. Estimates project that this student population will grow from 11 million in 2005 to 16 million in 2020. We must provide our institutions of higher education with the resources and flexibility to increase capacity and serve the increasing Hispanic student population. We must be ready for the next generation of students to meet the demands of a competitive workforce and to fully participate in the global economy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 357

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 called as the “Next Generation Hispanic Serving Institutions Act”.

TITLE I—GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES AT HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. POSTBACCALAUREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR HISPANIC AMERICANS.

(a) Establishment of Program.—Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1057 et seq.) is hereby expanded to include the following:

(1) by redesignating part B as part C;
(2) by redesigning sections 511 through 518 as sections 521 through 528, respectively; and
(3) by inserting after section 565 the following:

"PART B—PROMOTING POSTBACCALAUREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR HISPANIC AMERICANS"

SEC. 511. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

"(a) Findings.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the United States Census, by the year 2060, 1 in 4 Americans will be of Hispanic origin.

(2) Despite the dramatic increase in the Hispanic population in the United States, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that in 1999, Hispanics accounted for only 4 percent of the master's degrees, 3 percent of the doctor's degrees, and 5 percent of first-professional degrees awarded in the United States.

(3) Although Hispanics constitute 10 percent of the college enrollment in the United States, they comprise only 3 percent of instructional faculty in college and universities.

(4) The future capacity for research and advanced study in the United States will require increasing the number of Hispanics pursuing postbaccalaureate studies.

(5) Hispanic-serving institutions are leading the Nation in increasing the number of Hispanics attaining graduate and professional degrees.

(6) Among Hispanics who received master's degrees in 1999–2000, 25 percent earned them at Hispanic-serving institutions.

(7) Between 1991 and 2000, the number of Hispanic students earning master's degrees at Hispanic-serving institutions grew 136 percent, the number receiving doctor's degrees grew by 85 percent, and the number earning first-professional degrees increased 75 percent.

(8) It is in the national interest to expand the capacity of Hispanic-serving institutions to offer graduate and professional degree programs.

(b) Purposes.—The purposes of this part are:

(1) to expand postbaccalaureate educational opportunities for, and improve the
academic attainment of Hispanic students; and

(2) to expand and enhance the postbaccalaureate academic offerings of high quality that are educating the majority of Hispanic college students and helping large numbers of Hispanic students and low-income individuals complete postsecondary degrees.

SEC. 512. PROGRAM AUTHORITY AND ELIGIBILITY.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of funds appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary shall award competitive grants to eligible institutions.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—For the purposes of this part, an ‘‘eligible institution’’ means an institution of higher education that—

(1) is a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined under section 502); and

(2) offers a postbaccalaureate certificate or degree granting program.

SEC. 513. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

(‘‘Grants awarded under this part shall be used for 1 or more of the following activities:"

(1) Purchase, rental, or lease of scientific or laboratory equipment for educational purposes, including instructional and research purposes.

(2) Construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement in classroom, library, laboratory, and other instructional facilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services.

(3) Purchase of library books, periodicals, technical and other scientific journals, microfilm, microfiche, and other educational materials, including telecommunications program materials.

(4) Support for needy postbaccalaureate students including outreach, academic support services, mentoring, scholarships, fellowships, and other financial assistance to permit the enrollment of such students in postbaccalaureate certificate and degree granting programs.

(5) Support of faculty exchanges, faculty development, faculty research, curriculum development, and academic instruction.

(6) Creating or improving facilities for Internet or other distance learning academic instructional purposes, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services.

(7) Collaboration with other institutions of learning to support the preparation of Hispanic students to obtain postbaccalaureate certificate and degree offerings.

(8) Other activities proposed in the application submitted pursuant to section 514 that—

(A) contribute to carrying out the purposes of this part; and

(B) are approved by the Secretary as part of the review and approval of such application.

SEC. 514. APPLICATION AND DURATION.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any eligible institution may apply for a grant under this part by submitting an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as determined by the Secretary. Such application shall demonstrate how the grant funds will be used to improve postbaccalaureate education opportunities for Hispanic and low-income students and lead to such students' greater financial independence.

(b) DURATION.—Grants under this part shall be awarded for a period not to exceed 5 years.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not award more than 1 grant under this part in any fiscal year to any Hispanic-serving institution.

(b) COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 524(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) is amended by adding—

‘‘Section 512(a) as redesignated by section 502 is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 528(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award competitive grants to carry out part A of this title for fiscal year 2006, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

‘‘(2) ELIGIBILITY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B of this title for fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

‘‘(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 502—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i), by striking ‘‘section 512(b)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 512(b);’’ and

(B) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking ‘‘section 512(a)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 524(a);’’

(2) in section 524(a), by striking ‘‘section 512(b)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 525;’’

‘‘(3) in section 525 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2))—(A) by striking ‘‘section 512’’ and inserting ‘‘section 518’’; and

(3) Title V—Reducing Regulatory Barriers for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

SEC. 505. DEFINITIONS.

Section 502(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ‘‘and’’ after ‘‘after’’ in the first place where it appears; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘and’’ inserting ‘‘and’’ after ‘‘after’’ in the first place where it appears;

(2) in section 521(c)(6) (as redesignated by section 512(a)—(A) by striking ‘‘section 512’’ and inserting ‘‘section 524(a);’’

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

Section 503(b)(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101b(b)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(a) AWARD PERIOD.—The Secretary may award a grant to a Hispanic-serving institution under this title for 5 years.’’.

SEC. 204. APPLICATION PRIORITY.

Section 521(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by section 161(a)(2)) is amended by striking ‘‘(from funds other than funds provided under this title)’’.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that will amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to revise provisions for Hispanic-serving institutions, HSIs, under Title V, Developing Institutions. The changes will expand opportunities in postgraduate education, an essential part of our economy that enables our workforce to maintain the knowledge that keeps our nation at the forefront of science and technology.

The bill will establish a program of competitive grants for HSIs that offer post-baccalaureate certifications or degrees. Grants will support fellowships, services for students, facilities improvement and faculty development, among other things. It authorizes $125 million in grants for fiscal year 2006, and will reduce red tape by eliminating the requirement that an HSI certify half of its students are low-income, thus making it easier for students to transfer from two to four year colleges.

According to the 2000 Census, Hispanics represent the nation’s largest minority population. Unfortunately, too few graduate from high school or college, despite being the fastest-growing ethnicity in that age group. We need more resources to support Hispanic educational opportunities. Hispanic-Serving Institutions are currently educating 51 percent of the 457,000 Hispanic higher education students in the United States. Although HSIs account for 5 percent of all institutions of higher education, almost one-half of the 1.5 million Hispanic students currently in college programs attend them.

Between 1991 and 2000, the number of Hispanics earning master’s degrees grew 136 percent and the number of doctor’s degrees grew 85 percent. Our Nation’s economic strength and prosperity will depend on the knowledge, skills, and leadership of a population that already makes up one of three new workers joining the U.S. labor force today.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have been committed to increasing federal support of HSIs. Since 1990, Title V funding has increased from $12 million to $95 million in fiscal year 2005. I believe this is an important investment to ensure our nation’s youngest and largest ethnic population has access to the educational opportunities needed to excel.

Because I believe the success of Hispanic students will play a critical role in determining this country’s future, I am proud to offer this bill that will improve opportunities for graduate and post-graduate study, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MUKULSKI, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. SARBANS):

S. 358. A bill to maintain and expand the steel import licensing and monitoring program; to the Committee on Finance

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

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

S. 358

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

SECTION 1. MAINTENANCE AND EXPANSION OF STEEL IMPORT LICENSING AND MONITORING PROGRAM.

(a) MAINTENANCE.—The steel import licensing and monitoring program established by the Secretary of the Treasury
and the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Memorandum signed by the President on March 5, 2002 (67 Fed. Reg. 10598 through 10697) (pursuant to the authority of the President under section 202(e) of the Trade Act of 1974), shall, notwithstanding any other action taken by the President under section 201(e) of the Trade Act of 1974 concerning the steel products described in the Memorandum, remain in effect and be established by the Secretary of Commerce as a permanent program.

(b) EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expand the program to include all iron and steel, and all articles of or iron or steel, contained in the following headings and subheadings of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States:
(A) Each of the headings 7206 through 7229 (relating to mill products).
(B) Each of the headings 7301 through 7307 (relating to rails, structural steel, pipe and tubes, and fabricated shapes).
(C) Heading 7308 (relating to fabricated structural steel).
(D) Subheading 7310.10.00 (relating to rails and structural steels).
(E) Heading 7312 (relating to strand and rope).
(F) Heading 7313.00.00 (relating to barbed wire).
(G) Headings 7314, 7315, and 7317.00 (relating to fabricated wire).
(H) Heading 7318 (relating to industrial fasteners).
(I) Heading 7326 (relating to fence posts).
(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce are hereby authorized and directed to take such actions as are necessary—
(1) to maintain the program described in subsection (a) in accordance with such subsection; and
(2) to expand, as necessary and appropriate, such program to provide for the importation of iron or steel, or articles of iron or steel, described in paragraph (2). The import and licensing data made available to the public as part of this program shall be released based upon classifications at the tenth digit level of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(2) IRON AND STEEL DESCRIBED.—The iron and steel, and articles of iron or steel, referred to in subparagraph (A) are the iron and steel, and articles of iron or steel, contained in the following headings and subheadings of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States:
(A) Each of the headings 7206 through 7229 (relating to mill products).
(B) Each of the headings 7301 through 7307 (relating to rails, structural steel, pipe and tubes, and fabricated shapes).
(C) Heading 7308 (relating to fabricated structural steel).
(D) Subheading 7310.10.00 (relating to rails and structural steels).
(E) Heading 7312 (relating to strand and rope).
(F) Heading 7313.00.00 (relating to barbed wire).
(G) Headings 7314, 7315, and 7317.00 (relating to fabricated wire).
(H) Heading 7318 (relating to industrial fasteners).
(I) Heading 7326 (relating to fence posts).

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. VAIOVICH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DODD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BURSTEIN, Mr. BOXER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WDEN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mrs. MURRAY):
S. 359. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain foreign agricultural workers, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H-2A worker program under that Act, to provide a stable, legal agricultural workforce, to extend basic legal protections and better working conditions to more workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have introduced what I believe to be an important piece of legislation that the Senate should pass this year, dealing with an issue that is important on the minds of many Americans and No. 1 on the minds of some Americans. It is on the question of immigration reform and dealing with it in an appropriate fashion, to create a transparency in the laws regarding immigration and identify the 8 million to 12 million undocumented foreign nationals currently in our country.

Over the last 5 years, I have worked in a bipartisan way with many of my colleagues, and literally hundreds of organizations around the country, in focusing on a specific area of immigration, and that is the H-2A area, or those who work in agricultural employment.

What we have discovered over the course of time is a broken system, which in large part now allows the possibility of well over a million foreign nationals working illegally in this country, but working in an economy where they are needed to bring the food products from our fields, to process those products and put them on the shelves of the American consuming public. As a result of that great concern, I, working with my colleague Ted Kennedy in the Senate, with Congressman HOWARD BERMAN and Congressman CHRIS CANNON in the House for some time, have produced legislation that brings all sides of this very diverse and oftentimes very contentious issue together, to therefore be able to offer tonight a piece of legislation that has at this moment nearly 40 Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, supporting it; whereas last year, identical legislation had over 63 Senators, and we believe will have that same support again this year.

Americans, after 911, cried out to the Congress and to our Government, saying: What is wrong? Why were people allowed to come to our country who then turned on us to kill our citizens? Why did we let that happen?

Well, we learned that the immigration policies of our country were largely broken and that the Congress, over years and years, had turned its back on the issue, either not funding immigration appropriately or not enforcing the laws already on the books regarding immigration.

As a result of that, it is now estimated that there are between 8 million to 12 million foreign nationals living in this country, the vast majority of them working and living in law-abiding, peaceful ways, but working here to better themselves and their families for their own human well-being. We did find some who were here to do evil things to Americans.

In the legislation I bring to the floor tonight, in legislation we call the Agricultural Job Opportunity Benefit and Security Act, I focus rather narrowly on what is believed to be about 1.6 million of the total number, to recognize that clearly the vast majority of them are here for peaceful purposes, to better themselves and their families, and, in fact, helping to make our agriculture to work as effectively and efficiently as it does.

Oftentimes, these men and women do work that American citizens do not want to do or who do not have the skills in the hot fields of American agriculture to do day in and day out, dirty, tough work, but seeing it as an opportunity for themselves and an opportunity for their children to have a better life.

In so failing to recognize that need, we have oftentimes caused them to live in the back alleys and the shadows of America in an illegal status, but we still rely heavily on them for the services they provide.

Americans need and expect a stable, predictable, legal workforce in American agriculture, and consumers in our country deserve a stable, safe, domestic food supply. Willing American workers deserve a system that puts them first in line for the jobs that are available and with a fair market wage, and our legislation does that. All workers deserve decent treatment and protection of basic rights under the law, and our legislation does that. American citizens and taxpayers deserve secure borders, a safe homeland, and a government that works, and our legislation helps accomplish those three very important goals.

Yet we are threatened on all fronts because of a growing shortage now of legal workers in American agriculture. Last year, in 2 of the 12 months, we were net importers of agricultural food products. For the first time in the history of our country that happened. I grew up being told—and most of us did—because of our great American agriculture always being able to feed us, we were a secure, safe nation, and our food supply was such that we would never be dependent upon foreign interests to feed the American consumer.

Last year it happened 2 out of 12 months that we grew dependent. This year, USDA tells us that we will break even at about 50-50. There will be no surplus agriculture trade. We will be importing as much as we are exporting, and that will be a historic first for our Nation.

What it tells me, as someone who grew up in American agriculture, is that agriculture as an economy is becoming increasingly fragile. It no longer has the strength or the dynamics it once had. It grows increasingly dependent on the high cost of inputs—energy, equipment, other supplies necessary to produce the bounty of the American farm field. But one of those factors is labor that is stable, labor that you know will be there, and, most importantly, labor that can get the job done at the right time,
when the crop in the field is ripe and ready to harvest. That labor pool is largely undocumented today. It is estimated that anywhere from 72 to 75 percent of those who work in American agriculture today are undocumented foreign nationals. And yet, they toil in the fields, they pick our food, they help prepare it through the processing plants to get it to the consumer’s shelf.

If in our effort to protect our borders and to create a law enforcement community that can apprehend a person who has entered this country illegally, if all of that happens and we do not create a system that stabilizes and provides a legal foreign national workforce, we could literally collapse American agriculture.

We are working at trying to protect our borders. We have invested heavily in it for the last good number of years. We just passed an intelligence reform bill that is a part of the last session of the 108th Congress dealing closely with our borders. Members on the House side are ready to introduce new forms of legislation to tighten up and allow the driver’s license to be come more secure legal documentation—an American citizen versus one who would not be.

I support nearly all of those things because they are the right thing to do for America to reclaim herself and to control her borders. But at the same time, there is a legitimate and responsible need to recognize the importance—the critical importance—of foreign nationals in our workforce helping to provide for our economy.

In the late nineties, we were near 100 percent employment in our country. Anyone who wanted to work could work and was working. Those who were not probably either did not want to or could not. Yet during that time, we were importing an estimated 8 million foreign nationals in our country. That is not a negative, that is the character of a great country. That is the character of a great economy and a strong economy.

It is also that diversity that has produced the great American way, the idea of the American dream, the phenomenal hybrid vigor of a diverse character that is this country and has always been. And American agriculture has been a big part of that. Those who toil in American agriculture have been a big part of that.

What we do today by this legislation is reach out and attempt to recognize those who are here in an undocumented way and cause them to come forward and to be recognized, to have a background check done, to make sure they are not law violators or felons who are here for some other purpose. If they have been here and worked a period of 100 days since January 1, 2005, we will provide for a five-year legal status and then allow them to work and earn the right for permanent work status in our country.

To me, that seems fair and responsible. All of the parties involved in American agriculture today from the workforce to the producer themselves, they, too, agree that is a fair and responsible fashion. It is not giving anything away. It is attempting to correct a major problem in the ground with proper checks. It is making sure we have a legal and legitimate workforce so that as we plug all of these holes and change the character of a broken immigration law, we do so without collapsing the very economy of our country, recognizing that they became too dependent as agricultural producers on a workforce that was not legal.

So we do not just wipe the workforce away. We attempt to identify it, shape it, and cause it to be legal and do so in a responsible fashion. That is clearly what our legislation does. That is why 63 Senators supported it last year, and well over 100 in the House were cosponsors of it. We are working hard at this place, to introduce legislation, to get it to the President’s desk, and recognize that it may be a template, it may be a pilot for others to look at for a more comprehensive approach toward immigration reform.

There is a notion in my mind that our immigration laws are broken, and I am not going to stand here tonight and suggest I have the wisdom to fix it all. But I and others and hundreds of organizations and interest groups from around this country have spent the last 5 years trying to do so.

When we started, many of us were 180 degrees apart. Slowly but surely we came together out of need, the clear recognition of the necessity of providing a legal, recognizable, and stable workforce for American agriculture.

I do not think any citizen in our country would sleep well if they knew that a majority of our foodstuffs were imported, if they knew that we were dependent on foreign nations and their producers for our food supply.

I think they would grow frustrated over the risk that would be at hand there, the stability, the availability, the safety issue. Many have suggested that if we are going to have a terrorist attack against us some day, one of the approaches terrorists might use would be to attack our food supply. If we control our workforce, if we produce it here, the possibility of that happening is considerably lessened. That goes back to the old historic belief that a nation that can feed itself and its people is a nation that is inherently stable, and without question the produce of the American farm has allowed us to be that generation after generation, war after war.

We are now at a very fine point and balance in our Nation’s history where this year we will zero out that old historic belief of stability. We will be importing as much as we are exporting. So American agriculture deserves our attention.

The people who labor there deserve our attention and respect. They deserve to be treated fairly as we would expect all people in our country to be, to have proper conditions and proper wages and to be recognized for the quality of work they do, instead of simply shoving them into the shadows in the back streets of America and denying there are the problems that we need them. That is an interesting contradiction in the current immigration laws in our country and America knows it and has reacted accordingly.

It is why our President says immigration reform is critical and necessary and has proposed ways to accomplish it. It is why it is in the top list of issues and concerns that most Americans hold about what Government ought to be doing to create a safer, stronger America, from controlling our borders to an effective law enforcement system, to assuring that we know those who are within our borders and why they are here and what their intent is.

That is all part of the agricultural jobs bill we introduce tonight, the Agricultural Job Opportunity Benefit and Security Act of 2005.

I am proud that 40 Senators, nearly 50-50 in partisan split, have already endorsed this legislation. We will strive for that number of 60-plus again. In doing so, I will ask my colleagues to help us bring this bill to the floor very early in this session, to debate it, to pass it out, to work with our House colleagues and to put it on the President’s desk. I believe it is a positive and necessary start in marching down the road toward comprehensive immigration reform.

To do anything less than what we are proposing is once again to do the very thing we have done for well over a decade, and that is to turn our back on the problem and the issue, to know it is there but to deny it exists, and then to have a broken system produce the crisis that occurred on 9/11.

We are a better country than that, and this Senate is a more responsible legislative body than that.

So tonight I bring to my colleagues what I think is a major first step in immigration reform necessary and important to protecting our borders, to making sure we are secure at home, to stabilizing a food supply, to assuring that American agriculture has a predictable, stable workforce, and to say to all at hand that those who come here to toil, in the benefit of the American economy, will be treated in a fair, just, and responsible way.

I yield the floor.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. Kerry):

S. 360. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Coastal Zone Environmental Restoration Authorization Act of 2005. I am pleased to have worked with my cosponsor, Senator KERRY, in developing this bill, which will enable our
Nation to improve the way we manage our valuable, yet vulnerable, coastal resources.

More than three decades ago, Congress enacted the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, or CZMA, in response to concerns over growing threats to our Nation’s coastal environments and resources. While this act has been instrumental in facilitating better coastal planning and management, the September 2004 Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy reminded us that the pressures facing our coastal regions have greatly increased since the CZMA was enacted.

America’s coastal zone comprises only 17 percent of the country’s U.S. land area, yet nearly 53 percent of all Americans live in these coastal areas. Attracted by economic opportunity as well as beaches and other recreational amenities, more than 3,600 people are moving to this area each year. This relatively small portion of our country supports approximately 361 sea ports, including most of our largest cities. At the same time, it provides critical habitat for plants and animals, ranging from rare microscopic organisms to commercially valuable fish stocks.

The CZMA established a unique State-Federal framework for facilitating amendments to this act must uphold and strengthen this arrangement. Under the authorities in the CZMA, coastal States can elect to participate in a voluntary Federal Coastal Zone Management Program. The 34 participating States and territories create individually tailored coastal zone management plans, taking their State’s specific needs and problems into account, and then receive Federal matching funds to help implement them. This system respects states’ rights while empowering them to better identify and meet their environmental, social, and economic goals for their coastal areas. As a result of this program’s success, more than half of the United States 95,376 shoreline miles are managed under this system.

Even though our coastal States and territories have benefitted from this vital CZMA program, our coastal areas continue to face increasing demands to expand working waterfronts as well as increasing rates of nonpoint source water pollution. These persistent threats have outpaced the ability of many States to keep up with coastal zone conservation. Although the States are currently taking action to address this problem under existing authorities, the Coastal Zone Enhancement Reauthorization of 2006 would encourage them to take additional voluntary steps to combat these problems through the Coastal Community Program.

The State-Federal Coastal Zone Management Program has a long record of helping States achieve their coastal management goals. The bill I offer today would reauthorize the CZMA and make a number of improvements to strengthen our Nation’s coastal management system. The bill authorizes almost $137.5 million for fiscal year 2006 and initial authorization levels up to $160,000,000 for fiscal year 2010. This increase in funding would enable the States’ coastal programs to achieve their full potential.

Within these authorized funding levels, this bill will do the following:

1. Strengthen the Coastal Zone Enhancement Program’s authority to support it.
2. Provide additional programmatic flexibility required in any year when the overall appropriations increase. I must thank my former colleague, Senator Hollings, for his many years of effort and cooperation in helping us develop this new grant funding allocation language. His leadership and commitment to all ocean and coastal conservation matters continues to guide our efforts today.

The State-Federal Coastal Zone Management Program has a long record of helping States achieve their coastal management goals. The bill I offer today would reauthorize the CZMA and make a number of improvements to strengthen our Nation’s coastal management system. The bill authorizes almost $137.5 million for fiscal year 2006 and initial authorization levels up to $160,000,000 for fiscal year 2010. This increase in funding would enable the States’ coastal programs to achieve their full potential.

Within these authorized funding levels, this bill will do the following:

1. Strengthen the Coastal Zone Enhancement Program’s authority to support it.
2. Provide additional programmatic flexibility required in any year when the overall appropriations increase. I must thank my former colleague, Senator Hollings, for his many years of effort and cooperation in helping us develop this new grant funding allocation language. His leadership and commitment to all ocean and coastal conservation matters continues to guide our efforts today.
Section 306 (16 U.S.C. 1454(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (5); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF FUNDING. —

Section 306(c) (16 U.S.C. 1454(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof "In promoting equity, the Secretary shall consider the overall change in grant funding under this section from the preceding fiscal year and minimize the relative increases or decreases among all the eligible States. The Secretary shall ensure that each eligible State receives an increase in grant funding under this section from the preceding fiscal year of an equal percentage increase of the overall change in grant funding under this section from the preceding fiscal year among all the eligible States. The Secretary shall allocate any funds so allocated in furtherance of the objectives set forth in subsection (b)."

SEC. 8. COASTAL RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 306A (16 U.S.C. 1454a) is amended—

(1) by inserting "or other important coastal habitats" in subsection (b)(1)(A) after "(4)(d)(9)"

(2) by inserting "historic" in subsection (b)(2) after "urban"

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

"(5) The coordination and implementation of approved coastal nonpoint pollution control plans.

(6) The preservation, restoration, enhancement or creation of coastal habitats.

(7) by striking subsections (d), (e), and (f) and inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) Source of Federal Grants; State Matching Contributions.

SEC. 9. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND.

(a) Treatment of Loan Repayments. —

Section 308(a)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1456a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "Loan repayments made under this section shall be retained by the Secretary and deposited into the Coastal Zone Management Fund established under subsection (b); and" and inserting the following:

"(2) Loan repayments made under this section shall be retained by the Secretary and deposited into the Coastal Zone Management Fund established under subsection (b); and"

"(b) Use of Amounts in Fund. —

Section 308(b) (16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end thereof "Subject to Appropriation Acts, amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

SEC. 10. COASTAL ZONE ENHANCEMENT GRANTS.

Section 309 (16 U.S.C. 1456b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(1) and inserting the following:

"(1) Protection, restoration, enhancement, or creation of coastal habitats, including wetlands, coral reefs, marshes, and barrier islands;

(2) by inserting "and removal" after "entry" in subsection (a)(3)

(3) by striking "on various individual uses or activities on resources, such as coastal wetlands and fishery resources," in subsection (a)(6) and inserting the following:

"of individual uses or activities on coastal waters, habitats, and resources, including sources of polluted runoff;"

(4) by striking at the end of subsection (a) the following:

"(10) Development and enhancement of coastal nonpoint pollution control programs;

"(11) Development and enhancement of conditions placed on such programs as part of the Secretary's approval of the programs."

SEC. 5. CHANGES IN DEFINITIONS.

Section 304 (16 U.S.C. 1453) is amended—

(a) by striking "Trust Territories of the Far East," in paragraph (2); and

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

"The term 'coastal nonpoint pollution control strategies and measures' means strategies and measures included as part of the coastal nonpoint pollution control program under section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1455b).

"(b) by striking the term 'qualified local entity' means—

"(A) any local government;

"(B) any area wide agency referred to in sections 3321 of the Open Space and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3334 (a)(1));
“(1) Significant emerging coastal issues as identified by coastal states, in consultation with the Secretary and qualified local entities; and (2) by striking “proposals, taking into account the criteria established by the Secretary under subsection (d),” in subsection (c) and inserting “proposals.”

(6) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); (7) by striking “section, up to a maximum of $10,000,000 annually” in subsection (f) and inserting “section”.

(b) Section 315(b)(2)(C) (16 U.S.C. 1461(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking "research, education, and resource stewardship purposes;" and (8) by striking “research” before “results” in paragraph (3);

(b) by striking “proposals, taking into account the criteria established by the Secretary under subsection (d),” in subsection (c) and inserting “proposals.”

(5) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting “research, education, and resource stewardship purposes;” and (6) by striking “research” before “results” in paragraph (3);

(b) Section 315(b)(2)(C) (16 U.S.C. 1461(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “research, education, and resource stewardship purposes;” and (8) by striking “research” before “results” in paragraph (3);

(b) by striking “proposals, taking into account the criteria established by the Secretary under subsection (d),” in subsection (c) and inserting “proposals.”

(5) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting “research, education, and resource stewardship purposes;” and (6) by striking “research” before “results” in paragraph (3);
nearby agencies, and with the participation of affected Federal agencies, and inserting the following:

Section 316 of the America’s Competitiveness Act of 2005, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking “to the President for transmittal” in subsection (a);

(2) by striking “for fiscal years” in subsection (c)(1) and inserting “to states under this Act:”; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

(4) PURCHASE OF OTHERWISE UNAVAILABLE FEDERAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES.—Federal funds allocated under subsection (a) may be used by grantees to purchase Federal products and services not otherwise available.

SEC. 16. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT REPORTS.

Section 316 of the America’s Competitiveness Act of 2005, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking “to the President for transmittal” in subsection (a);

(2) by striking “for fiscal years” in subsection (c)(1) and inserting “to states under this Act:”; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

(4) PURCHASE OF OTHERWISE UNAVAILABLE FEDERAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES.—Federal funds allocated under subsection (a) may be used by grantees to purchase Federal products and services not otherwise available.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere should re-evaluate the calculation of shoreline mileage used in the distribution of funding under the Coastal Zone Management Program to ensure equitable treatment of all regions of the coastal zone, including the southeastern States and the Great Lakes States.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. INSULL, and Mr. GOODBELL): S. 361. A bill to develop and maintain an integrated system of ocean and coastal observations for the Nation’s coasts, oceans and Great Lakes, to improve warnings of hazardous ocean conditions and quickly assess the effectiveness of financial assistance provided under this title, to ensure equitable treatment of all regions of the coastal zone, including the southeastern States and the Great Lakes States.

This bi-partisan, science-based bill to provide a tremendous public service for our Nation.

As the President, I rise today to introduce the Ocean and Coastal Observation Systems Act of 2005, a bill that would forever change our understanding of the marine environment.

Our ability to understand ocean dynamics took a great leap forward in 2001, when marine scientists and educators launched an innovative partnership known as the Gulf of Maine Ocean Observing System, or GoMOOS, to start gathering a range of ocean data from a large regional scale. This prototype system, which started with ten observation buoys, has transformed how we observe and track ocean conditions over time. The GoMOOS system takes ocean and surface condition data and ensures that near-live data is communicated through a network of linked buoys, and these real-time measurements can be monitored and accessed by the public via the GoMOOS Web site. The unprecedented geographical range and frequency of measurements revolutionized our knowledge about the Gulf of Maine, and GoMOOS continues to provide a tremendous public service for New England.

Of course, the need to access this type of ocean information is not limited to the Gulf of Maine. Our observing systems are planned or developed in other coastal regions, many in conjunction with NOAA, universities, and State agencies. Data from these independent regional systems, however, are often incompatible with data from the Gulf of Maine. The result is, there is a possibility that these systems would be unable to link their data to develop a comprehensive picture of coastal and ocean conditions around the Nation.

The Ocean and Coastal Observation Systems Act of 2006 seeks to rectify this situation by integrating ocean and coastal observation efforts in cooperation with NOAA. This Act would encourage further development of the regional systems, enable their data to be linked through a national network, provide information that anyone could access, and facilitate timely public understanding of our coastal and ocean conditions. It would authorize the National Ocean Research Leadership Council to have general oversight for research and...
development of this national undertaking. This Council would establish an interagency program office that would plan and coordinate operational activities and budgets, and NOAA would be the lead Federal agency charged with ensuring that a national network of regional observation associations, such as GoMoOS and others under development, effectively integrates and utilizes ocean data for the benefit of the American public.

As the U.S. Commission made clear in its final report issued in September 2004, ocean and coastal observations are a cornerstone of sound marine science, management, and commerce, and the potential uses of this system are nearly unlimited. For example, fisheries scientists and managers can use ocean data to better predict ocean productivity and use this information to facilitate ecosystem management. Fishermen, sailors, shippers,Coast Guard search-and-rescue units, and other seafarers can better monitor sea conditions to more safely navigate rough seas. Ocean scientists and regulators can better predict and respond to marine pollution, harmful algal blooms, and other hazards that contribute to other conditions and issue prompt alerts to potentially vulnerable communities. Clearly, anyone who uses and depends upon the ocean stands to benefit from this integrated system.

I am very proud to introduce this bill, and I would like to thank my co-sponsors, Senators KERRY, STEVENS, and INOUYE, for contributing to this legislation and supporting this national initiative. Of course, our current and expanding ocean observation and communication system would not be possible without the work of dedicated professionals in the ocean and coastal science, management, and research communities—they have taken the initiative to build the grassroots regional observation systems as well as contribute to this legislation. Thanks to their ongoing efforts, ocean observations will continue to provide a tremendous service to the American ocean and coastal public.

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

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Ocean and Coastal Observation System Act of 2005.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.
(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Ocean and coastal observations provide vital information for protecting human lives and property from marine hazards, enhancing national and homeland security, predicting weather and global climate change, improving ocean health and providing for the protection of national use, and enjoyment of the resources of the Nation’s coasts, oceans, and Great Lakes.

(2) The continuing and potentially devastating threat posed by tsunamis, hurricanes, storm surges, and other marine hazards requires immediate implementation of strengthened observation and communication systems to provide timely detection, assessment, and warnings to the millions of people living in coastal regions of the United States and their neighbors.

(3) The 96,000-mile coastline of the United States, including the Great Lakes, is vital to the Nation’s prosperity, contributing over $117 billion to commerce in 2000, and supporting jobs for more than 200 million Americans, handling $700 billion in waterborne commerce, and supporting commercial and sport fisheries valued at more than $30 billion annually.

(4) Safeguarding homeland security, conducting search and rescue operations, responding to natural and man-made coastal hazards such as oil spills and harmful algal blooms, and managing fisheries and other coastal activities require improved monitoring of the Nation’s waters and coastline, including the ability to track vessels and to provide rapid response teams with real-time environmental conditions necessary for their work.

(5) While knowledge of the ocean and coastal environment and processes is far from complete, advances in sensing technology and computing have made possible long-term and continuous observation from shore, from space, and in situ of ocean and coastal characteristics and conditions.

(6) Many elements of a coastal observation system in space, ground, and underwater, are in place, but require national investment, consolidation, coordination, and support by Federal, national, State, and local levels.

(7) The Commission on Ocean Policy recommends a national commitment to a sustainable and improved coastal observation system to prioritize research programs in order to assist the Nation and the world in understanding the oceans and the global climate system, enhancing homeland security, improving weather and climate forecasts, strengthening management of ocean and coastal resources, improving the safety and efficiency of maritime operations, and mitigating marine hazards.

(8) In 2003, the United States led more than 50 nations in recognizing the vital importance of timely, quality, long-term global observations as a basis for sound decision-making, recognizing the contribution of observation systems to meet national, regional, and global needs, and strengthening cooperative observation and coordination in establishing a Global Earth Observation System of Systems, of which an integrated ocean and coastal observing system is an essential part.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to provide for—

(1) the development and maintenance of an integrated ocean and coastal observing system that provides the data and information to ensure national security and public safety, support economic development, sustain and restore healthy marine ecosystems and the resources they support, enable advances in scientific understanding of the oceans, and strengthen science education and communication;

(2) implementation of research and development and education programs to improve understanding and protect ocean and Great Lakes ecosystems to achieve the full national benefits of an integrated ocean and coastal observing system;

(3) implementation of a data and information management system required by all components of an integrated ocean and coastal observing system and related research to develop early warning systems; and

(4) establishment of a system of regional ocean and coastal observing systems to address national needs for ocean information.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.
In this Act—
(a) the term “Council” means the National Ocean Research Leadership Council established under section 7902(a) of title 10, United States Code;
(b) the term “observing system” means the term “observational system” as defined in section 7902(a) of title 10, United States Code;
(c) the term “Oceanographic Partnership Program” means the program established under section 7901 of title 10, United States Code;
(d) the term “interagency program office” means the office established under section 4(d); and
(e) the term “Integrated Ocean and Coastal Observation System” means the system established under part I of this Act.

SEC. 4. INTEGRATED OCEAN AND COASTAL OBSERVING SYSTEM.
(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President, acting through the Council, shall establish an integrated system of ocean and coastal observations, data communication, and management, analysis, modeling, research, and education designed to provide data and information for the timely detection and prediction of changes occurring in the ocean and coastal environment that impact the Nation’s social, economic, and ecological systems. The observing system shall provide for long-term, continuous and quality-controlled observations of the oceans, and Great Lakes for the following purposes:

(1) Improving the health of the Nation’s coasts, oceans, and Great Lakes.

(2) Protecting human lives and livelihoods from hazards such as tsunamis, hurricanes, coastal erosion, and fluctuating Great Lakes water levels.

(3) Supporting national defense and homeland security efforts.

(4) Understanding the effects of human activities and natural variability on the state of the coasts and oceans and the Nation’s socioeconomic well-being.

(5) Tracking, explaining, and predicting environmental changes.

(6) Providing for the sustainable use, protection, and enjoyment of ocean and coastal resources.

(7) Providing a scientific basis for implementation and refinement of ecosystem-based management.

(8) Educating the public about the role and importance of the oceans and Great Lakes in daily life.

(9) Tracking and understanding climate change and the ocean and Great Lakes roles in it.

(10) Supplying critical information to marine-related businesses such as marine transportation, aquaculture, fisheries, and offshore energy production.

(11) Supporting research and development to ensure continuous improvement of ocean and coastal observations systems and to enhance understanding of the Nation’s ocean and coastal resources.

(b) SYSTEM ELEMENTS.—In order to fulfill the purposes of this Act, the observing system shall consist of the following program elements:

(1) A national program to fulfill national observation priorities, including the Nation’s contribution to the Global Earth Observation System of Systems and the Global Ocean Observation System.
(2) A network of regional associations to manage the regional ocean and coastal observing and information programs that collect, measure, and disseminate data and information to meet regional and national needs;

(3) A data management and communication system for the timely integration and dissemination of data and information products for regional and national purposes;

(4) A research and development program conducted under the guidance of the Council.

An outreach, education, and training program shall exist and be conducted by existing programs, such as the National Sea Grant College Program and the Centers for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence program, to ensure the use of information for fostering public education and awareness of the Nation’s oceans and building the technical expertise required to operate and improve the observing system.

(c) COUNCIL FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out responsibilities under this section, the Council shall—

(1) serve as the oversight body for the design and implementation of all aspects of the observing system;

(2) adopt plans, budgets, and standards that are developed and maintained by the interagency program office in consultation with the regional associations;

(3) coordinate the observing system with other earth observing activities including the Global Earth Observation System of Systems;

(4) coordinate and administer programs of research and development and education to support improvements to and the operation of an integrated ocean and coastal observing system and to advance the understanding of the oceans;

(5) establish pilot projects to develop technology and methods for advancing the development of the observing system;

(6) support the development of institutional mechanisms to further the goals of the program and provide for the capitalization of the required infrastructure;

(7) provide, as appropriate, support for and representation on United States delegations to international meetings on ocean and coastal observing programs, including those under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission involving Canadian waters; and

(8) in consultation with the Secretary of State, coordinate relevant Federal activities with those of other nations.

(d) INTERAGENCY PROGRAM OFFICE.—The Council shall establish an interagency program office to be known as “OceanUS”. The interagency program office shall be responsible for program planning and coordination of the observing system. The interagency program office shall—

(1) prepare annual and long-term plans for consideration by the Council for the design and implementation of the observing system that promote collaboration among Federal agencies and regional associations in developing the global and national observing systems, including identification and refinement of a core set of variables to be measured by all systems;

(2) coordinate the development of agency priorities for activities and investments for implementation of the observing system, including budgets for the regional associations;

(3) establish and refine standards and protocols for implementation of the observing system, including quality standards, in consultation with participating Federal agencies and regional associations;

(4) improve or certify the regional associations and their periodic review and recertification; and

(5) establish an external technical committee to provide biennial review of the observing system.

(e) LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY.—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall be the lead Federal agency for implementation and operation of the observing system. Based on the plans prepared by the interagency program office and adopted by the Council, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall—

(1) coordinate implementation, operation and improvement of the observing system;

(2) establish efficient and effective administrative and financial systems for fund distribution among Federal agencies and regional associations in a timely manner and according to the budget adopted by the Council;

(3) implement and maintain appropriate elements of the observing system;

(4) provide for the migration of scientific and technological advances from research and development to operational deployment;

(5) integrate and extend existing programs and pilot projects into the operational observation system; and

(6) certify regional associations that meet the requirements of subsection (f).

(f) REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF OCEAN AND COASTAL OBSERVING SYSTEMS.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration may certify one or more regional associations to be responsible for the development and operational regional ocean and coastal observing systems to meet the information needs of user groups in the region while adhering to national standards. To be certifiable by the Administrator, a regional association shall—

(1) demonstrate an organizational structure capable of supporting and integrating the local and national observing and information programs within a region;

(2) operate under a strategic operations and business plan that details the operation and support of regional ocean and coastal observing systems pursuant to the standards established by the Council;

(3) provide information products for multiple users in the region;

(4) work with governmental entities and programs at all levels within the region to provide timely warnings and outreach and education to the public; and

(5) meet certification standards developed by the interagency program office in conjunction with the regional associations and approved by the Council.

(g) CIVIL LIABILITY.—For purposes of section 1386(b)(1) and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, the Suites in Admira lity Act (46 U.S.C. App. 741 et seq.), and the Public Vessels Act (46 U.S.C. App. 781 et seq.), any regional ocean and coastal observing system that is a designated part of a regional association certified under this section shall, in carrying out the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and any employee of such system, while acting within the scope of his or her employment in carrying out such purposes, shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government.

SEC. 5. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION.

The Council shall establish programs for research and development and education for the ocean and coastal observing system, including projects under the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, consisting of the following:

(1) Basic research to advance knowledge of ocean and coastal systems and ensure continued support of national products, including related infrastructure and observing technology.

(2) Focused research projects to improve understanding of the relationship between the coasts and oceans and human activities.

(3) Large scale computing resources and research advancement programs to advance modeling of ocean and coastal processes.

(4) A coordinated effort to build public education and awareness of the ocean and coastal observing system and to support improvements to and the operation and development of existing programs, including related infrastructure and observing technology.

(5) A data management and communication system for the timely integration and dissemination of data and information that augments existing programs, and the Centers for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence.

(6) Interagency financial support for the implementation of ongoing activities such as the National Sea Grant College Program and the Centers for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence.

SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY FINANCING.

The departments and agencies represented on the Council are authorized to participate in interagency financing and share, transfer, receive, obligate, and expend funds appropriated to any member of the Council for the purpose of carrying out any administrative or programmatic project or activity under this Act or under the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, including support for the interagency program office, a common infrastructure, and system integration for a ocean and coastal observing system. Funds may be transferred among such departments and agencies through an appropriate instrument that specifies the goods, services, or space being acquired from other Council member and the costs of the same.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the implementation of an integrated ocean and coastal observing system under section 4, and the research and development program under section 5, including financial assistance to the interagency program office, the regional associations for the implementation of regional ocean and coastal observing systems, and the departments and agencies represented on the Council, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. At least 50 percent of the sums appropriated for the implementation of the integrated ocean and coastal observing systems under section 4 shall be allocated to the region associations certified under section 4(f) for implementation of regional ocean and coastal observing systems. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than March 31, 2010, the President, acting through the Council, shall transmit to Congress reports on programs established under sections 4 and 5. The report shall include a description of activities carried out under the programs, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs, and recommendations concerning reauthorization of the programs and funding levels for the programs in succeeding fiscal years.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 362. A bill to establish a program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the United States Coast Guard to help identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent marine debris and its adverse impacts on the marine environment and navigation safety, in cooperation with Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
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RESEARCH AND REDUCTION ACT
Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Marine Debris Re- search and Reduction Act. From the shore, our oceans seem vast and limitless, but I fear that we often overlook the impacts our actions have on the sea and its resources. The Act that I am introducing today with my friends and colleagues, Senators STEVENS, CANTWELL, SNOWE, KERRY, and LAUTEN- BEERG, focuses on one particular impact that goes unnoticed by many: marine debris. I am proud to say that the Senate unanimously passed this bill in the 108th Congress, and we look for swift action on this legislation again this year.

In a high-tech era of radiation, carcinogenic chemicals, and human-in- duced climate change, the problem of the trash produced by ocean-going ves- sels or litter swept out to sea must seem old-fashioned by comparison. Sea garbage would seem to be a simple issue that must rise to the top- iority level of the stresses our 21st cen- tury civilization places on the natural environment.

Regrettably, that perception is wrong. While marine debris includes con- verted fishing gear, it also includes a vast array of additional materials. It is discarded or lost fishing gear. It is cargo washed overboard. It is aban- doned equipment from our commercial fleets. Nor does the “low-tech” nature of some of its debris imply an impact on the creatures of the sea. Whether an animal dies from a immune system weakened by toxic chemicals, or drowns entangled in a discarded fishing net, the result is the same—and in many cases, preventable.

Global warming, disease, and toxic contamination of our seas has already stressed these fragile ecosystems. These threats have been described in last year’s Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, which also dedicated an entire chapter to the threats posed by marine debris. The bill we introduce today adopts the measures recommended by the Commission to help remove man-made marine debris from the list of ocean threats. It also follows the rec- ommendations of the International Ma- rine Debris Conference held in my home State of Hawaii in 2000.

The bill establishes a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program within the National Oceanic and At- mospheric Administration, NOAA, di- rects the U.S. Coast Guard to improve enforcement of laws designed to pre- vent ship-based pollution from plastics and other garbage, reinvigorates an interagency committee on marine debris, and improves our research and in- formation on marine debris sources, threats, and prevention.

In Hawaii, we are able to see the im- pacts of marine debris more clearly than most because of the convergence caused by the North Pacific Tropical High. Atmospheric forces cause ocean surface currents to converge on Ha- walli, bringing with them the vast amount of debris floating throughout the Pacific. Since 1996, a total of 484 tons of debris have been removed from coral reefs in the Northwestern Hawai- ian Islands, which is also home to many endangered marine species. But the job is not done because more arr- ives daily. In 2004 alone, the program removed over 125 tons of debris.

I am pleased that the coordinated ap- proach taken to address the threats posed by marine debris, particularly in the western Hawaiian Islands has provided a model for the nation. NOAA’s Pacific Islands Region Fisheries Science Center is leading this interagency partner- ship, which also includes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hawaii’s business and university communities, and conser- vation groups. Not only have we re- moved debris that poses hazard to en- dangered species, but with the help of donated services, we have recycled the abandoned nets into energy to power residential homes.

We have learned that our best path to success lies in partnering with one another to share resources, and it is my hope that others may adopt our project to the extent that increased partnership and funding opportunities set forth in this bill. This is why the bill strengthens and reestablishes an Interagency Committee on Marine De- bris to coordinate marine debris pre- vention and removal efforts among federal agencies state governments, uni- versities, and nongovernmental organi- zations.

We must also bear in mind that no matter how zealously we reform our practices, the ultimate solution lies in international cooperation. The oceans connect the coastal nations of the world, and we must work together to reduce this increasing threat to our seas and shores. The Marine Debris Re- search and Reduction Act will provide the U.S. Government the means to de- velop effective marine debris preven- tion and removal programs on a world- wide basis, including reporting and in- formation requirements that will assist in the creation of an international ma- rine debris database.

Mr. President, I hope you will join me in supporting enactment of the Ma- rine Debris Research and Reduction Act. This bill will provide the United States with the programs and re- sources necessary to protect our most valuable resources, our oceans. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record.

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

S. 362
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep- resentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Marine Debris Research Prevention and Reduction Act.”

SEC. 2. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Preven- tion and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Preven- tion and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

(a) MAPPING, IDENTIFICATION, IMPACT ASSESSMENT, REMOVAL, AND PREVENTION.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with relevant Federal agencies responsible for marine debris mapping, identification, impact assess- ment, prevention, and removal efforts, with a focus on marine debris posing a threat to endangered or protected species) and naviga- tion safety, including—

(1) the oceans, which comprise nearly three quarters of the Earth’s surface, are an important source of food and provide a wealth of other natural products that are essential to the economy of the United States and the world.

(2) Ocean and coastal areas are regions of remarkably high biological productivity, are home to many recreational and commercial activities, and provide a vital means of transportation.

(3) Ocean and coastal resources are limited and susceptible to changes as a direct and ind- direct result of human activities, and such changes can impact the ability of the ocean to provide the benefits upon which the Na- tion depends.

(4) Marine debris, including plastics, drow- ners, or animals entangled in a discarded fishing net, the result is the same—and in many cases, preventable.

(5) Marine debris is also a hazard to navi- gation, putting mariners and rescuers, their vessels, and consequently the marine envi- ronment at risk, and can cause economic loss due to entanglement of vessel systems.

(6) Modern plastic materials persist for decades in the marine environment and therefore pose the greatest potential for long-term damage to the marine environment.

(7) Insufficient knowledge and data on the source, movement, and effects of plastics and other marine debris in marine ecosystems have hindered efforts to develop effective strategies for addressing marine debris.

(8) Lack of resources, inadequate attention to this issue, and poor coordination at the Federal level has undermined the develop- ment and implementation of a Federal pro- gram to address marine debris, both domesti- cally and internationally.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish programs within the Na- tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra- tion and the United States Coast Guard to help identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent marine debris and its ad- verse impacts on the marine environment and navigation safety, in coordination with other Federal and non-Federal entities;

(2) to re-establish the Inter-agency Marine Debris Coordinating Committee to ensure a coordinated government response across Federal agencies;

(3) to develop a Federal information clear- iance to enable researchers to study the sources and impact of marine debris more efficiently; and

(4) to take appropriate action in the inter- national community to prevent marine de- bris and reduce concentrations of existing debris on a global scale.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.

SEC. 3. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PREVENTION AND REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—There is established, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Marine Debris Prevention and Removal Program to re- duce and prevent the occurrence and adverse impacts of marine debris on the marine envi- ronment and navigation safety.
The Administrator shall improve efforts and actively seek to prevent and reduce fishing gear losses, as well as to reduce adverse impacts of such gear on living marine resources, safety, and the environment. To achieve this goal, the Administrator shall:

1. Conduct and support activities to reduce the loss and discard of fishing gear, and to aid its recovery, such as incentive programs, reporting loss and recovery of gear, observer programs, toll-free reporting, and computer-based detection and identification, and providing adequate and free disposal receptacles at ports.

2. Outreach. The Administrator shall undertake outreach and education of the public and other stakeholders, such as the fishing industry, fishing gear manufacturers, and other marine-dependent industries, on sources, magnitude of threats, and impacts of gear and approaches to identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent gear loss and its adverse impacts on the marine environment and navigational safety. Including outreach and education activities through public-private initiatives. The Administrator shall coordinate these outreach and education activities under this paragraph with any outreach programs conducted under section 2204 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1905).

3. Grants.—

   (1) In general.—The Administrator shall provide financial assistance, in the form of grants, to the Marine Debris Collection and Removal Program for projects to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

   (2) 50 percent matching requirement.—

   (A) In general.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), Federal funds for any project under this section may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of such project. For purposes of this subparagraph, the non-Federal share of project costs may be provided by in-kind contributions and other noncash support.

   (B) Waiver.—The Administrator may waive all or part of the matching requirement under subparagraph (A) if the Administrator determines that no reasonable means are available which applicants can meet the matching requirement and the probable benefit of such project outweighs the public interest in such matching requirement.

   (3) Amounts paid and services rendered under consent.—

   (A) Consents and orders.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this Act may include money paid pursuant to, or the value of any in-kind service performed under, an administrative order on consent or judicial consent order that will remove or prevent marine debris.

   (B) Other decrees and orders.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this Act may not include any money paid pursuant to, or the value of any in-kind service performed under, any other administrative order or court order.

4. Eligibility.—Any marine debris project under this Act, supported by Federal or other governmental authority whose activities are directly or indirectly related to plastic and other debris, and any educational or non-governmental organizations with demonstrated expertise in a field related to marine debris, are eligible to submit to the Administrator a marine debris proposal under the grant program.

5. Grant criteria and guidelines.—Within 180 days after enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations implementing the provisions of the grant program, including criteria and priorities for grants. Such priorities may include proposals that would reduce new sources of marine debris and provide additional benefits to the public, such as recycling of marine debris or use of biodegradable materials. In developing those guidelines, the Administrator shall consult with:

   (A) the Interagency Marine Debris Committee;

   (B) regional fishery management councils established under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S. C. 1901 et seq.);

   (C) State, regional, and local governmental entities with marine debris experience;

   (D) marine-dependent industries;

   (E) non-governmental organizations involved in marine debris research, prevention, or removal activities.

6. Project review and approval.—

   (A) Provide for external merit-based peer review of the proposal;

   (B) after considering any written comments and recommendations based on the review, approve or disapprove the proposal; and

   (C) provide written notification of that approval or disapproval to the person who submitted the proposal.

7. Project reporting.—

   (A) Provide for periodic reports as required by the Administrator. Each report shall include all information required by the Administrator for evaluating the progress and success in meeting its stated goals, and impact on the marine debris problem.

8. Coast Guard Program.

   The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall, in cooperation with the Administrator, undertake measures to reduce violations of MARPOL Annex V and the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) with respect to the discard of plastics and other garbage from vessels. The measures shall include:

   (1) Development of a strategy to improve monitoring and enforcement of current laws, as well as recommendations for statutory or regulatory changes to improve compliance and for the development of any appropriate amendments to MARPOL.

   (2) Regulations to address representation gaps with respect to the requirement of MARPOL Annex V and section 6 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) that all United States ports and terminals maintain receptacles for disposing of plastics and other garbage, which may include measures to ensure that a sufficient quantity of such facilities exist at all such ports and terminals, requirements for logging the waste received, and for Coast Guard coordination with States and port log books to determine compliance.

   (3) Regulations to close record keeping gaps, which may include requiring fishing vessels under 400 gross tons entering United States ports to maintain records subject to Coast Guard inspection on the disposal of plastics and other garbage, that at a minimum, include the time, date, type of garbage, quantity, and location of discharge by latitude and longitude, or, if discharged on land, the name of the port where such materials were disposed for disposal.

   (4) Program to improve ship-board waste management, which may include expanding to smaller vessels existing requirements to maintain ship-board records to maintain a ship-board waste management plan, taking into account potential economic impacts and technical feasibility;

   (5) Development of outreach to encourage United States flag vessels to follow the Interagency Marine Debris Committee, the United States ports to maintain records subject to Coast Guard inspection on the disposal of plastics and other garbage, that at a minimum, include the time, date, type of garbage, quantity, and location of discharge by latitude and longitude.

   (6) A voluntary program encouraging United States flag vessels to voluntarily report to the Coast Guard of any ports in other countries that lack adequate port reception facilities for garbage.

9. Interagency Coordination.

   (A) Interagency Marine Debris Committee Established.—There is established an Interagency Committee on Marine Debris to coordinate a comprehensive program of marine debris research and activities among Federal agencies, industry, non-governmental organizations, and other nations, in an effort to enhance international efforts and to foster cost-effective mechanisms to identify, determine sources of, assess, reduce, and prevent marine debris, and its adverse impact on the marine environment and navigational safety, including the joint funding of research and mitigation and prevention strategies.

   (B) Membership.—The Committee shall include:

   (1) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which shall serve as the chairperson of the Committee;

   (2) the United States Coast Guard;

   (3) the United States Environmental Protection Agency; and

   (4) the United States Navy;

   (5) the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation;

   (6) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

   (7) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

   (8) the Department of State;

   (9) the U.S. Marine Mammal Commission; and

   (10) such other Federal agencies that have an interest in ocean issues or water pollution prevention and control as the Administrator determines appropriate.

   (C) Meetings.—The Committee shall meet at least twice a year to provide a public,
interagency forum to ensure the coordination of national and international research, monitoring, education, and regulatory actions addressing the persistent marine debris problem.

(d) DEFINITION.—The Committee shall develop and promulgate through regulation a definition of the term “marine debris.”

(e) REPORTING.—

(1) INTERAGENCY REPORT ON MARINE DEBRIS IMPACTS AND STRATEGIES.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee, through the chairperson, and in cooperation with the coastal States, Indian tribes, local governments, and non-governmental organizations, shall complete and submit to the Congress a report identifying the source of marine debris, examining the ecological and economic impact of marine debris, including measures for reducing, mitigating, preventing, and controlling the harmful effects of marine debris, the social and economic costs and benefits of such alternatives, and recommendations regarding both domestic and international marine debris issues.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall provide recommendations on—

(A) establishing priority areas for action to address leading problems relating to marine debris;

(B) developing an effective strategy and approaches to preventing, reducing, removing, and controlling marine debris, including through private-public partnerships;

(C) providing appropriate infrastructure for effective implementation and enforcement of measures to prevent and remove marine debris, especially the discard and loss of fishing gear;

(D) establishing effective and coordinated educational and outreach activities;

(E) ensuring Federal cooperation with, and assistance to, the coastal States (as defined in section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4))), Indian tribes, and local governments in the identification, determination of sources, prevention, reduction, management, mitigation, and control of marine debris and its adverse impacts.

(3) ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act and biennially thereafter, the Committee, through the chairperson, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report that evaluates United States and international progress in meeting the purposes of this Act. The report shall include—

(A) the status of implementation of the recommendations of the Committee and analysis of their effectiveness;

(B) a summary of the marine debris inventory to be maintained by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(C) a review of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration programs authorized by section 3 of this Act, including projects funded and accomplishments relating to reduction and prevention of marine debris;

(D) a review of United States Coast Guard programs and accomplishments relating to marine debris removal, including enforcement activities and the development of MARPOL requirements; and

(E) estimated Federal and non-Federal funding provided for marine debris and recommendations for priority funding needs.

(f) MONITORING.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall utilize the marine debris data derived under this Act and title V of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) to—

(1) the Committee in ensuring coordination of research, monitoring, education, and regulatory actions;

(2) the United States Coast Guard in assessing the effectiveness of this Act and the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) and implementing measures to prevent pollution from ships under section 2201 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1213); and

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2203 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1214) is repealed.

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

The Interagency Marine Debris Committee shall develop a strategy and pursue in the International Maritime Organization and other appropriate international and regional forums, international action to reduce the incidence of marine debris, including—

(1) the inclusion of effective and enforceable marine debris prevention and removal measures in international and regional agreements, including fisheries agreements and maritime agreements;

(2) measures to strengthen and to improve compliance with MARPOL Annex V;

(3) national reporting and information requirements that will assist in improving information collection, identification and monitoring, and incident reporting; and

(4) the establishment of an international database, consistent with the information clearinghouse established under section 7, that will provide current information on location, source, prevention and removal of marine debris;

(5) the establishment of public-private partnerships and sources for pilot programs that will assist in implementation and compliance with marine debris requirements in international agreements and guidelines;

(6) the identification of possible amendments to and provisions in the International Maritime Organization Guidelines for the Implementation of Annex V of MARPOL for potential inclusion in Annex V; and

(7) when appropriate assist the responsible Federal agency in bilateral negotiations to effectively prevent marine debris.

SEC. 7. FEDERAL INFORMATION CLEARING-HOUSE.

The Administrator, in coordination with the Committee, shall maintain a Federal information clearinghouse for marine debris that will be available to researchers and other interested parties to improve source identification, data sharing, and monitoring efforts through collaborative research and open sharing of data. The clearinghouse shall include—

(1) standardized protocols to map locations of commercial fishing and aquaculture activities using Geographic Information System techniques;

(2) a world-wide database which describes fishing gear and equipment, and fishing practices, including information on gear types and specifications;

(3) guidance on the identification of types of fishing gear fragments and their sources developed in consultation with persons of relevant expertise; and

(4) the data on mapping and identification of marine debris to be developed pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of this Act.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) COMMITTEE.—The term “Committee” means the Interagency Marine Debris Committee established by section 5 of this Act.

(3) UNITED STATES EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.—The term “United States exclusive economic zone” means the zone established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 5030, dated March 10, 1983, including the special areas identified in section 2 of “eastern special areas” in Article 1(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990.

(4) MARPOL, ANNEX V; CONVENTION.—The terms “MARPOL,” “Annex V,” and “Convention” mean the maritime terms in paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 2(a) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901(a)).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year 2006 through 2010—

(1) to the Administrator for the purpose of carrying out sections 3 and 7 of this Act, $10,000,000, of which no more than 10 percent may be for administrative costs; and

(2) to the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, for the purpose of carrying out sections 3 and 7 of this Act, $10,000,000, of which no more than 10 percent may be for administrative costs.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. AKaka, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 383. A bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to establish vessel ballast water management requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ballast Water Management Act of 2005. I am joined by my friend and colleague, Senator TED STEVENS, for some time we have recognized the impacts of land-based invasive species. In Hawaii, the impact of such invasive species have been among the most significant in the country.

While not as visible, invasive species pose an equally great threat. One of the major ways that aquatic invasives make their way around the globe is through the ballast water used by vessels.

Modern maritime commerce depends on ships stabilized by the uptake and discharge of huge volumes of ocean water for ballast. Regrettably, ships do not just transport people—but also the plants and animals, as well as human diseases such as cholera, that it contains. An estimated 10,000 aquatic organisms travel around the globe each day in the ballast water of cargo vessels. Over 2 billion gallons of ballast water are discharged into waters of the United States each year.

From the zebra mussel fouling the facilities and shores of the Great Lakes, to the noxious algae that choke the coral reefs of Hawaii, aquatic invasive species pose a separate threat to marine ecosystems and human health. The economic costs are also staggering—the direct and indirect costs of...
The direct and indirect costs of aquatic invasive species to the economy of the United States amount to billions of dollars each year.

We must find an effective solution to this problem, while at the same time ensuring that our maritime industry can continue to be a cost-effective manner. We will need to rely on the steady collaborative efforts of industry, science, government, and coastal communities as we move forward.

The bill I introduce today lays the foundation for such progress. It establishes standards for ballast water treatment that will be effective but on a schedule that our maritime fleet can realistically achieve. It recognizes safety as a paramount concern, and allows flexibility in ballast exchange practices to safeguard vessels and their passengers and crew. Looking to the future, my bill will also encourage the development and adoption of new ballast water treatment technologies, as well as innovative technologies to address other vessel sources of invasives such as hull fouling, through a grant program.

The bill closely tracks and is consistent with an agreement recently negotiated in the International Maritime Organization (IMO) phase II ballast water treatment requirements on the same schedule as that adopted by the IMO agreement, and require ballast water exchange to be used until treatment systems are in place. Importantly, the international agreement includes a provision assuring that parties can adopt more stringent measures than those included in the agreement. This provision was sought by the United States and is important to assure the sovereignty of nations in addressing their needs while striving for international cooperation. In light of this provision, the bill includes a standard for treatment that is more effective than that adopted by the international community to ensure that the impacts in the United States are adequately prevented.

Finally, the bill would require a report on other vessel pathways of invasive species, including hull fouling, and the development of standards to reduce the introduction of invasive species through such pathways. This issue is particularly important for Hawaii. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill. I ask unanimously that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

(A) vessels to which section applies.—
"(1) In general.—This section applies to a vessel that is designed or constructed to carry ballast water; and

(A) a vessel of the United States (as defined in section 2101(46) of title 46, United States Code); or

(B) a vessel that—

(i) is en route to a United States port; or

(ii) has departed from a United States port and is within the exclusive economic zone.

(2) exceptions.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), this section does not apply to—

(A) permanent ballast water in a sealed tank on a vessel that is not subject to discharge;

(B) a vessel of the Armed Forces; or

(C) a vessel, or category of vessels, exempted by the Secretary under paragraph (4).

(B) standards for vessels of the armed forces.—With respect to a vessel of the Armed Forces, if the Secretary determines that there is no risk of the transmission of non-indigenous aquatic organisms through such pathways. This issue was sought by the United States and is important to assure the sovereignty of nations in addressing their needs while striving for international cooperation. In light of this provision, the bill includes a standard for treatment that is more effective than that adopted by the international community to ensure that the impacts in the United States are adequately prevented.

(2) exceptions.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), this section does not apply to—

(A) permanent ballast water in a sealed tank on a vessel that is not subject to discharge;

(B) a vessel of the Armed Forces; or

(C) a vessel, or category of vessels, exempted by the Secretary under paragraph (4).

(4) standards for vessels of the armed forces.—With respect to a vessel of the Armed Forces, if the Secretary determines that there is no risk of the transmission of non-indigenous aquatic organisms through such pathways. This issue was sought by the United States and is important to assure the sovereignty of nations in addressing their needs while striving for international cooperation. In light of this provision, the bill includes a standard for treatment that is more effective than that adopted by the international community to ensure that the impacts in the United States are adequately prevented.

(2) exceptions.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), this section does not apply to—

(A) permanent ballast water in a sealed tank on a vessel that is not subject to discharge;

(B) a vessel of the Armed Forces; or

(C) a vessel, or category of vessels, exempted by the Secretary under paragraph (4).
"(3) Special Rule for the Great Lakes.—

Paragraph (2) does not apply to a vessel subject to the regulations under subsection (e)(2) until the vessel is required to conduct ballast water treatment in accordance with subsection (f) of this section in accordance with subsection (f) of this section.

"(c) Vessel Ballast Water Management Plan.—

In general.—A vessel to which this section applies shall conduct all its ballast water management operations in accordance with a ballast water management plan that—

"(A) meets the requirements prescribed by the Secretary by regulation; and

"(B) is approved by the Secretary.

The Secretary may not approve a ballast water management plan unless the Secretary determines that the plan—

"(1) describes in detail safety procedures for the vessel and crew associated with ballast water management;

"(2) describes in detail the actions to be taken to implement the ballast water management requirements established under this section;

"(3) describes in detail procedures for disposal of sediment and on shore;

"(4) designates the officer on board the vessel in charge of ensuring that the plan is properly implemented;

"(5) contains the reporting requirements for vessels established under this section; and

"(6) meets all other requirements prescribed by the Secretary.

"(d) Copy of Plan on Board Vessel.—The owner or operator of a vessel to which this section applies shall maintain a copy of the vessel ballast water management plan on board at all times.

"(e) Vessel Ballast Water Record Book.—

In general.—The owner or operator of a vessel to which this section applies shall maintain a ballast water record book on board the vessel in which—

"(1) each vessel; and

"(2) the crew and passengers of each vessel;

"(3) take into consideration different operating conditions; and

"(4) be based on the best scientific information available.

"(f) Hudson River Port.—The regulations under this paragraph also apply to vessels that call at the Port of the Hudson River Bridge of the George Washington Bridge.

"(g) Education and Technical Assistance Programs.—The Secretary may carry out education and technical assistance programs and other measures to promote compliance with the regulations issued under this paragraph.

"(h) Exchange Areas.—

"(1) In general.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the operator of a vessel to which this section applies shall conduct ballast water exchange in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary in—

"(I) at least 200 nautical miles from the nearest land; and

"(II) in water at least 200 meters in depth.

"(2) Minimum Distance and Depth.—

"(I) As Far as Possible from Land.—

"(II) As Far as Practicable thereafter but no later than 24 hours after the ballast water discharge or uptake commenced.

"(3) Limitation on Volume.—The volume of any ballast water that is discharged under the exception described in clause (i) of paragraph (h)(1) shall not exceed the volume necessary to ensure the safe operation of the vessel.

"(4) Review of Circumstances.—If the master of a vessel conducts a ballast water discharge or uptake under the exception described in clause (i), the master of the vessel shall notify the Secretary as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter but no later than 24 hours after the ballast water discharge or uptake commenced.

"(5) Material Deviation or Delay of Voyage.—The material deviation or delay of a voyage under the exception described in clause (i) may not occur under the exception described in clause (i) of paragraph (h) unless the Secretary has determined that the deviation or delay is necessary to promote the health or safety of passengers or crew, or to avoid adverse weather, ship design or stress, equipment failure, or any other relevant condition.

"(6) Notification Required.—Whenever the master of a vessel conducts a ballast water discharge or uptake under the exception described in clause (i), the vessel shall notify the Secretary as soon as practicable thereafter but no later than 24 hours after the ballast water discharge or uptake commenced.

in accordance with subparagraph (A), the ballast water exchange shall be conducted in water that is—

"(i) as far as possible from land;

"(ii) at least 50 nautical miles from land; and

"(III) in water of at least 200 meters in depth.
to deviate from its intended voyage or unduly delay its voyage to comply with those requirements.

(3) IMPACT OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 100 cubic meters or of more than 100,000 cubic meters.

(4) REVIEW OF STANDARDS—(A) IN GENERAL.—In December, 2011, and in every subsequent year, the Secretary shall review the treatment standards established in paragraph (1) of this subsection to determine, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the best available technologies and treatment processes for the discharge of ballast water to minimize the potential for the introduction of invasive species.

(B) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTED STANDARDS.—In the regulations, the Secretary shall provide for the implementation of such adjusted standards to existing vessels.

(C) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with paragraph (1) before the first date on which paragraph (1) applies.

(iii) The Secretary may deviate from those subparagraphs.

D. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the implementation schedule in paragraph (3), before discharging ballast water in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States a vessel to which this section applies shall conduct ballast water treatment in accordance with those subparagraphs.

(2) RECEPTION FACILITY EXCEPTION.—(i) No person may remove and dispose of such sediment from a vessel to which this section applies in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States unless the vessel is designed to carry ballast water except in accordance with this subsection and the ballast water management plan required under subparagraphs.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations regarding the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations regarding the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2014, for vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan.

(B) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—The Secretary shall no longer determine the characteristics of a vessel to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(4) REVIEW OF STANDARDS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—In December, 2011, and in every subsequent year, the Secretary shall review the treatment standards established in paragraph (1) of this subsection to determine, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that a vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) or (B) of this section to comply with those subparagraphs.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR GREAT LAKES.—This paragraph does not apply to vessels subject to the regulations under paragraph (2).

C. Ballast Water Management Plans

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 5,000 cubic meters or not more than 5,000 cubic meters.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

D. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the implementation schedule in paragraph (3), before discharging ballast water in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States a vessel to which this section applies shall conduct ballast water treatment in accordance with those subparagraphs.

(2) RECEPTION FACILITY EXCEPTION.—(i) No person may remove and dispose of such sediment from a vessel to which this section applies in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States unless the vessel is designed to carry ballast water except in accordance with this subsection and the ballast water management plan required under subparagraphs.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations regarding the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations regarding the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2014, for vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan.

B. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 5,000 cubic meters or not more than 5,000 cubic meters.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2014, for vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan.

B. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 5,000 cubic meters or not more than 5,000 cubic meters.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2014, for vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan.

B. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 5,000 cubic meters or not more than 5,000 cubic meters.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2014, for vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan.

B. Ballast Water Treatment Requirements

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) if the vessel has a ballast water capacity of less than 5,000 cubic meters or not more than 5,000 cubic meters.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VESSEL CHARACTERISTICS.—(i) The Secretary may determine the characteristics of a vessel, including the ballast water capacity, to the extent necessary to achieve those objectives to the greatest extent practical in accordance with those regulations.

(ii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.

(iii) The Secretary shall prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2009, to ensure compliance with the extended date schedule.

(iv) The Secretary may prescribe standards and regulations governing the ballast water management plan for vessels constructed on or after January 1, 2009.
"(d) Existing vessels.—For vessels constructed before January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct the examination required by subsection (a)(1) before the date on which subsection (a)(1) applies to the vessel according to the schedule in subsection (a)(3); and

(2) inspect the vessel’s ballast water record book under subsection (d).

"(e) Subsequent examinations.—The Secretary shall examine vessels no less frequently than once each year to ensure vessel compliance with the requirements of this section.

"(3) Inspection authority.—In order to carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary may take ballast water samples at any time on any vessel to which this section applies to ensure its compliance with this Act.

"(4) Required certificate.—

(A) In general.—If, on the basis of an initial examination under paragraph (1) the Secretary finds that a vessel complies with the requirements of this section and the regulations promulgated hereunder, the Secretary shall issue a certificate under this paragraph providing evidence of such compliance. The certificate shall be valid for a period of not more than 5 years, as specified by the Secretary. The certificate or a true copy shall be aboard the vessel.

(B) Foreign certificates.—The Secretary may treat a certificate issued by a foreign government as a certificate issued under this section if the Secretary determines that the standards used by the issuing government are equivalent to or more stringent than the standards used by the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

"(5) Notification of violations.—If the Secretary finds, on the basis of an examination conducted under paragraph (1) or (2), sampling under paragraph (3), or any other information, that a vessel is being operated in violation of the requirements of this section and the regulations promulgated hereunder, the Secretary shall—

(A) notify—

(i) the master of the vessel; and

(ii) the captain of the port at the vessel’s next port of call; and

(B) take such other action as may be appropriate.

"(6) Detention of vessels.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary, by notice to the owner, charterer, manager operator, agent, master, or other individual in charge of a vessel, may detain a vessel if the Secretary determines that vessels if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that—

(A) the vessel is a vessel to which this section applies; or

(B) the vessel does not comply with the requirements of this section or of the regulations issued hereunder or is being operated in violation of such requirements; and

(C) the vessel is about to leave a place in the United States.

(2) Clearance.—

(A) Notice.—A vessel detained under paragraph (1) may obtain clearance under section 4197 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. App. 91) only if the previous for which it was detained has been corrected.

(B) Withdrawal.—If the Secretary finds that a vessel detained under paragraph (1) has received a clearance under section 4197 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. App. 91) before it was detained under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall request the Secretary of the Treasury to withdraw the clearance. Upon receipt of the request, the Secretary of the Treasury shall withhold or revoke the clearance.

"(7) Sanctions.—Any person who violates a regulation promulgated under this section shall be liable for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed $25,000. Each day of a continuing violation constitutes a separate violation. A vessel operated in violation of the regulations is liable in rem for any civil penalty assessed under this subsection for that violation.

"(q) Preemption.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) (other than subsection (f)(2)) supersede any provision of State or local law determined by the Secretary to be inconsistent with the requirements of this subsection or to conflict with the requirements of that subsection.

"(r) Penalties.—The Secretary may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section and the terms defined in section 1003 that are used in this section.

(b) Definitions.—Section 1003 of the Non-Indigenous Aquatic nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4702) is amended—

(1) by redesignating—

(A) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(B) paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), respectively;

(C) paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (14) and (15) respectively;

(D) paragraphs (11) and (12) as paragraphs (17) and (18), respectively;

(E) paragraphs (13), (14), and (15) as paragraphs (20), (21), and (22), respectively;

(F) paragraph (16) as paragraphs (22), (23), and (24), respectively;

(G) paragraph (17) as paragraph (23) and inserting it after paragraph (22), as redesignated;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

(‘‘1) ‘‘adverse impact’’ means the direct or indirect result or consequence of an event or process that—

(A) creates a hazard to the environment, human health, property, or a natural resource;

(B) impairs biological diversity; or

(C) interferes with the legitimate use of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; ‘‘

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

(‘‘4) ‘‘ballast water’’—

(A) means water taken on board a vessel to control trim, list, draught, stability, or stresses of the vessel, including matter suspended in such water; but

(B) does not include potable or technical water that does not contain harmful aquatic organisms or pathogen that is taken on board a vessel and used for a purpose described in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(C) does not include potable or technical water that is discharged in compliance with section 312 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1322); ‘‘

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

(‘‘5) ‘‘ballast water capacity’’ means the total volumetric capacity of any tanks, spaces, or compartments on a vessel that is used for carrying, loading, or discharging ballast water, including any multi-use tank, space, or compartment designed to allow carriage of ballast water; ‘‘

(6) ‘‘ballast water management’’ means mechanical, physical, chemical, and biological processes used, either singularly or in combination, to remove, render harmless, or avoid the uptake or discharge of harmful aquatic organisms and pathogens within ballast water and sediment; ‘ ‘

(7) ‘‘construction’’ means the state of construction of a vessel at which—

(A) the keel is laid; ‘ ‘

(B) the vessel is identifiable with the specific vessel at the time of beginning; ‘ ‘

(C) assembly of the vessel has begun comprising at least 50 tons or 1 percent of the estimated mass of all structural material of the vessel, whichever is less; or

(D) the vessel undergoes a major conversion; ‘ ‘

"
SEC. 5. COAST GUARD REPORT ON OTHER VESSEL-RELATED VECTORS OF INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on vessel-related vectors of harmful aquatic organisms and pathogens, including vectors related to: water and sediment, including vessel hulls and equipment, and from vessels equipped with ballast tanks that carry no ballast water on board.

(b) Requirements.—The requirements described in paragraph (a) shall be consistent with the requirements described in the standards and procedures for other vessel vectors of invasive aquatic species. The Commandant shall transmit to the Committees describing the standards and procedures developed and the implementation timeframe, together with any recommendations, including legislative recommendations if appropriate, to the Committee on Commerce and Science and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may promulgate regulations to incorporate and enforce standards and procedures developed under this subsection.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LOTT, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):—

S. 361. A bill to establish a program within the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration to integrate Federal coastal and ocean mapping activities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act, and I am pleased to be joined by my Commerce Committee Chairman, Senator STEVENS, and fellow Committee members Senators LOTT, CANTWELL, SNOWE, KERRY, and LAUTENBERG, who are all original cosponsors of the bill. I am pleased to report that the Senate passed this bill unanimously in the 108th Congress, and we look forward to moving this legislation quickly this year, particularly because of its importance to coastal planning for natural hazards.

The jurisdiction of the United States extends 200 miles beyond its coastline and includes the U.S. Territorial Sea and Exclusive Economic Zone, or “EEZ.” Regrettably, nearly 90 percent of this expanse remains uncharted by modern technologies, meaning that we have almost no information about a swath of ocean as large as the terra firma of the entire United States.

There was a time in the history of our Nation when our best efforts to map the seas meant lowering weights and Mr. LAUTENBERG):—

S. 361. 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 “Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act”.

SEC. 2. INTEGRATED OCEAN AND COASTAL MAP-
ING PROGRAM.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall establish a program to develop, in coordination with the Interagency Committee on Ocean and Coastal Mapping, a coordinated and comprehensive Federal ocean and coastal mapping plan for the Great Lakes and Coastal State waters, the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone, and the continental shelf of the United States that enhances ecosystem approaches in decision-making, manages and develops marine resources; and
(d) Other purposes of environmental protection; (e) nonliving resources, marine ecosystems, sensors.
(f) Mapping technologies between the Federal government and the private sector; and
(g) Private and public sector technologies and transferring new technologies and intellectual property to the public sector.

(b) PROGRAM PARAMETERS.—In developing such a program, the Administrator shall work with the Committee to—
(1) Identify all Federal and Federally-funded programs conducting shoreline delineation and ocean or coastal mapping, noting geographic coverage, frequency, spatial coverage, resolution, and subject matter focus of the data and location of data archives;
(2) Promote cost-effective, cooperative mapping efforts among all Federal agencies conducting ocean and coastal mapping activities by increasing data sharing, developing data acquisition and metadata standards, and facilitating the interoperability of in situ data collection systems, data processing, archiving, and distribution of data products;
(3) Facilitate the adaptation of existing technologies to address the growing expertise in new ocean and coastal mapping technologies, including through research, development, and training conducted in cooperation with the private sector, academia, and other non-Federal entities;
(4) Develop standards and protocols for testing innovative experimental mapping technologies and transferring new technologies between the Federal government and the private sector or academia;
(5) Centralize, manage, and distribute All Federal and non-Federal data as well as provide mapping products and services to the general public in service of statutory requirements;
(6) Develop specific data presentation standards for the Federal, State, and other entities that document locations of Federally permitted activities, living and nonliving resources, marine ecosystems, sensitive areas, emergent cultural resources, undersea cables, offshore aquaculture projects, and any areas designated for the purposes of environmental protection or conservation and management of living marine resources; and
(7) Identify the procedures to be used for coordinating Federal data with State and local government programs.

SEC. 3. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON OCEAN AND COASTAL MAPPING.
(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established an Interagency Committee on Ocean and Coastal Mapping.
(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be comprised of senior representatives from Federal agencies with ocean and coastal mapping and surveying responsibilities. The representatives shall be high-ranking officials of their respective agencies or departments, or, if possible, the head of the portion of the agency or department that is most relevant to the purposes of this Act. Membership shall include senior representatives of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Chief of Naval Operations, the United States Geological Survey, Minerals Management Service, National Science Foundation, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Geological Survey, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Emergency Management Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other appropriate Federal agencies involved in ocean and coastal mapping.
(c) CHAIRMAN.—The Committee shall be chaired by the representative from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The chairman may create subcommittees chaired by any member agency of the Committee. Working groups may be formed by the chairman to address issues of short duration.
(d) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis, but subcommittee or working group meetings shall meet on an as needed basis.
(e) COORDINATION.—The Committee shall coordinate activities when appropriate, with—
(1) Other Federal efforts, including the Digital Coast, Geospatial One-Stop, and the Federal Geographic Data Committee;
(2) International initiatives and activities;
(3) States and user groups through workshops and other appropriate mechanisms.
SEC. 4. NOAA INTEGRATED MAPPING INITIATIVE.
(a) GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Committee, shall develop and submit to Congress a plan for an integrated ocean and coastal mapping initiative within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
(b) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall—
(1) Identify and describe all ocean and coastal mapping programs within the agencies, including those that conduct mapping or processing of data that contribute to a set of federal missions, such as hydrographic surveys, ocean exploration projects, living marine resource conservation and management programs, coastal zone management projects, and ocean and coastal science projects;
(2) Establish priority mapping programs and establish and periodically update priorities of mapping and mapping, as well as minimum data acquisition and metadata standards for those programs;
(3) Encourage the development of innovative ocean and coastal mapping technologies and applications through research and development through cooperative or other agreements at joint centers of excellence and with the private sector;
(4) Document available and developing technologies, best practices in data processing and distributing opportunities with other Federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector;
(5) Identify training, technology, and other resource requirements for enabling the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s programs, ships, and aircraft to support a coordinated ocean and coastal mapping program;
(6) Identify a centralized mechanism or office for coordinating data collection, processing, archiving, and disseminating activities of all such mapping programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including—
(A) Establishing primary data processing centers to maximize efficiency in information technology investment, develop consistency in data processing, and meet Federal mandates for interoperability and ease of use;
(B) Developing a repository that is responsible for archiving and managing the distribution of all ocean and coastal mapping data to simplify the provision of services to benefit Federal and State programs and international and cooperation between the Federal government and the private sector;
(c) NOAA JOINT OCEAN AND COASTAL MAPPING CENTERS.—The Administrator is authorized to establish one or more Joint Ocean and Coastal Mapping Centers, including a Joint Hydrographic Center, which shall be co-located with a higher education institution or the Center for Hydrographic excellence in and are authorized to conduct activities necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and—
(1) Research and development of innovative ocean and coastal mapping technologies, equipment, and data products;
(2) Developing a plan for an integrated ocean and coastal mapping program, and civilian personnel.
SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY PROGRAM REPORTING.
No later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and bi-annually thereafter, the Chairman of the Committee shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Resources a report detailing progress made in implementing the provisions of this Act, including—
(1) An inventory of ocean and coastal mapping data, noting the metadata, within the territorial seas and the exclusive economic zone and throughout the continental shelf of the United States, noting the age and source of the survey and the spatial resolution (meters or feet) of the data;
(2) Identification of priority areas in need of survey coverage using present technologies;
(3) A resource plan that identifies when priority areas in need of modern ocean and coastal mapping surveys can be accomplished;
(4) The status of efforts to produce integrated digital maps of ocean and coastal areas;
(5) A description of any products resulting from coordinated mapping programs that improve public understanding of the coasts, oceans, or regulatory decision-making;
(6) A documentation of minimum and desired standards for data acquisition and integrated metadata;
(7) A statement of the status of Federal efforts to coordinate ocean mapping technologies, coordinate mapping activities, share expertise, and exchange data;
(8) A statement of resource requirements for navigation to meet the goals of the program, including technology needs for data acquisition, processing and distribution systems;
(9) A statement of the status of efforts to declassify data gathered by the Navy, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and other agencies to the extent possible without losing protection under the law.

The Committee is most relevant to the purposes of this Act. Membership shall include senior representatives of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Chief of Naval Operations, the United States Geological Survey, Minerals Management Service, National Science Foundation, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Geological Survey, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Emergency Management Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other appropriate Federal agencies involved in ocean and coastal mapping.

The administrator is authorized to establish one or more Joint Ocean and Coastal Mapping Centers, including a Joint Hydrographic Center, which shall be co-located with an institution of higher education or the Center for Hydrographic Excellence in and are authorized to conduct activities necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including—
(1) Research and development of innovative ocean and coastal mapping technologies, equipment, and data products;
(2) Developing a plan for an integrated ocean and coastal mapping program, and civilian personnel.

No later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and bi-annually thereafter, the Chairman of the Committee shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Resources a report detailing progress made in implementing the provisions of this Act, including—
(1) An inventory of ocean and coastal mapping data, noting the metadata, within the territorial seas and the exclusive economic zone and throughout the continental shelf of the United States, noting the age and source of the survey and the spatial resolution (meters or feet) of the data;
(2) Identification of priority areas in need of survey coverage using present technologies;
(3) A resource plan that identifies when priority areas in need of modern ocean and coastal mapping surveys can be accomplished;
(4) The status of efforts to produce integrated digital maps of ocean and coastal areas;
(5) A description of any products resulting from coordinated mapping programs that improve public understanding of the coasts, oceans, or regulatory decision-making;
(6) A documentation of minimum and desired standards for data acquisition and integrated metadata;
(7) A statement of the status of Federal efforts to coordinate ocean mapping technologies, coordinate mapping activities, share expertise, and exchange data;
(8) A statement of resource requirements for navigation to meet the goals of the program, including technology needs for data acquisition, processing and distribution systems;
(9) A statement of the status of efforts to declassify data gathered by the Navy, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and other agencies to the extent possible without losing protection under the law.

The Committee is most relevant to the purposes of this Act. Membership shall include senior representatives of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Chief of Naval Operations, the United States Geological Survey, Minerals Management Service, National Science Foundation, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Geological Survey, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Emergency Management Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other appropriate Federal agencies involved in ocean and coastal mapping.

The administrator is authorized to establish one or more Joint Ocean and Coastal Mapping Centers, including a Joint Hydrographic Center, which shall be co-located with an institution of higher education or the Center for Hydrographic Excellence in and are authorized to conduct activities necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including—
(1) Research and development of innovative ocean and coastal mapping technologies, equipment, and data products;
(2) Developing a plan for an integrated ocean and coastal mapping program, and civilian personnel.

No later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and bi-annually thereafter, the Chairman of the Committee shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Resources a report detailing progress made in implementing the provisions of this Act, including—
(1) An inventory of ocean and coastal mapping data, noting the metadata, within the territorial seas and the exclusive economic zone and throughout the continental shelf of the United States, noting the age and source of the survey and the spatial resolution (meters or feet) of the data;
(2) Identification of priority areas in need of survey coverage using present technologies;
(3) A resource plan that identifies when priority areas in need of modern ocean and coastal mapping surveys can be accomplished;
(4) The status of efforts to produce integrated digital maps of ocean and coastal areas;
(5) A description of any products resulting from coordinated mapping programs that improve public understanding of the coasts, oceans, or regulatory decision-making;
(6) A documentation of minimum and desired standards for data acquisition and integrated metadata;
(7) A statement of the status of Federal efforts to coordinate ocean mapping technologies, coordinate mapping activities, share expertise, and exchange data;
(8) A statement of resource requirements for navigation to meet the goals of the program, including technology needs for data acquisition, processing and distribution systems;
(9) A statement of the status of efforts to declassify data gathered by the Navy, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and other agencies to the extent possible without losing protection under the law.
S. 365. A bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign centers and programs for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, torture is a fundamental violation of human rights. It is an act that aims not only to destroy the body but to destroy a person’s spirit, leaving a psychologically crippled victim as a warning to others in the community.

Approximately 500,000 survivors of torture have found refuge in the United States, with many more around the world. The survivors of this terrible experience require treatment to recover from the effects of torture and to rebuild their shattered lives.

Fortunately, we have the ability to provide such treatment. There are 30 torture treatment centers in the United States located in 16 states, all helping former victims to recover from the trauma they experienced. We in Minnesota are proudly proud of the work of Minnesota’s Center for Victims of Torture, a world leader in administering this kind of treatment.

The Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act will authorize $92 million in funding for both domestic and foreign treatment centers for victims of torture. $50 million of the funding goes directly to domestic programs. The remaining funds assist foreign treatment centers through the U.S. Agency for International Development and the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture.

This reauthorization comes at a critical time. With the liberation of the people of Iraq and Afghanistan and other events around the world, even more survivors of torture around the world are seeking treatment. I look forward to the prompt consideration of this legislation and urge my colleagues to support this and other efforts to assist victims of torture.

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.

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

S. 368. A bill to provide assistance to reduce teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, and other sexually transmitted diseases and to support health and education programs for the treatment of victims of torture.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DOMESTIC TREATMENT CENTERS FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE. Section 5(b)(1) of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2152 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “and 2005” and inserting “, 2005, 2006, and 2007”;

(2) by striking “2004 and” and inserting “2004,”; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 2006, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 2007.”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN TREATMENT CENTERS FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE. Of the amounts appropriated to be appropriated for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 pursuant to chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2221 et seq.), there are authorized to be appropriated to the President for a voluntary contribution to the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and $9,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 368. A bill to provide assistance to reduce teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, and other sexually transmitted diseases and to support health and education programs for the treatment of victims of torture.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Responsible Education About Life or “REAL” Act along with my cosponsors Senators KENNEDY, and Mrs. MURRAY.

The REAL Act aims to reduce adolescent pregnancy, HIV rates, and other sexually transmitted diseases by providing federal funds for comprehensive sex education in schools. Comprehensive sex education is medically accurate, age appropriate, education that includes information about contraception and abstinence. It is an approach that doesn’t hide important information from our kids.

For years, taxpayer dollars have been flooded into unproven “abstinence-only” programs—programs that no one believes are suited to the real lives of teenagers. The overwhelming evidence suggests that abstinence-only education is not effective. Programs that deliver information about contraception and abstinence will increase knowledge about sexuality and will reduce the likelihood of pregnancy and other sexually transmitted diseases.

This bill would provide $206 million dollars for comprehensive sex education. By comparison, federal support for ‘abstinence-only’ education amounts to only $85 million dollars.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Responsible Education About Life or “REAL” Act along with my cosponsors Senators KENNEDY, and Mrs. MURRAY.

The REAL Act aims to reduce adolescent pregnancy, HIV rates, and other sexually transmitted diseases by providing federal funds for comprehensive sex education. Under the Bush Administration, federal support for “abstinence-only” education has expanded rapidly.

The proof is in the numbers. In fiscal year 2004 the federal government spent $138 million dollars on “abstinence-only” programs. In fiscal year 2005 the federal government increased funding for these programs by $30 million dollars. This year President Bush is asking for $206 million dollars for “abstinence-only” education—a 50 percent increase over the 2004 funding level. Would you like to know how much money has the government devoted to education sex education programs over this same time? Zero dollars.

Much of the taxpayer funds going to “abstinence-only” programs are essentially being wasted. Teens need information, not censorship. “Abstinence-only” education often tells young people half the story, and they need the full picture. These programs are not getting the job done.
After years of “abstinence only” programs, the United States still has the—highest rates of teen pregnancy in the industrialized world. The American public knows what works. Parents do not want sexual education programs limited to abstinence in schools. Even the Heritage Foundation had to admit this when their own poll showed that “75 percent of parents want teens to be taught about both abstinence and contraception.” Other polls show numbers as high as 93 percent in support of high school programs that include information about contraception.

The REAL Act also has the support of the National Education Association (NEA), the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), the American Nurses Association (ANA), the Child Welfare League of America and more than 130 other medical and professional organizations. It is a fact that teenagers who receive sex education that includes discussion of contraception are more likely to delay sexual activity than those who receive abstinence-only education. Comprehensive sex education simply works better.

The stakes are high: of the 19 million cases of sexually transmitted diseases every year in the United States, almost half of them strike young people between the ages of 15 and 24. And each year in the United States, about 20,000 young people are newly infected with HIV.

These aren’t just numbers. These are our sons and daughters whose health and well-being are jeopardized when ideology comes before sound public policy. That is why we are introducing this legislation today. It’s time for a more balanced approach; it’s time to protect out kids, and it’s time to get REAL. Our bill authorizes $206 million per year in federal funds to states for comprehensive sexual education programs.

The REAL Act is step in a more effective direction. It brings sex education up-to-date in a way that will reflect the serious issues and real life situations millions of young people find themselves in every year. Young people have a right to accurate and complete information that could protect their health and even save their lives. I urge my colleagues to support the REAL Act and make it possible to give young people the tools to make safe and responsible decisions. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Responsible Education About Life Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The American Medical Association (“AMA”), the American Academy of Pediatrics (“AAP”), the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (“ACOG”), the American Public Health Association (“APHA”), the Society for Adolescent Medicine (“SAM”), support responsible sexuality education that includes information about both abstinence and contraception.

(2) Research published by the Institute of Medicine, the American Medical Association and the Office on National AIDS Policy stress the need for sexuality education that informs about abstinence and provides young people with information about contraception for the prevention of teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases.

(3) Research shows that teenagers who receive sexuality education that includes discussion of contraception are more likely than those who receive abstinence-only messages to delay sexual activity and to use contraceptives when they do become sexually active.

(4) Comprehensive sexuality education programs respect the diversity of values and beliefs represented in the community and will complement and augment the sexuality education children receive from their families.

(5) The median age of puberty is 13 years and the average age of marriage is over 26 years old. American teens need access to full, complete, and medically and factually accurate information regarding sexuality, including contraception, STD/HIV prevention, and abstinence.

(6) Although teen pregnancy rates are decreasing, there are still between 750,000 and 850,000 teen pregnancies each year. Between 75 and 90 percent of teen pregnancies among 15-19-year-old adolescents are attributable to improved contraceptive use; the remainder to increased abstinence.

(7) Studies estimate that 50 to 75 percent of the reduction in adolescent pregnancy rates is attributable to improved contraceptive use and remaining abstinence.

(8) More than eight out of ten Americans believe that young people should have information about abstinence and protecting themselves from unplanned pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases.

(9) United States teens and young adults acquire an estimated 4,000,000 sexually transmitted infections each year. By age 23, at least 1 of every 2 sexually active people will have contracted a sexually transmitted disease.

(10) More than 2 young people in the United States are infected with HIV every hour of every day. African American and Hispanic youths are disproportionately affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Although about 15 percent of the adolescent population (ages 13 to 19) in the United States is African American, nearly 60 percent of AIDS cases through 2002 among 13- to 19-year-olds were among African Americans. Hispanics comprise nearly 16 percent of the adolescent population (ages 13 to 19) in the United States and 22 percent of reported adolescent AIDS cases through June 2002.

SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE TO REDUCE TEEN PREGNANCY, HIV/AIDS, AND OTHER SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES AND TO SUPPORT HEALTHY ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT.

(a) In General. The eligible State shall be entitled to receive from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2010, a grant to conduct programmed, including education on both abstinence and contraception for the prevention of teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND FAMILY LIFE PROGRAMS. For purposes of this Act, a program of family life education is a program that—

(1) is age-appropriate and medically accurate;

(2) does not teach or promote religion;

(3) teaches that abstinence is the only sure way to prevent pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases;

(4) stresses the value of abstinence while not ignoring those young people who have had or are having sexual intercourse;

(5) provides information about the health benefits and side effects of all contraceptives and barrier methods as a means to prevent pregnancy;

(6) provides information about the health benefits and side effects of all contraceptives and barrier methods as a means to reduce the risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS;

(7) encourages family communication about sexuality between parent and child;

(8) teaches young people the skills to make responsible decisions about sexuality, including how to avoid unwanted verbal, physical, and sexual advances and how not to make unwanted verbal, physical, and sexual advances; and

(9) teaches young people how alcohol and drug use can affect responsible decision-making.

(10) provides sex education that includes messages about abstinence and contraceptive use; the remainder to increased abstinence.

(11) teaches young people the skills to make responsible decisions about sexuality, including how to avoid unwanted sexual advances, and to use contraceptives when they do become sexually active.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND FAMILY LIFE PROGRAMS. For purposes of this Act, a program of family life education is a program that—

(1) is age-appropriate and medically accurate;

(2) does not teach or promote religion;

(3) teaches that abstinence is the only sure way to prevent pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases;

(4) stresses the value of abstinence while not ignoring those young people who have had or are having sexual intercourse;

(5) provides information about the health benefits and side effects of all contraceptives and barrier methods as a means to prevent pregnancy;

(6) provides information about the health benefits and side effects of all contraceptives and barrier methods as a means to reduce the risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS;

(7) encourages family communication about sexuality between parent and child;

(8) teaches young people the skills to make responsible decisions about sexuality, including how to avoid unwanted sexual advances, and to use contraceptives when they do become sexually active.

(9) teaches young people how alcohol and drug use can affect responsible decision-making.

(10) provides sex education that includes messages about abstinence and contraceptive use; the remainder to increased abstinence.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that while States are not required to provide matching funds, they are encouraged to do so.

SEC. 5. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.

(a) In General. For the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of programs of family life education carried out with a grant under section 3, evaluations of such program shall be carried out in accordance with subsections (b) and (c).

(b) NATIONAL EVALUATION. The Secretary shall provide for a national evaluation of a representative sample of programs of family life education carried out with grants under section 3. A condition for the receipt of such a grant is that the State involved agree to cooperate with the evaluation. The purposes of the national evaluation shall be the determination of—

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that while States are not required to provide matching funds, they are encouraged to do so.

SEC. 7. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.

(a) In General. For the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of programs of family life education carried out with a grant under section 3, evaluations of such program shall be carried out in accordance with subsections (b) and (c).

(b) NATIONAL EVALUATION. The Secretary shall provide for a national evaluation of a representative sample of programs of family life education carried out with grants under section 3. A condition for the receipt of such a grant is that the State involved agree to cooperate with the evaluation. The purposes of the national evaluation shall be the determination of—
(A) the effectiveness of such programs in helping to delay the initiation of sexual intercourse and other high-risk behaviors; 
(B) the effectiveness of such programs in preventing adolescent pregnancy; 
(C) the effectiveness of such programs in preventing sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS; 
(D) the effectiveness of such programs in increasing contraceptive knowledge and contraceptive behaviors when sexual intercourse occurs; and 
(E) a list of best practices based upon essential programmatic components of evaluated programs that have led to success in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(2) REPORT.—Providing the results of the national evaluation under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than March 31, 2009, with an interim report provided on a yearly basis at the end of each fiscal year.

(c) INDIVIDUAL STATE EVALUATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under section 3 is that the State involved agree to provide for the evaluation of the programs of family education carried out with the grant in accordance with the following:

(A) The evaluation will be conducted by an external, independent entity.

(B) The purposes of the evaluation will be the determination of:

(i) the effectiveness of such programs in helping to delay the initiation of sexual intercourse and other high-risk behaviors;

(ii) the effectiveness of such programs in preventing adolescent pregnancy;

(iii) the effectiveness of such programs in preventing sexually transmitted disease, including HIV/AIDS;

(iv) the effectiveness of such programs in increasing contraceptive knowledge and contraceptive behaviors when sexual intercourse occurs.

(2) USE OF GRANT.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under section 3 is that the State involved agree that not more than 10 percent of the grant will be expended for the evaluation under paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term ‘‘eligible State’’ means a State that makes an application for a grant under section 3 that is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information that the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this Act.

(2) The term ‘‘HIV/AIDS’’ means the human immunodeficiency virus, and includes acquired immune deficiency syndrome.

(3) The term ‘‘medically accurate’’, with respect to information, means information that is supported by research, recognized as accurate by leading medical, psychological, psychiatric, and public health organizations and agencies, and where relevant, published in peer review journals.

(4) The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SEC. 7. APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(b) ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year—

(1) not more than 7 percent may be used for the administrative expenses of the Secretary in carrying out this Act for that fiscal year; and

(2) not more than 10 percent may be used for the national evaluation under section 5(b).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 47—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CIVILIAN EMPLOYERS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR THEIR SUPPORT OF MEMBERS WHO ARE CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY AND FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE MEMBERS’ FAMILIES

Mr. BAYH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. Res. 47

Whereas over 450,000 members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces have been called to active duty between September 11, 2001, and February 2005, and have had to leave their families and employers to serve and protect their country,

Whereas, the reservists called to active duty provide critical support of United States military operations abroad by serving as engineers, medics, military police, and civil affairs specialists, and in other military specialties;

Whereas, more than half of all reservists are married, and about half of them have children or other dependents;

Whereas, extended active-duty service in the performance of critical national security missions abroad has required reservists to make significant sacrifices in time spent away from their family and, in some cases, loss of income;

Whereas, the business community in the United States played a crucial role in supporting our reservists by providing significant financial assistance for reservists ordinarily in their workforce who experience a reduction in income due to extended active-duty service;

Whereas, this financial support by civilian employers makes it possible, in many cases, for the families of reservists to meet daily expenses associated with raising children and attaining the American dream;

Whereas the business community continues to provide assistance so that the Nation’s reservists may serve their country without worrying about the financial condition of their reservists and families;

Whereas the following Indiana employers, among others, provide assistance to their employees when, as reservists, they are called to active duty, and the employers deserve public recognition for their role in supporting our troops: Eli Lilly and Company, Cummins, Inc., Guidant Corporation, Alcoa, Inc., ConAgra Foods, Inc., CSX Corporation, Daimler Chrysler, Delphi Technologies, Inc., The Dow Chemical Company, FedEx Corporation, Raytheon Company, General Electric Company, American International Group, Inc., Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, Pfizer, Inc., United Parcel Service of America, Inc., The Group plc, Honeywell International, Inc., and Am General, LLC: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces and the businesses that ordinarily employ them are a cornerstone of the ongoing war against the war on terror, and the Federal Government should take steps to assist businesses that are providing this critical support to the citizen-soldiers and their employees who are away in the military service of the United States;

(2) the business community deserves the Nation’s gratitude for the role it continues to perform in supporting the members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families, and this Nation, and this Senate should recognize the role played by American businesses in supporting the community of employers within the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 48—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

Mr. LUGAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 48

Whereas an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked annually;

Whereas approximately 70 percent of trafficked persons are female and 50 percent are children;

Whereas approximately 250,000 people are trafficked in, out, and through the South Asia region;

Whereas the tsunami that struck South East Asia, South Asia, and East Africa on December 26, 2004, killed more than 160,000 people, affected 5,000,000 people, and left an estimated 35,000 children orphaned;

Whereas these orphaned children are particularly vulnerable to being trafficked for sexual exploitation, forced labor, or to be child soldiers;

Whereas governments of countries affected by the earthquake and tsunami in the Indian Ocean have taken measures to prevent the trafficking of children and other vulnerable persons;

Whereas President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono of Indonesia has ordered that immigration and police officers not allow children from Aceh to be removed from the country;

Whereas Prime Minister Abdullah Badawi of Malaysia undertook measures to prevent child trafficking by directing immigration enforcement officials in Malaysia to be on the alert for child trafficking and by imposing a temporary ban on the adoption of foreign children;

Whereas, in India, the state government of Tamil Nadu opened shelters to protect orphaned or separated children and pledged that it would provide orphans of the tsunami andphans with food, education, and support and education;

Whereas, the Royal Thai Government has placed all tsunami orphans in that country in the protective custody of extended family members and has awarded boarding school scholarships to children affected by the tsunami;

Whereas, in Sri Lanka, the National Child Protection Authority (NCPA), UNICEF, and nongovernmental organizations have mobilized teams to identify and register all children who have been separated from their immediate families;

Whereas the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the Organized Crime Convention”) and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, a protocol to the Organized Crime Convention (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the “Trafficking Protocol”), require countries to enact laws to criminalize trafficking in persons, punish traffickers, and assist victims;

Whereas the United States, on December 13, 2000, signed, but has not yet ratified, the
Organized Crime Convention and the Trafficking Protocol;

Whereas ratification by the United States of the Organized Crime Convention and the Trafficking Protocol would enhance the ability of the United States Government to render and receive assistance on a global basis in the common struggle to prevent, investigate, and prosecute trafficking in persons; and

Whereas, like the United States, most countries affected by the tsunami disaster have not yet ratified the Organized Crime Convention and the Trafficking Protocol: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) combating trafficking in persons should continue to be a priority of United States foreign policy;

(2) the United States should ratify the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children;

(3) the President should commend the efforts of governments of those countries affected by the December 26, 2004, tsunami to protect their children from the dangers of trafficking; and

(4) the President should urge all countries to ratify the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, particularly those countries that have been most affected by the tsunami and in which children face the result of increased risk of being abducted and trafficked.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to submit a resolution expressing the Sense of the Senate regarding the trafficking in children following the Asian tsunami.

The recent tsunami in the Indian Ocean region was a natural disaster unlike anything in recent human history. It is estimated that the tsunami claimed the lives of more than 160,000 people throughout the region and displaced more than 1 million.

This disaster has taken an incredible toll on children. The United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, estimates that children comprise more than one-third of all deaths. Tens of thousands of children have lost family members and friends and are coping with unspeakable trauma. Nearly 35,000 children have been orphaned, and many more have been separated from their families. These children are in need of food, water, and shelter. They face the imminent threats of hunger, disease, and diarrhea.

In addition to these dangers, these children are also vulnerable to being trafficked for sexual exploitation, forced labor, or to be child soldiers. According to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons at the Department of State, an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked every year, some 50 percent of whom are children. In South East Asia alone, nearly 250,000 people are trafficked in, out, and through the region. With their families, the children orphaned by the tsunami lack protection from predators who would profit from their tragedy.

My resolution acknowledges this uniquely vulnerable group and urges the United States and other countries to ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children and the underlying U.N. Convention Against Organized Crime. The Protocol requires countries to enact laws to criminalize trafficking in persons, punish traffickers and assist victims. In addition, the Protocol would enhance our ability to give and receive assistance on a global basis in the common struggle to prevent, investigate and prosecute trafficking.

On December 13, 2000, the United States signed these international agreements. Last June, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing on these very important law enforcement treaties. At the earliest opportunity, I intend to schedule a vote on the Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocol that the Senate has passed with overwhelming support.

The President should urge other countries to do the same, we would send a strong message to the world that modern form of slavery must be stopped and that the United States is committed to ensuring that perpetrators are punished and that victims are helped.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 10, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006 and the future years defense program.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 10, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., to conduct a hearing on The Role of the Government-Sponsored Enterprises in the Mortgage Market. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 10, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on The International Financial System. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Thursday, February 10, 2005 at 10:15 a.m. on “Bankruptcy Reform.” The hearing will take place in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness List

Mr. Kenneth Beine, President & CEO, Shoreline Credit Union, Two Rivers, WI; Mr. Malcom Bennett, President, International Realty & Investments, Inc., Los Angeles, CA; Mr. Dave McCall, Director, District 1, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, Columbus, OH; Mr. R. Michael Stewart Menzies, Sr., President & CEO, East Bank and Trust Company, Easton, MD; Mr. Philip Strauss, Retired Attorney, Family Support Bureau in the Office, District Attorney Office in San Francisco, on behalf of the National Child Support Enforcement Association, San Francisco, CA; Ms. Maria Vullo, Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, New York, NY; Prof. Elizabeth Warren, Leo Gottlieb Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA; and Prof. Todd J. Zywicki, Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet on Thursday, February 10, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. for a hearing entitled, “Unlocking the Potential within Homeland Security; the New Human Resources System.”

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 10, 2005 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed meeting.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to Joe Heblie and Lydia Olander, both science fellows in my office, during consideration of the Climate Stewardship Act of 2005.

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

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 37, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.
February 10, 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 37) designating the week of February 7 through February 11, 2005, as “National School Counseling Week”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, that any statement relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 37) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 37

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has declared the week of February 7 through February 11, 2005, as “National School Counseling Week”;

Whereas the Senate has recognized the importance of school counseling through the inclusion of mandatory and voluntary school counseling programs in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Whereas school counselors have long advocated that the education system of the United States must leave no child behind and must provide opportunities for every student;

Whereas personal and social growth results in increased academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding them through their academic, personal, social, and career development;

Whereas school counselors were instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with the trauma of terrorism inflicted on the United States on September 11, 2001, and the aftermath of that trauma;

Whereas students face myriad challenges every day, including peer pressure, depression, and school violence;

Whereas school counselors are usually the only professionals in a school building that are trained in both education and mental health;

Whereas the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are often misunderstood, and the school counselor position is often among the first to be eliminated in order to meet budgetary constraints;

Whereas the national average ratio of students to school counselors of 485:1 is more than double the 250:1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the American Counseling Association, the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, and other organizations; and

Whereas the celebration of “National School Counseling Week” would increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the week of February 7 through February 11, 2005, be designated as “National School Counseling Week”;

ANNUAL CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Michael Chertoff to be Secretary of Homeland Security; that the nomination be debated for up to 6 hours equally divided on Monday; that the Senate resume debate on the nomination on Tuesday; February 15, at 2:15 p.m., with the time prior to 4 p.m. to be equally divided and that the Senate vote on the nomination at 4 p.m. on Tuesday; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; and the Senate then return to legislative session; further, that all time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. DURBin, Mr. President, on our side, on Monday I designate Senator DoDd to control 2 hours, Senator DooD to control 20 minutes.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2005

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon on Monday, February 14. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to executive session for the consideration of the nomination of Michael Chertoff to be Secretary of Homeland Security, as provided under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. On Monday at noon the Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Chertoff to be Secretary of Homeland Security. Under the agreement, we will debate the nomination throughout the afternoon on Monday, with the vote on confirmation at 4 p.m. during Tuesday’s session. Therefore, as I announced earlier, there will be no roll call votes on Monday.

For the remainder of next week we will consider any legislative or executive business available for action.

Mr. President, I do thank our colleagues, once again, for the participation and the efficiency with which we had the Senate consider the Class Action Fairness Act which was finally voted upon now several hours ago. People worked together very well, and I think it does bode well for bills that come to the floor in this manner in the future.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2005

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.
There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 14, 2005, at 12 noon.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 10, 2005:

**CONFIRMATION**

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Thursday, February 10, 2005:

_**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**_

ROBERT B. ZOELICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE RICHARD LEE ARMITAGE, RESIGNED.

_**NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION**_

ALLEN WEINSTEIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE’S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.
ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR ELIE WIESEL AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF NAZI DEATH CAMPS

HON. TOM LANTOS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 of this year, the United Nations General Assembly commemorated the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Nazi death camps. January 27, 1945, was the date on which Russian troops liberated Auschwitz, the most notorious of the death camps, and the symbol of the Holocaust, in which over 6 million Jews and hundreds of thousands of other nationalities were brutally murdered during World War II.

Most of those individuals who spoke on this solemn and somber occasion were high government officials representing the United Nations or its member countries, but one of the most important and thoughtful speeches was given by Elie Wiesel, who like me is an American citizen by choice. He was welcomed to this incredibly generous nation as the American citizen by choice. His welcome to this incredibly generous nation as the American citizen by choice.

Mr. Speaker, Elie Wiesel has contributed a great deal to our nation as a professor and scholar, and as a man of action as the Founding Chair of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. The U.S. Holocaust Museum just a few blocks from this Capitol Building is an enduring testament to his vision, his understanding, and his commitment.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the outstanding address of Professor Elie Wiesel be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read his thoughtful remarks.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR ELIE WIESEL

Mr. President of the General Assembly.

Mr. Secretary General, my friend, Excellencies: The man who stands before you this morning feels deeply privileged. A teacher and a writer, he speaks and writes as a witness to a crime committed in the heart of European Christendom and civilization by a brutal dictatorial regime—a crime unprecedented in human history. It was a new world implacably, irrevocably devoid of Jews. Hence Auschwitz, Ponar, Treblinka, Belzec, Chelmno and Sobibor: dark factories of death erected for the Final Solution. Killers came there to kill and victims to die.

As a young adolescent, he saw what no human being should have to see: the triumph of political fascism and ideological hatred for a people who for thousands of years had cultivated multitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who commit these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, socio-economic spheres, speaking attitudes of human beings humiliated, isolated, tormented tortured and murdered. They were overwhelmingly Jews but there were others. And those who committed these atrocities, soci...
Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor a good friend and a hard-working public servant, Ms. Elaine Valente. Ms. Valente is retiring as a Commissioner for Adams County, Colorado after 16 years of dedicated service.

Commissioner Valente was born and raised in Adams County Colorado. She and her husband Larry own the successful Valente’s Deli, in Westminster Colorado. She and her husband are proud parents of two accomplished children, and are passionate community activists.

Elaine’s interest in her community began long before assuming her role as County Commissioner. She served on the Adams County Planning Commission, the city of Westminster Urban Renewal Authority, the Westminster Planning Commission, the Citizen’s Evaluation for Retention of Judges, and the School District 50 Superintendent’s Parent Advisory Committee.

Her deep passion to give something back to her community to help improve Colorado is what motivated her to run for County Commissioner in 1988. Elaine was victorious in that election and quickly became an outspoken advocate for Adams County’s communities. As Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners she took interest and in many issues affecting her constituency, helping pave the way for future economic development, transportation improvements, air traffic investments and reform of county services. When I was elected to Congress in 1998 I knew that one of my first objectives was to learn as much as I could from Elaine, not only about one of Colorado’s fastest growing communities, but also about effective public service.

Elaine is the kind of person who speaks her mind with a blend of honest bluntness and old-school graciousness. As a daughter of Italian-Americans she also established a reputation for leadership on behalf of ethnic minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Elaine Valente and in wishing her success in all her future endeavors. It has been a true privilege to work with such a remarkable woman.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor a good friend and a hard-working public servant, Ms. Elaine Valente. Ms. Valente is retiring as a Commissioner for Adams County, Colorado after 16 years of dedicated service.

Commissioner Valente was born and raised in Adams County Colorado. She and her husband Larry own the successful Valente’s Deli, in Westminster Colorado. She and her husband are proud parents of two accomplished children, and are passionate community activists.

Elaine’s interest in her community began long before assuming her role as County Commissioner. She served on the Adams County Planning Commission, the city of Westminster Urban Renewal Authority, the Westminster Planning Commission, the Citizen’s Evaluation for Retention of Judges, and the School District 50 Superintendent’s Parent Advisory Committee.

Her deep passion to give something back to her community to help improve Colorado is what motivated her to run for County Commissioner in 1988. Elaine was victorious in that election and quickly became an outspoken advocate for Adams County’s communities. As Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners she took interest and in many issues affecting her constituency, helping pave the way for future economic development, transportation improvements, air traffic investments and reform of county services. When I was elected to Congress in 1998 I knew that one of my first objectives was to learn as much as I could from Elaine, not only about one of Colorado’s fastest growing communities, but also about effective public service.

Elaine is the kind of person who speaks her mind with a blend of honest bluntness and old-school graciousness. As a daughter of Italian-Americans she also established a reputation for leadership on behalf of ethnic minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Elaine Valente and in wishing her success in all her future endeavors. It has been a true privilege to work with such a remarkable woman.
HIV/AIDS impacts the African-American community worse than any other ethnic group in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) report that African-Americans account for 50 percent of all new HIV infections, which is an incredible number considering only 12 percent of the American population is African-American. The CDC further reported that 69 percent of all children born to infected mothers were African-American. A study conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation showed that African-Americans accounted for 56 percent of deaths due to HIV in 2002.

Public awareness about HIV/AIDS is vital. National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day will help educate the African-American community about the disease, including prevention and treatment. The first annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was held on February 23, 2001. The slogan for the day was “Get Educated, Get Involved and Get Tested.” February 7 of each year is now recognized as National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

I was proud to cosponsor this important resolution that encourages State and local governments, including their public health departments, to publicize the day in African-American Communities and to promote testing. The resolution encourages media organizations to carry messages in support of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. Most importantly, it encourages enactment of effective HIV prevention programs.

HIV/AIDS is a formidable threat to our African-American communities. However, we can work together to ensure that the public is aware of the ways to prevent transmission of this disease and how individuals can protect themselves. But we can’t do this without funding. The Minority AIDS Initiative needs to be fully funded. The Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act is authorized through FY2005, so this year we need to ensure that no programs are under funded or dropped altogether.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will result in increased public awareness. As advocates work together to ensure that the public is aware of the ways to prevent transmission of this disease and how individuals can protect themselves, but we can’t do this without funding. The Minority AIDS Initiative needs to be fully funded. The Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act is authorized through FY2005, so this year we need to ensure that no programs are underfunded or dropped altogether.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will result in increased public awareness. As advocates work together to ensure that the public is aware of the ways to prevent transmission of this disease and how individuals can protect themselves, but we can’t do this without funding. The Minority AIDS Initiative needs to be fully funded. The Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act is authorized through FY2005, so this year we need to ensure that no programs are under funded or dropped altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of a valued public servant, Mr. Thomas Zipf, of St. Louis, MO.

Mr. Zipf was a valued employee of the City of St. Louis Police Department where he served for over 30 years and rose to the rank of Captain. Mr. Zipf was known throughout the force as being dedicated to his job and being driven by his desire to help and protect others.

His love of life and passion for his community live on through his wife, Mary Ann Zipf, and his two children, Kate, and Tom, Jr. His dedication to his job continues with his son, who is also an officer with the City of St. Louis Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends, and the community made it evident to all what an extraordinary person and public servant Mr. Zipf was. His wife and two children are a great testament to his life and vision. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his life.

HONORING ALFVIN F. POUSSAINT, M.D.
HON. BARBARA LEE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005
Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Delahunt, and I rise today to honor the extraordinary achievements and contributions of Dr. Alvin F. Poussaint of Boston, Massachusetts. Dr. Poussaint has devoted his professional life to the eradication of racism in American society, and is one of the foremost experts in the world today on the topics of race relations, prejudice and diversity, and is also a world-renowned child psychologist.

Dr. Poussaint, who was born in East Harlem, New York, on May 15, 1934, completed his undergraduate studies at Columbia University before receiving his M.D. from Cornell in 1960. He went on to do postgraduate work at the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute, where he served as Chief Resident in Psychiatry in 1964–65.

Inspired by the burgeoning Civil Rights movement in the South, Dr. Poussaint chose to take a job at the Southern Field Director of the Medical Committee for Human Rights in Jackson, Mississippi, a position he held from 1965–67. In that role, he courageously worked to provide medical care to civil rights workers and fought for the desegregation of health facilities throughout the South.

Dr. Poussaint was influential in the founding of Operation PUSH (People United to Save Humanity) and served as the Chairman of its Board of Directors. Operation PUSH, which has since merged with the National Rainbow Coalition to form the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition, has been a significant force in the struggle for racial equality in America, registering hundreds of thousands of voters across the country, assisting in the election of hundreds of local, state and national leaders and lobbying for increased representation of minorities in many industries.

As one of the nation’s preeminent psychiatrists and experts on race relations, Dr. Poussaint has authored the books Why Blacks Deny Blacks (1972), Raising Black Children (1992, with Dr. J.P. Comer) and Lay My Burden Down (2000, with Amy Alexander). His most recognizable work includes contributing articles to Ebony magazine, and acting as a consultant for several television projects, including The Cosby Show.

On Saturday, February 12, 2004, Dr. Poussaint will be honored in Boston, Massachusetts for his wide-ranging contributions to the fields of civil rights, mental health, social justice and the needs of children. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my own heartfelt thanks on behalf of the Congress to him for his many years of tireless work for the enrichment of our society. The dedication, intelligence and compassion he brings to his work have helped him to touch countless lives, and we salute him for his invaluable contributions.

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005
Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a Resolution expressing the Sense of the Congress that the United States should not ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty (“LOST”).

The Law of the Sea Treaty was conceived in the early 1970s by the “New International Economic Order,” a United Nations political movement designed to transfer wealth and technology from the industrial nations to communist and undeveloped nations. President Ronald Reagan recognized the threat this treaty would pose to America’s sovereignty and economic interests and rightly rejected the Treaty in 1982.

The proponents acted again in the 1990s, offering a separate “Agreement” that purported to amend the Treaty. This “corrected treaty” was also deemed unacceptable by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1994.

Now we are once again facing a terribly flawed treaty that will hand over more of our sovereignty to a corrupt United Nations—just at a time when the extent of the United Nations’ corruption is becoming more evident through the oil for food scandal in Iraq.

What is specifically wrong with the Law of the Sea Treaty?

The Law of the Sea Treaty will deem the oceans of the Earth as the “Common Heritage of Mankind.” The Treaty dictates that oceanic resources should be shared among all mankind. The effect of this will be U.N. control over the world’s seaboards—a full 70 percent of the earth’s surface.

The Law of the Sea Treaty will also create, for the first time in history, an international body with the authority to collect taxes from American citizens. It is truly a U.N. global tax. This will come about as a fee on private enterprises and state nations from seabed mining, offshore oil platforms, and other raw material recovery activities. These fees will first be paid to the governments of the signatory states, which will then have the burden of collecting the monies back from the private enterprises engaged in seabed mining.

This treaty will create a Law of the Sea Tribunal, which will claim—already has claimed—jurisdiction over the onshore as well as within the territorial sea or economic zones of coastal nations. This U.N. Tribunal could very well rule in a manner contrary to U.S. military, counterterrorism, and commercial interests.

Mr. Speaker, the Law of the Sea Treaty is a perfect example of “taxation without representation” that our Founding Fathers rebelled against. We should stand against it, surrendering one bit of American sovereignty or treasure to the United Nations or any other global body. I hope my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this...
Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of dedicated and distinguished federal service, Betty Loy will be retiring from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. During that time she supported six CDC Directors and seven Deputy Directors.

Beginning her career in the federal government with the Atomic Energy Commission in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Loy later came to CDC’s Office of Director as a part-time employee. Following the resignation of Director Dr. Bill Foege (1977–1983), Loy was asked to work in the Director’s office till a new Director was designated and staff were selected. Having enjoyed her part-time position in the Director’s office Betty applied for the full-time position, and was subsequently selected.

In June 2002, after nearly two decades of service as the Special Assistant to the Director, Betty left to become a Management and Program Analyst working as the liaison with partner organizations and visitors. It is safe to say Loy has been the voice and face of CDC to a who’s who of public health leaders, Atlanta community leaders, Congressional dignitaries, distinguished visitors and even TV and movie stars. She is virtually a walking, talking history book of CDC.

Betty has said of her job, “I’ve been privileged to work for some of the best people ever.” Well, Betty, the same could be said about you. Former CDC Director, James Mason, MPH, MD, said the feeling is mutual, “Betty Loy, rightfully referred to as ‘CDC’s Ultimate Ambassador’ will leave a lonely gap at CDC. Her skills, competence, in-depth, knowledge, perspective and warm pleasant personality made her a valuable partner to me and a series of other CDC Directors and Deputy Directors.”

In retirement, Betty plans to travel, spend time with friends, family, her children and grandchildren, and work on family genealogy. We wish Betty all the best in her future endeavors and thank her for years of service to our Nation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Mr. Ted Strickland, outgoing Commissioner for Adams County, Colorado.

In the last 5 years I have appreciated working with the Board of Adams County Commissioners, and I have found Commissioner Strickland to be a good source of wisdom and experience. I certainly wish him well on his retirement.

Commissioner Strickland was born and raised in Austin, Texas. After serving in the military he came to Colorado. Ted began a successful career in the oil and gas industry, becoming Vice President of Petroleum Information.

Feeling drawn toward public service, Ted ran for election to the Colorado House of Representatives. He served 2 years in the House before being elected to the Colorado State Senate, where he served as Senate President and later as a candidate for Governor in 1986.

Ted’s obvious passion for public service led him to run for Commissioner in 1996. Once on the Commission he continued his hard work for those he represented.

He served on the E–470 Public Highway Authority Board, the Front Range Airport Authority Board, the Adams County Economic Development Board, the Adams County Water Quality Association, and on the Denver Regional Council of Governments. With such a wide scope of reach, Commissioner Strickland has left an important legacy in Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Ted Strickland and in wishing him well on his retirement from local government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Ted Strickland for his dedicated service and in wishing him well on his retirement from local government.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, one doesn’t have to look very far from home to find an excellent example of patriotism. Ken Wolters, of Jefferson City, Missouri, is the commander of American Legion Post 5. In late January, he left home for up to 18 months of active duty in Iraq with the Missouri National Guard’s 105th Maintenance Company.

Wolters has been a National Guardsmen for 39 years and a Legion member for 34 years. A sergeant first class, Wolters is an automotive technician with the unit. He also has worked full-time as an armament inspector at the Missouri National Guard headquarters, and has been activated for state power outages and the Missouri River flood in 1993, but this is his first federal duty. The unknowns don’t bother Wolters because years of training and a reliable unit give him confidence, he said.

As Ken Wolters begins his active duty in Iraq, he will continue to serve our country with great distinction. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House will join me in thanking Ken for his dedicated service and in wishing him all the best in the days ahead.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Safe Nursing and Patient Act with Rep. STEVEN LATOURETTE (R-OH). Assuring quality medical care and addressing our nursing shortage should not divide us on partisan lines. That’s why I’m especially pleased to be working across the aisle with my friend from Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, in this important endeavor.

Senator KENNEDY is introducing the companion legislation in the Senate.

There are some 500,000 trained nurses in this country who are not working in their profession. Of course, their reasons for leaving nursing are many. But nurses consistently cite their concerns about the quality of care they feel that are able to provide in many health care settings today. Nurses are also greatly concerned about being forced to work mandatory overtime.

Listen to these words of a nurse in the state of Washington:

I have been a nurse for six years and most of the time I have worked in the hospital environment. It is difficult to tell you how terrible it is to “work scared” all the time. A mistake that I might make could easily cost someone their life. Every night at work we routinely “face the clock.” All of us do without lunch and breaks and work overtime, often without pay, to ensure continuity of care for families. Yet, we are constantly asked to do more. It has become the norm for us to have patient assignments two and a half times greater than the staffing guidelines established by the hospital itself. I cannot continue to participate in this unsafe and irresponsible practice. So I am leaving, not because I don’t love being a nurse, but because it is not safe places: not for patients and not for nurses.

While stories like this are telling, we also have a growing body of research to back up the anecdotes. Premier among these studies is a comprehensive report issued by the Institute of Medicine in the document entitled, “Keeping Patients Safe, Transforming the Work Environment of Nurses.” Highlighting their concern with regard to this issue, the IOM headline for their release of the report was, “Substantial Changes Required in Nurses’ Work Environment to Protect Patients from Health Care Errors.” Within the report, they concluded that “limiting the number of hours worked per day and consecutive days of work by nursing staff; as is done in other safety-sensitive industries, is a fundamental safety principle.” The report went on to specifically recommend that “working more than 12 hours in any 24-hour period and more than 60 hours in any 7-day period be prevented except in case of an emergency, such as a natural disaster.”

Another study published in the July/August 2004 Health Affairs Journal, “The Working Hours of Hospital Staff Nurses and Patient Safety,” found that nurses who worked shifts of twelve and a half hours or more were three times more likely to commit an error than nurses who worked 8.5 hours (a standard shift) or less. The study also found that working overtime increased the odds of making at least one error, regardless of how long the shift was originally scheduled. Finally, this article illustrates how nurses are being forced to work more and more overtime. The majority of nurses surveyed reported working overtime ten or more times in a twenty-eight day period and one-sixth reported working sixteen or more consecutive hours at least once during the period. Nurses reported being mandated to work overtime on 360 shifts and on another 475 shifts they described as “coerced” into working voluntary overtime.

As these studies show, the widespread practice of requiring nurses to work extended...
shifts and forgo days off causes nurses to frequently provide care in a state of fatigue, contributing to medical errors and other consequences that compromise patient safety. In addition to endangering patients, studies also point to overtime issues as a prime contributing factor in nursing shortages. For example, a 2001 report by the General Accounting Office, Nursing Workforce: Emerging Nurse Shortages Due to Multiple Factors, concluded:

The current high levels of job dissatisfaction among nurses may also play a crucial role in determining the extent and duration of nurse shortages. Efforts undertaken to improve the workplace environment may both reduce the number of nurses leaving the field and encourage more young people to enter the nursing profession.

We have the voices of nurses and the research evidence to prove that the practice of requiring nurses to work beyond the point they believe is safe is jeopardizing the quality of care patients receive. It is also contributing to the growing nurse shortage. Current projections are that the nurse workforce in 2020 will have fallen 20 percent below the level necessary to meet demand.

We have existing federal government standards that limit the hours that pilots, flight attendants, truck drivers, railroad engineers and other professions can safely work before consumer safety is endangered. However, no similar limitation currently exists for our nation’s nurses who are caring for us at the most vulnerable times in our lives.

The Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act would change that. It would set strict, new federal standards on the ability of health facilities to require ten-year tenures from overtime. Nurses would be allowed to continue to volunteer for overtime if and when they feel they can continue to provide safe, quality care. But, forced mandatory overtime would only be allowed when an official state of emergency was declared by federal, state or local government. These limits would be part of Medicare’s provider agreements. They would not apply to nursing homes since alternative staffing and quality measures are already moving forward for those facilities.

To ensure compliance, the bill provides HHS with the authority to investigate complaints from nurses about violations. It also grants HHS the power to issue civil monetary penalties of up to $10,000 for violations of the act and to increase those fines for patterns of violations.

Providers would be required to post notices explaining these new rights and to post nurse schedules in prominent workplace locations. Nurses would also obtain anti-discrimination protections against employers who continued to force overtime for nurses beyond what a nurse believes is safe for quality care. Providers found to have violated the law would be posted on Medicare’s website.

Often the states are ahead of the federal government when it comes to pinpointing problems that need to be addressed. It is worth noting that many states are considering such laws to strictly limit the use of mandatory nurse overtime. Several states—including California, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Washington and West Virginia—have already passed laws or regulations limiting the practice.

This bill is an important first step, but it isn’t the complete solution. I believe that standards must be developed to define timeframes for safe nursing care within the wide variety of health settings (whether such overtime is mandatorily or voluntarily). That is why the legislation also requires the Agency on Healthcare Research and Quality to report back to Congress with recommendations for developing overall standards to protect patient safety in nursing care. Once we have better data in that regard, I will support broader limitations on all types of overtime. But, we must not wait to act until that data can be developed. The data collection will take years and the crisis of mandatory overtime is upon us now.

I know that our nation’s hospital trade associations will claim that my solution misses the mark because it is precisely the lack of nurses in the profession today that is necessitating their need to require mandatory overtime. Let me respond directly. Mandatory overtime is dangerous for patients plain and simple. It is also a driving force for nurses leaving the profession. These twin realities make mandatory overtime a dangerous short-term gamble at best. We should join together to end the practice.

Mandatory overtime is a very real problem facing the nursing profession and that is why our bill is endorsed by the American Nurses Association, the AFL–CIO, AFSCME, AFT, SEIU, AFGE, UAW, UAN, and UFCW—organizations that speak for America’s nearly 3 million nurses.

Again, our bill is not the sole solution. I supported the Nurse Reinvestment Act, which was passed by Congress and signed into law in August 2002. That legislation authorizes new federal investment and initiatives to increase the number of people pursuing a nursing education. Such efforts will help in the future, but it will be years before that law’s impact is felt in our medical system. And, it will take even longer if the President and Republicans in Congress continue to withhold the funding necessary for the act to be fully implemented.

We need to help now. We must take steps to improve the nursing profession immediately so that today’s nurses will remain in the field for those of us who need such care before new nurses can be trained. We also need today’s nurses to be there as mentors for the nurses of tomorrow.

Mandatory nurse overtime is a very real quality of care issue for our health system and I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the Safe Nursing and Patient Care Act. It will start us down the right path toward protecting patients and encouraging people to remain in—and enter—the nursing profession.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE LATE OSSIE DAVIS

SPEECH OF
HON. JOE BACA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 2005

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to a great civil rights pioneer; a man who provided vital social and political commentary on our nation at a time when it was unwelcome to do so. Above all, Ossie Davis was an activist for social equality. He believed vigorously in the tenets on which our nation was founded: freedom, justice, and that all men are indeed created equal.

Ossie Davis passed away last year at the age of 87. With his passing our nation lost not only a leader of the civil rights movement but also one of the preeminent playwrights, authors and actors of the African American community.

Over his 50 years in the entertainment business, Ossie Davis wrote various plays, television shows and movies, shedding necessary light on the challenges facing the African American community and race relations in the United States.

He was a champion for the disenfranchised, providing a voice for those who could not speak out and inspiration for those seeking a better life. Ossie’s theatrical achievements and unshashed commentary on the civil rights movement led to him receiving the Silver Circle Award from the Academy of the Television Arts and Sciences in 1994, the National Medal of Arts in 1995, and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Screen Actor’s Guild in 2000. He was also honored by the Kennedy Center in 2004.

Through his proactive participation in the entertainment industry, Ossie Davis exhibited a deep resolve to highlighting the struggle for equality in the African American community and, in so doing, changed the direction of our nation.

I commend Congressman Conyers on awarding Ossie Davis this well-deserved medal. His contributions to the African American community and our entire nation should not go overlooked.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMISSIONER OF FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES ON JANUARY 8, 2005

HON. STEVE ISRAEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Suffolk County Commissioner of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services David H. Fischler. Suffolk County has been the beneficiary of Commissioner Fischler’s remarkable skill, his dedication to public service and his tremendous leadership all displayed over a distinguished 28-year career devoted to the people of Suffolk County. On January 8, 2005, Commissioner Fischler retired completing a full career tenure as Commissioner. His service will not soon be forgotten; his shoes will not soon be filled; but his legacy of excellence and service will forever last within the Suffolk Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services community.

Commissioner Fischler began his fire service career as a volunteer firefighter with the St. James (NY) Fire Department, where he later served as an Assistant Chief and Chief-of-Department for 8 years. While still serving the St. James Fire Department in a volunteer capacity, Commissioner Fischler began his leadership in the Suffolk County, a county with 1.4 million residents and approximately 12,500 providers in 136 fire and EMS agencies. Commissioner Fischler first served as the county’s...
Tribute to Norma B. Champ, Jr., of St. Louis, MO

Hon. Russ Carnahan
Of Missouri
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are to pay tribute to the life of Mr. Norma B. Champ, Jr., of St. Louis, MO, husband of Judith Smith Champ.

Mr. Champ's remarkable life took him through ventures in politics, business, farming, and the arts. He spent twenty years as the democratic committeeman for Clayton Township and was a member of the St. Louis County Board of Jail Visitors. His business acumen and the tough character in dairy farming and a trucking equipment company.

He had an undeniable impact on the arts community. He was on the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, was a member of the Missouri Arts Council, and was one of the longest serving members of the National Council.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends, and the community made it evident to all what an extraordinary person Mr. Champ was. His wife, children, and grandchildren are a great testament to whom he was as a person. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his life.

Honoring the 2004 African American Ethnic Sports Hall of Fame Inductees

Hon. Barbara Lee
Of California
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the inductees of twelve former black Olympians into the African American Ethnic Sports Hall of Fame on July 8, 2004 in Sacramento, California. The honorees were notable not only for their tremendous athletic achievements, but also for the profound social significance these achievements in sports.

The Athens Games in 2004 marked the 100th anniversary of the first African American participation in the Olympics, when George Poage earned bronze medals in the 200- and 400-meter hurdles, and Joseph Stadler won a silver medal in the standing high jump in St. Louis in 1904. Since then, African Americans have produced numerous outstanding Olympic performances, and the July inductees to the African American Ethnic Sports Hall of Fame are responsible for some of the finest. Of the Hall of Fame's twelve honorees, eleven were track and field athletes, and one was a coach. Alice Coachman-Davis, who was not allowed to participate in organized athletic activities while growing up in the South, became the first African American woman to win a gold medal when she placed first in the high jump at the London Games in 1948. Harrison Dillard won an astounding 82 consecutive 110-meter hurdles races, a record which still stands. Wilbur Ross coached two of the most successful Olympic athletes of all time, Carl Lewis and Michael Johnson.

The inductees, Smith and John Carlos, who finished first and third, respectively, in the 200 meters at the 1968 Games in Mexico City, took a courageous stand for social justice in one of the most powerful moments in the history of the Olympics. Other Hall of Fame inductees included Milt Campbell, Herb Douglas, Lee Evans, Edith McGuire-Duvall, Dr. Reginald Pearman, Wyomia Tyus and John Woodruff, all of whom were outstanding track and field athletes.

These inductees' achievements are clearly remarkable in the pure athletic sense, but when placed in their social context, they are even more meaningful. Athletics has played an important role in the broader Civil Rights movement, and the Olympic Arena has provided not only an opportunity for African Americans to prove that they could compete with the rest of the world, but has also served as a forum for making important social and political statements. Today, it is of vital importance that we continue to recognize and pay tribute to these achievements, and that we continue to draw inspiration from them in furthering our own goals.

On behalf of the Ninth Congressional District, I salute both the African American Ethnic Sports Hall of Fame and its July 2004 inductees for their invaluable contributions to athletics, the United States, and the entire world.
Founded by Gary Zeff in 1994, Open Studios’ first event was held in Boulder, Colorado during October of 1995. Every fall since then, Open Studios has invited the public to create self-guided tours of approximately 135 studios featuring painters, sculptors, woodworkers, furniture makers, glass artists, photographers, papermakers, jewelers, potters and other fine visual artists. These tours allow the public to meet the artists one-on-one in their studios and watch them work.

Participating artists include an educational component in their studio setting. Many frequently engage the visitors by demonstrating their artistic skills and technique. Visitors are encouraged to ask questions about particular aspects of their work and their artistic process. At some studios, materials are available for adults and children to try their hand at creating art. Open Studios enhances the public tours with a unique Guidebook containing all the participating artists, an easy-to-read tour map, and an Art Resource Directory.

Prior to the six more Boulder Review exhibit is held locally along with an artists’ reception. The general public is joined at this free event by art designers, art consultants, dealers, gallery owners, private collectors, and other artists. Open Studios has established an excellent reputation in the community. In the 10-year history, attendance has increased from about 20,000 studio visits to over 70,000. Its programs are implemented by an exceptional, dedicated staff with the sound stewardship of an innovative Board of Directors.

Open Studios has a mission of education. That mission has been expanded over the years to include not just educational opportunities in the studios during the two week event, but also community activities especially for children. Six years ago, Open Studios coordinated with the Director of Special Education of the Boulder Valley School District to provide art supplies and instruction to Halcyon School. With the success of the program at Halcyon, the educational programs has been expanded to include six more Boulder Valley schools. There is no charge to the schools, and Open Studios pays artists for their time with a grant from the Boulder Arts Commission.

Throughout the decade, Open Studios has worked to bring art to the community in a myriad of different ways. Open Studios has assisted my office with the annual United States Congressional High School Art Competition for students to include six more Boulder Valley schools.

Mr. UDALL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Sam and Betty Kennedy of Columbia started their life together on November 6, 1954, at the Methodist Church, in the small Tennessee community of Culleoka. They reached the 50 year milestone on November 6, 2004, and celebrated this occasion with family and friends at Greenway Farms, their home for more than 40 years, a few weeks later.

Sam, the fifth of eight children, grew up the son of a dentist and farmer, Dr. Henry Grady and Annie Porter Delk Kennedy, farm wife and teacher. An attorney and newspaper publisher, Sam has served as general sessions judge, district attorney and county executive of Maury County.

Raised the daughter of Columbia Daily Herald Editor and Publisher John and Elizabeth Read Ridley Finney, Betty attended Agnes Scott College and Emory University’s School of Journalism. According to family lore, Sam and Betty met on a street in Columbia in 1953 when Betty was soliciting newspaper advertising. During the following months their courtship continued and they fell in love.

After the passing of Betty’s father John Finney, Sam left his law career and with Betty led the Daily Herald, as publisher until 1983 when the paper was sold. Today, they own and operate the Lawrence County Advocate, the Waverly News Democrat, the News Leader, and the Buffalo River Review.

Over their 50 year marriage, Sam and Betty have been blessed with two children and five grandchildren.

Sam Kennedy, Jr. is an assistant U.S. Attorney and is married to Mary Susan Betty Kennedy, a business professor at Columbia State Community College. Their son, Sam Kennedy III is a junior at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Their daughter, Berry, is a freshman at Yale University.

Elizabeth Kennedy Blackstone is the editor of the Parsons News Leader. She is married to Billy Blackstone, a partner with the law firm of Stokes, Bartholomew, Evans and Petree. The Blackstones have three children—Emory, Jack, and Eliza. We all should take a moment and applaud their accomplishment and their commitment to one another.

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF FRIENDSHIP AND LOVE IN MARRIAGE

HON. LINCOLN DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Sam and Betty Kennedy of Columbia started their life together on November 6, 1954, at the Methodist Church, in the small Tennessee community of Culleoka. They reached the 50 year milestone on November 6, 2004, and celebrated this occasion with family and friends at Greenway Farms, their home for more than 40 years, a few weeks later.

Sam, the fifth of eight children, grew up the son of a dentist and farmer, Dr. Henry Grady and Annie Porter Delk Kennedy, farm wife and teacher. An attorney and newspaper publisher, Sam has served as general sessions judge, district attorney and county executive of Maury County.

Raised the daughter of Columbia Daily Herald Editor and Publisher John and Elizabeth Read Ridley Finney, Betty attended Agnes Scott College and Emory University’s School of Journalism. According to family lore, Sam and Betty met on a street in Columbia in 1953 when Betty was soliciting newspaper advertising. During the following months their courtship continued and they fell in love.

After the passing of Betty’s father John Finney, Sam left his law career and with Betty led the Daily Herald, as publisher until 1983 when the paper was sold. Today, they own and operate the Lawrence County Advocate, the Waverly News Democrat, the News Leader, and the Buffalo River Review.

Over their 50 year marriage, Sam and Betty have been blessed with two children and five grandchildren.

Sam Kennedy, Jr. is an assistant U.S. Attorney and is married to Mary Susan Betty Kennedy, a business professor at Columbia State Community College. Their son, Sam Kennedy III is a junior at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Their daughter, Berry, is a freshman at Yale University.

Elizabeth Kennedy Blackstone is the editor of the Parsons News Leader. She is married to Billy Blackstone, a partner with the law firm of Stokes, Bartholomew, Evans and Petree. The Blackstones have three children—Emory, Jack, and Eliza. We all should take a moment and applaud their accomplishment and their commitment to one another.

RECOGNITION OF OPEN STUDIO’S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Open Studios on celebrating their 10th Anniversary of providing exemplary educational and cultural programming for artists and art lovers in the Boulder community. Open Studios is one of Colorado’s outstanding arts organizations, offering opportunities to gain a broader understanding and appreciation of the visual arts.

Founded by Gary Zeff in 1994, Open Studios’ first event was held in Boulder, Colorado during October of 1995. Every fall since then, Open Studios has invited the public to create self-guided tours of approximately 135 studios featuring painters, sculptors, woodworkers, furniture makers, glass artists, photographers, papermakers, jewelers, potters and other fine visual artists. These tours allow the public to meet the artists one-on-one in their studios and watch them work.

Participating artists include an educational component in their studio setting. Many frequently engage the visitors by demonstrating their artistic skills and technique. Visitors are encouraged to ask questions about particular aspects of their work and their artistic process. At some studios, materials are available for adults and children to try their hand at creating art. Open Studios enhances the public tours with a unique Guidebook containing all the participating artists, an easy-to-read tour map, and an Art Resource Directory.

Prior to the six more Boulder Review exhibit is held locally along with an artists’ reception. The general public is joined at this free event by art designers, art consultants, dealers, gallery owners, private collectors, and other artists. Open Studios has established an excellent reputation in the community. In the 10-year history, attendance has increased from about 20,000 studio visits to over 70,000. Its programs are implemented by an exceptional, dedicated staff with the sound stewardship of an innovative Board of Directors.

Open Studios has a mission of education. That mission has been expanded over the years to include not just educational opportunities in the studios during the two week event, but also community activities especially for children. Six years ago, Open Studios coordinated with the Director of Special Education of the Boulder Valley School District to provide art supplies and instruction to Halcyon School. With the success of the program at Halcyon, the educational programs has been expanded to include six more Boulder Valley schools. There is no charge to the schools, and Open Studios pays artists for their time with a grant from the Boulder Arts Commission.

Throughout the decade, Open Studios has worked to bring art to the community in a myriad of different ways. Open Studios has assisted my office with the annual United States Congressional High School Art Competition for students.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, a strong domestic manufacturing base is vital to our country’s national defense and economic security. Because of massive global competition, and costs that manufacturers cannot directly control, manufacturing in the United States is under great stress. In order to improve the economic environment in America for manufacturers, we have to address the issues that make our companies less globally competitive.

These issues include lawsuit abuse, rising health care costs, energy prices, tax reform, and fighting against criminal counterfeiters.

But in order to provide an environment where our manufacturers can effectively compete in the global market, we must address the distortions in the U.S. market for steel. Today I am introducing a resolution that seeks to address unnecessary distortions.

There are currently 188 antidumping and countervailing duty (AD/CVD) orders in place on various types of steel, which is well over
The Department of Commerce (DoC) and International Trade Commission (ITC) are required by law to conduct 5-year “sunset reviews” of anti-dumping and countervailing duty (AD/CVD) orders to determine whether to terminate, suspend, or continue the duties beyond the 5 years they have already been in place. In particular, on March 2, 2005 the ITC will conduct a sunset review hearing on hot-rolled steel products from Brazil, Japan, and Russia (Invs. 701–TA–384 and 731–TA–806–808 (Review)). And on April 26, 2005 the ITC will conduct a sunset review hearing on stain- less steel from France, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom (Invs. 701–TA–380–382 and 731–TA–797–804 (Review)). Today I am introducing a resolution that urges the DoC and ITC to consider, and report on, the impact of the AD/CVD orders on domestic steel-consuming companies and the overall economy when conducting sunset reviews of duties on steel products. The DoC and ITC have the discretion to take into account the impact of these duties on steel consumers, and they should. But traditionally they have not. If this continues, economic decisions will be made without seeing the full effects of those decisions. This is not wise, and it’s not fair. Furthermore, the dam- age unnecessary duties do to steel consumers causes the customer base for domestic steel producers to shrink, ultimately harming the steel industry. Sound economic policy cannot be made in a vacuum. When economic policy decisions are made, the full effects of those decisions should be taken into consideration. I support both a strong domestic steel in- dustry and a strong domestic manufacturing base because they are vital to our national de- fense and economic security. Removing some specific duties will not harm domestic steel producers, who are doing quite well. In fact, domestic steel producers noted record earnings in 2004 (including increases as high as 45 percent over 2003) and analysts predict a strong 2005 for the industry. If the AD/CVD duties for specific types of steel were re- moved, market conditions would become less distorted and steel producers may see some extremely high prices they charged now drop to just very high. This will not cause material in- jury to steel producers, and in fact could pro- vide some much-needed relief for their cus- tomer base. This resolution does nothing to change trade law. It simply calls for sound policy and fundamental fairness. The DoC and ITC already have the authority to look at the full pic- ture during sunset reviews of duties on steel products. This resolution simply calls on them to do just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

IN HONOR OF MISS ASHLEIGH BRIANNA OLIVER

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ac- knowledge the outstanding achievements of a student from Ohio’s Third Congressional Dis- trict. Miss Ashleigh Brianna Oliver recently re- ceived the Bronze Medallion Award, an aca- demic honor present in Walter E. Stebbins, Unit 776 since she was 7 years old. She is currently serving as the Junior President, as she has done for 4 years.

Miss Oliver’s high level of academic achievement and strong community involve- ment is worthy of recognition. She is a fine ex- ample of a young person contributing to soci- ety as an exemplary citizen. I urge my col- leagues to join me in acknowledging Miss Ol- ier’s success.

ADDRESS OF ISRAEL’S DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SILVAN SHALOM, AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF NAZI DEATH CAMPS

HON. TOM LANTOS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 of this year, the United Nations General As- sembly commemorated the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Nazi death camps. January 27, 1945, was the date on which Russian troops liberated Auschwitz, the most notorious of the death camps, and the symbol of the Holocaust, in which over 6 million Jews and hundreds of thousands of other nationalities were killed in the Second World War II.

The United Nations commemoration, which was held three days before the anniversary, began with a moment of silence for the vic- tims. Among the major speakers at the Gen- eral Assembly special session was the distin- guished Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel, Silvan Shalom.

Israel, like the United Nations, was born from the ashes of the Holocaust. Hundreds of thousands of Jews fled Europe as the Nazi grip was tightening around Europe and hundreds of thousands more who survived the Nazi terror immigrated to Israel. The State of Israel became their refuge, and they became citizens of a state dedicated to remembering and never to allow a repetition of the Holo- caust.

Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Shalom previously served as Finance Minister and Science Minister in the Israeli govern- ment. He has been a member of the Knesset since 1992. Born in Tunis, he fought in the Israeli army, and by the age of 20 he had moved to Israel when he was only a year old.

Minister Shalom’s address at the United Na- tions General Assembly session draws upon three millennia of Israeli history and tradition. For the dry bones of the horror of the Holo- caust a living Israel has emerged, an Israel that is absolutely and irrevocably committed that such a tragedy shall not happen ever again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the outstanding ad- dress of the Foreign Minister of Israel be placed in the Congressional Record. I urge my colleagues to give thoughtful attention to his statement.

ADDRESS OF ISRAEL’S DEPUTY PRIME MIN- ISTER AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS SILVAN SHALOM

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President, Fel- low Foreign Ministers, Survivors of the Hol- ocaust, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentleman:

Sixty years ago, allied soldiers arrived at the gates of the Auschwitz concentration camp. Nothing could prepare them for what they would witness: in other camps they liberated—the stench of the bod- ies, the piles of clothes, of teeth, of chil- dren’s shoes. But in the accounts of the lib- erators, more than the smell, more even than the piles of bodies, the story of the hor- ror was told in the faces of the survivors.

The account of Harold Berber, an American liberator in Buchenwald, is typical of many, and I quote: “As I walked through the barracks I heard a voice, and I turned around and I saw a skeleton talk to me. He said, ‘thank God you’ve come.’ And that was a funny feeling. Did you ever talk to a skeleton that talked back? And that’s what I was doing. And later on I saw mounds of these living skeletons that the Germans left behind them.

Thousands of years ago the prophet Eze- kiel had a similar vision. In one of the most famous passages of the Bible, the prophet de- scribes how he came to a valley full of bones. The heavens open, says Ezekiel, and I saw a great horde of bones in the plain of Halah. Shall these bones live?

Here with me today, are those who have given life to dry bones, both survivors and liberators. Men like Dov Shilankey who fought in the ghetto and later became speak- er of Israel’s parliament, the Knesset; like Yossi Peled, who after being evacuated from the Scourges of the Nazis, eventually became a Major-General in the Israeli Defense Forces, to protect his people from the horrors of an- other calamity; and like David Grinstein, who survived the labor camps, and now heads an organization for restitution for the forced laborers under Nazi rule; and women like Gila Almagor—today the first lady of Israeli stage and screen—who has translated her ex- periences as the daughter of a Holocaust sur- vivor, into art that has touched millions.

At the same time, when we see what the survivors have given to humankind, we can
only begin to appreciate, what might have been given to the world by the millions who did not survive. We mourn their loss, to this day. Every fiber of our people, feels their lack. Every heart, every soul, every mind, every bone, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wound, every wound, every scar, every scar, every chemical, every chemical, every tear, every tear, every wind...
CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MRS. DELOIS JACKSON WILKINSON

HON. JIM COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Black History month, I rise today to celebrate the remarkable life of Mrs. DeLois Jackson Wilkinson of Nashville, Tennessee. Mrs. Wilkinson was a physical therapist, school board member and local community activist. Often referred to as “Miss Civil Rights,” she was among the many brave leaders who participated in the civil rights movement to make this country a better place not only for black Americans, but for all citizens. When she passed away on Saturday, January 29, 2004 at the age of 80, our country lost a dedicated advocate and a dear friend.

Mrs. Wilkinson’s energy, passion, and perseverance endeared her to all. Born in Fayette County, Tennessee, Mrs. Wilkinson was one of eight children. She attended Lembreve College in Memphis and graduated from Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. She moved to Nashville, Tennessee, where she became a physical therapist at Meharry Medical College. She and her husband, Fred Wilkinson, had five children whom they raised during the tumultuous civil rights era and whom they struggled to protect from the harsh realities of life in the South.

Frustrated by the inequalities of segregation, Mrs. Wilkinson worked hard to ensure that she, her children, and other black Americans would some day experience the joys of true freedom. She often told a story about going to a downtown department store in Nashville with her young son and passing a restaurant with a play area set up for children. Her son desperately wanted to go in, but to shield him from the harsh truth that he was not allowed, she simply told him that they were too much of a rush. Mrs. Wilkinson recalled years later that she hated having to lie to her son. Fueled by her desire for equal rights, she helped organize sit-in demonstrations at downtown Nashville lunch counters, and in 1963 and 1983, she participated in the historic civil rights marches on Washington, DC.

As a member of the Board of Education in Nashville, Mrs. Wilkinson advocated for quality education for all children. When asked to serve as a board member, she said that the question of “why Johnny can’t read needs to be answered.” Because “Johnny does not teach himself,” she stressed the responsibility of the school board, administration and teachers to ensure that. In 1994, Mrs. Wilkinson was appointed by Governor Don Sundquist to serve as a board member, and later she was appointed as the executive director of the Tennessee Board of Education. Mrs. Wilkinson’s insights and efforts throughout this endeavor makes her a powerful force.

In 1991, Mrs. Wilkinson was honored by the National Association of Black Women for her outstanding contributions to the civil rights movement. She was presented with the NAACP’s first annual Rosa Parks Award and the Life Time Achievement Award by the Tennessee Women Legislators Coalition. She was listed in “Who’s Who Among Black Americans,” “Women Who Made a Difference,” “Women of Courage” and “Women of Distinction.” Mrs. Wilkinson was a strong advocate for quality education for all children.

A tireless advocate, Mrs. Wilkinson devoted her lifetime to improving the lives of all Americans. As we celebrate Black History Month, who better to recognize than Mrs. Wilkinson—an extraordinary Nashvillian who provided energy and a sense of purpose to her community, compassion and hope to the poor and sick, and promise for a better future to the repressed.

On behalf of the fifth district of Tennessee, I send my deepest condolences to Mrs. Wilkinson and her family. Many of us will take to heart the philosophy she lived by—“that every person should contribute positively during their lifetime to the betterment and spiritual life on earth.”
for distribution of products and services, ranging from familiar restaurants and hotels to home movers, tax preparers, personnel providers and so on. Clearly, franchising is a critical engine of America’s economic growth.

When an individual acquires a franchise, the individual must first undergo various types of training. The franchisee must train on the specific franchise he or she wishes to acquire. Training can include education on specialized knowledge of goods, services, policies and practices of the individual franchise system. Training may also include customer service, daily operational management, computer systems, inventory control, costing and pricing as well as regulatory obligations.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, American military members, whether as active duty servicemembers or veterans, possess a wealth of experience and abilities. Their training in the armed forces has provided them with high-end skill sets that employers are looking for in the future workforce. Yet outside of what has been provided during their tenure with the military, statistics show that many of our younger military men and women have had no formal education or training beyond their high school years.

Mr. Speaker, the “Veterans Self-Employment Act” will allow more veterans to take advantage of the opportunities in franchising by allowing servicemembers, veterans, national guardsmen, reservists, and eligible dependent spouses or children to apply a portion of his or her educational benefit to defray the portion of a franchise purchase cost attributable to training. Specifically, in a one-time lump sum payment, beneficiaries will be able to use the lesser of 1/3 of the remaining Montgomery GI Benefit entitlement or 1/2 the franchise fee.

In addition, the bill provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs proper authority to oversee and avoid any possible abuse of this program; submit to the Secretary a detailed description of the training program; two year operating rule for franchise businesses; and provide individual progress reports regarding successful completion of individual training, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our Nation’s veterans and thus urge floor consideration for the “Veterans Self-Employment Act.”

INTRODUCTION OF THE ‘INTERNET SPYWARE (I-SPY) PREVENTION ACT’

HON. BOB GOODLATTE
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the “Internet Spyware (I-SPY) Prevention Act.”

This bipartisan legislation, which I introduced with my colleagues ZOE LOFGREN of California and LAMAR SMITH of Texas, will impose tough criminal penalties on the most egregious purveyors of spyware, without imposing a broad regulatory regime on legitimate online businesses. I believe that this targeted approach is the best way to combat spyware. Spyware is a growing and serious problem. The Federal Trade Commission has testified that “spyware appears to be a new and rapidly growing practice that poses a risk of serious harm to consumers.” Spyware is software that provides a tool for criminals to crack into computers to conduct nefarious activities, such as altering a user’s security settings, collecting personal information to steal a user’s identity, or to commit other crimes.

The I-SPY Prevention Act would impose criminal penalties on the most egregious behaviors associated with spyware. Specifically, this legislation would impose up to a 5 year prison sentence on anyone who uses software to intentionally break into a computer and uses that software in furtherance of another federal crime. In addition, it would impose up to a 2 year prison sentence on anyone who uses spyware to intentionally break into a computer or alter the computer’s security or to commit other crimes. Second, or more pervasive, information with the intent to defraud or injure a person or with the intent to damage a computer. By imposing stiff penalties on these bad actors, this legislation will help deter the use of spyware, and will thus help protect consumers from these aggressive enforcement.

Spyware is an inherently criminal practice that poses a risk of serious harm to consumers. Without a robust enforcement effort, the threat is only going to increase. The I-SPY Prevention Act authorizes $10 million for fiscal years 2006 through 2009, to be devoted to prosecutions, and expresses the sense of the Congress that the Department of Justice should vigorously enforce the laws against spyware violations, as well as against online phishing scams in which criminals send fake e-mail messages to consumers on behalf of famous companies and request account information that is later used to conduct criminal activities.

I believe that four overarching principles should guide the development of any spyware legislation. First, we must punish the bad actors, while protecting legitimate online companies. Second, or more pervasive, but rather encourage innovative new services and the growth of the Internet. Third, we must not stifle the free market. Fourth, we must target the behavior, not the technology.

By imposing criminal penalties on those that use spyware to commit federal crimes and other dangerous activities, the I-SPY Prevention Act will protect consumers by punishing the bad actors, without imposing liability on those that act legitimately online.

The targeted approach of the I-SPY Prevention Act also avoids excessive regulation and its repercussions, including the increased likelihood that an overly regulatory approach would have unintended consequences that could discourage the creation of new and exciting technologies and services on the Internet. By encouraging innovation, the I-SPY Prevention Act will help ensure that consumers have access to cutting-edge products and services at lower prices.

In addition, the approach of the I-SPY Prevention Act does not interfere with the free market principle that a business should be free to react to consumer demand by providing consumers with easy access to the Internet’s wealth of information and convenience. Instead, we want a seamless interaction with the Internet, and we must be careful to not interfere with businesses’ abilities to respond to this consumer demand with innovative services. The I-SPY Prevention Act will help ensure that consumers, not the federal government, define what their interaction with the Internet looks like.

Finally, by going after the criminal behavior associated with the use of spyware, the I-SPY Prevention Act recognizes that not all software is spyware and that the crime does not lie in the technology itself, but rather in actually using the technology for nefarious purposes. People commit crimes, not software.

The I-SPY Prevention Act is a targeted approach that protects consumers by imposing stiff penalties on the bad actors, while protecting the ability of legitimate companies to develop new and exciting products and services online for consumers.

I urge each of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TONY HALL FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

SPEECH OF
HON. ROB PORTMAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 2005

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, fellow Ohioan, and former colleague, Ambassador Tony Hall, upon overwhelming House passage of legislation to designate the federal building located at 200 West Second Street in Dayton, Ohio, as the “Tony Hall Federal Building and Courthouse.”

Currently United States Ambassador to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, Mr. Hall is well known to those of us from Ohio and in the House. But for those who are not familiar with his distinguished career, permit me to reveal just a few of his many accomplishments.

Prior to serving as Ambassador, Mr. Hall represented the people of the Third Congressional District of Ohio for nearly 24 years. During his service in Congress, he was a founding member and Chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger and Chairman of the Democratic Caucus on Hunger. Ambassador Hall also founded and served as a steering committee member for the Congressional Friends of Human Rights Monitors.

In Congress, Ambassador Hall wrote significant legislation supporting food aid, child survival, basic education, primary health care, microenterprise and development assistance programs for the world’s poorest nations. He has made over one hundred trips to poverty-stricken and war-torn nations in his efforts to observe first hand the important work of these programs.

His tireless advocacy for hunger relief and humanitarian programs around the world resulted in his being nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize three times. He has also received the UNICEF 1995 Children’s Legislative Advocate Award; the U.S. AID Presidential Emergency Hunger Award; the 1993 Oxfam America Partners Award; and the NCAA Silver Anniversary Award. Ambassador Hall’s work for the people of Ohio and around the world. I join my colleagues in congratulating him on receiving this important honor.
Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, whether we live in prosperous or uncertain times, American families need economic security—security from tyranny. Because he believes in freedom and because he actively and peacefully advocates for liberty, Mr. Ramos Lauzerique has been targeted by the despotic regime.

In March 2003, as part of the tyrant's heinous island wide crackdown on peaceful, pro-democracy activists, Mr. Ramos Lauzerique was arrested by the regime. In a sham trial, he was sentenced to 18 years in the totalitarian gulag.

Mr. Ramos Lauzerique is over 60 years old and languishing in the revolting, hellish gulag. However, being confined in these inhumane conditions has not discouraged him from continuing to demand justice for the people of Cuba and his fellow political prisoners.

Mr. Ramos Lauzerique has been targeted by the despotic regime. He believes that the Cuban people are entitled to human rights, democracy, and freedom from tyranny. Because he believes in freedom and because he actively and peacefully advocates for liberty, Mr. Ramos Lauzerique has been targeted by the despotic regime.

In March 2003, as part of the tyrant's heinous island wide crackdown on peaceful, pro-democracy activists, Mr. Ramos Lauzerique was arrested by the regime. In a sham trial, he was sentenced to 18 years in the totalitarian gulag.

Mr. Ramos Lauzerique is over 60 years old and languishing in the revolting, hellish gulag. However, being confined in these inhumane conditions has not discouraged him from continuing to demand justice for the people of Cuba and his fellow political prisoners. Amnesty International reports that Mr. Ramos Lauzerique has participated in at least two hunger strikes while imprisoned in Castro's dungeon. He has undertaken these strikes to bring attention to the repulsive squalor of the gulag, the lack of medical attention, and the barbaric punishment cells; all in defiance of the machinery of repression that has unjustly confined him in these repugnant conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it remains categorically unacceptable that men and women who demand freedom from tyranny are locked in the dungeons of tyrannical monsters. Here, under the dome that represents modern democracy, we must continue to demand the liberation of all who suffer in the darkness of totalitarianism. As we continue to exercise our democratic rights, let us never forget those who are struggling to liberate their own nations. My colleagues, we must demand the immediate release of Mr. Ramos Lauzerique and every prisoner of conscience locked in Castro's totalitarian gulag.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 750, THE SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE PLUS ACT OF 2005

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, whether we live in prosperous or uncertain times, American families need economic security—the kind of economic security that Social Security provides. For 70 years, Social Security has protected workers and their families from falling into poverty if breadwinner retires, suffers disability, or dies. Social Security has ended, unlike many other government programs, because its architects designed it to be owned by workers and to be safe for future generations.

Social Security has evolved over the decades, strengthening its protections and finding new ways to improve. However, our nation's demographic trends are changing rapidly, and Social Security's ability to continue meeting its promises is threatened.

The Social Security Guarantee Plus Plan I am introducing today will enable Social Security to continue fulfilling its vital role in the lives of all Americans.

First, the Guarantee Plus Plan keeps intact the Social Security safety net. Promised benefits, including cost of living increases, are guaranteed for people receiving benefits today, tomorrow, and for all future generations.

Second, under the Guarantee Plus Plan, Workers who have paid into the system, it's their money, and we must protect and enhance their investment. It's not fair to workers to see their benefits eroded by taxes.

Nor is it fair for the government to tell workers to work longer. That's why my plan does not raise taxes, does not lower benefits, and does not change anybody's eligibility.

Third, Social Security payroll taxes belong to the workers who paid them. My plan gives workers a real ownership stake in Social Security so they can rely on the system to secure their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the Guarantee Plus Plan protects our daughters, our mothers, our aunts and our grandmothers, not only by guaranteeing full benefits, but also by enhancing current law benefits and lowering earnings, women are more likely to suffer poverty in old age. Social Security is a vital source of income for working women.

In addition to the much needed improvements to the Social Security program, the Guarantee Plus Plan also provides a new Social Security system to generate surplus cash in the latter part of the century, actually adding black ink to the government's bottom line.

My plan uses general revenues to fund the accounts. Even assuming borrowing for a transitional period, my plan pays back every dollar plus interest within the seventy-five year actuarial period.

The Guarantee Plus Plan also meets or exceeds all of the President's principles for reform—pays promised benefits to retirees, near-retirees, and all workers; no tax increases; no government investing; fully predictable aid and security; and offers individually controlled, voluntary personal retirement accounts that will augment Social Security.

In addition, my plan is consistent with the first option to establish personal accounts recommended by the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security.

President Bush has made the strengthening of Social Security his highest priority. Americans are already showing their willingness to explore new ideas to strengthen this vital program, since the old ways are no longer adequate to today's realities. Now is the time for a straightforward, honest and realistic discussion about the future of Social Security. The longer we wait to address the coming crisis, the more difficult and expensive the job will be down the line.

The time of Social Security's enactment until today, the history of the program's evolution has demonstrated that while everybody has his or her own ideas on how to strengthen the program, progress toward that goal can only be achieved with open and honest cooperation. It's long past time for us to lay all our best thoughts on the table and work together to build on our success to make a stronger Social Security system that is an asset to all and not a liability to our children and grandchildren.

HONORING HENRIETTA SMITH AND NINA KLEIN

HON. RALPH M. HALL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the lives of two outstanding Texas women, Henrietta C. Smith of Greenvale, Texas, in the Fourth Congressional District, and her twin sister, Nina Lee Klein of Garland. Henrietta and Nina will celebrate their 85th birthdays with a family reunion in Austin, and join their children, grandchildren, and many friends in recognition of this joyous occasion.

Henrietta and Nina have been excellent role models for their families and friends, and for everyone who have known them. Henrietta obtained bachelor's and master's degrees from Texas
A&M University at Commerce and also attended Miss Hick's Secretarial School in St. Louis, MO. A resident of Greenville for 54 years, she retired as a vocational counselor from Blythewood High School in 1988. Prior to that, she was a guidance counselor at Greenville Junior High School and a sixth grade teacher at Bowie Elementary School. She remains a community, as an elder at Grace Presbyterian Church, past president and annual book sale volunteer for the American Association of University Women, and past president of the Greenville Area Retired Teachers and School Employees Association.

Nina also has been active in her church as well as various women's groups and is a life-long Democrat. Although legally blind throughout her life, Nina graduated from Maryville University in St. Louis with a degree in sociology—a significant accomplishment—and has been a productive and active member of her community.

Henrietta was married to the late Wilson Smith, who died in 1968. They have three children—Charlotte Wright of Davidsonville, MD, Marsha Smith of Pahrump, NV, and Edward Smith of Fairfield, TX, as well as four grandchildren. Nina lost her husband, Walter Klein, in 1985. Their daughter, Barbara Klein, lives in Garland.

Although these sisters live 50 miles apart, they still see each other several times each month. Although they were unable to attend their 85th birthday on Valentine's Day, February 14, with their family, I want to take this opportunity in the House of Representatives to extend my best wishes to Henrietta C. Smith and Nina Lee Klein for a wonderful celebration and recognize their many contributions to their families and their communities.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a simple, straightforward bill to ensure that as the architects of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, we seek to provide the Department of Homeland Security the tools to do the job. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a bill that will help ensure our borders are secure.

NANCY TIPPINS, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague who recently retired from Capitol Hill after three decades of exemplary service.

Nancy Tippins, a native of Auburn, Alabama, and graduate of Auburn University, first came to Washington in 1975 and accepted a position as legislative assistant on the staff of my predecessor, Representative Jack Edwards. Following Jack's retirement in 1984, Nancy was hired by my immediate predecessor, Representative Sonny Callahan, as his legislative director.

During her tenure with Sonny, Nancy became an invaluable member of the legislative team, a role made even more important in 1994 with Sonny's appointment as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittees on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs. She quickly developed a thorough and extensive knowledge of subcommittee operations and the appropriations process. Sonny's chairmanship became an integral part of the team drafting each year's Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

Nancy's hard work and dedication to her colleagues and the people of south Alabama have earned her wide admiration from Members and staff alike, and she developed a strong and well-deserved reputation for being a team player and an invaluable source for assistance and information.

It would be difficult to adequately describe the tremendous gifts and skill Nancy brought to our office in Washington. Adored by Members and staff on both sides of the aisle, she brought great levels of knowledge to the job and displayed tremendous dedication to the residents of Alabama's First Congressional District. As my legislative director for the past two years, I found my new job as a member of this chamber made much easier as a result of the passion and dedication Nancy possessed. Having worked side-by-side with her for twenty years, it was not hard for me to develop a deep and genuine respect for Nancy Tippins and her exceptional successes. It is due in large part to Nancy Tippins that my first term continued what has become a time-honored tradition of dedicated public service for the people of south Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, while the retirement of Nancy Tippins marks a tremendous loss for my office and for her many friends in Washington, DC, it also marks the beginning of an exciting new chapter in Nancy's life. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting her for thirty years of exemplary public service to this body and to have her know how much we treasure our very best wishes and our heartfelt thanks for everything she has brought to this great city; my hope is for only the best of good health, happiness, and prosperity in the years ahead.

COMMENDING PALESTINIAN PEOPLE FOR HOLDING FREE AND FAIR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

SPEECH OF

HON. ROY BLUNT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 2005

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, free democratic elections in the Middle East are vital to our security and to the security of our democratic ally. After today we can demonstrate to the world that their presidential election was free and fair.

December 1 I traveled to Jerusalem and Ramallah to discuss preparations for the Palestinian presidential election. I found those Palestinian leaders I met to be eager to demonstrate to the world that their presidential election would be free and fair. And today we congratulate the Palestinian people for conducting a presidential election that has been widely regarded as both free and fair.

During the voting, Israel's efforts to balance the security of its people with easing the ability of Palestinians to vote in the West Bank and Gaza were vital to the success of the Palestinian election and Israel should be commended for its efforts.

The presidential election on January 9 represented a real opportunity for the Palestinian leadership to make a statement for their own future by rejecting violent and extremist leaders in favor of those who favor a moderate approach to lasting peace with Israel.

Today we commend President Mahmoud Abbas for his victory in the Palestinian presidential election. For many years the Palestinians have been without a leader committed to the peaceful negotiations toward peace with Israel. It is my sincere hope that the leadership of Mahmoud Abbas may finally change that.

The news today that the Israeli and Palestinian senior leaderships will hold a summit in Egypt is encouraging. We should all encourage this effort and hope that trust can be built among the region's leaders. However, as we have said before, peace over the hard conflict, peace will not be achieved through words spoken at a table. A lasting peace will require patience, strong leadership, and above all a realistic approach to the underlying issues. Few of these qualities existed in the previous leader of the Palestinian Authority. It is not clear that they exist in Mahmoud Abbas, but we are hopeful.

While Mahmoud Abbas once renounced the use of terrorism during his premiership in
I was unavoidably detained.

Among other things, this will help offset Commodity Supplemental Food Program, simply to help more seniors get the food they need. Today, I rise to introduce the Senior Nutrition Act, a bill I also introduced last year as H.R. 1021. The intent of the Senior Nutrition Act is very simple: to help more seniors get the food they need by changing eligibility standards for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, CSFP. The mission of the CSFP is to improve the health of both women and children and seniors by supplementing their diets with nutritious USDA commodity foods. More than 400,000 people participate in the CSFP each month, but it is important to note that the majority of these participants—more than 75 percent—are elderly and that number is on the rise.

The average senior citizen pays around $1,000 per year on prescription drugs. Many seniors who rely solely on Medicare for their health care cannot afford to buy prescription drugs, and are forced to either stretch their prescriptions, or to choose between purchasing medication or food.

The Senior Nutrition Act will provide for the following:

1. In those areas in which the CSFP operates, categorical eligibility is granted for seniors who are eligible to participate in the Food Stamp Program. No further verification of income would be necessary in such cases; and
2. The same income standard that is currently used to determine eligibility for women, infants, and children in the CSFP—185 percent of the Poverty Income Guidelines—would be applied to senior applicants as well. The current income eligibility standard for seniors has been capped by regulation at 130 percent. Despite the addition of a Medicare prescription drug plan, many of our seniors still need help. We have an obligation to protect our most vulnerable citizens from having to make the awful choice of eating or taking their prescriptions. The Senior Nutrition Act will help protect the health and well being of our senior citizens.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

HON. XAVIER BECERRA OF CALIFORNIA

IN HONOR OF THE AUDUBON CENTER AT ERNEST E. DEBS PARK, LOS ANGELES, CA

HON. RUSSELL C. CARNAHAN OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are to pay tribute to the life of the Reverend Charlie Dooley, of St. Louis, MO, husband of Lonnie Merl Dooley. Rev. Dooley’s life was defined by dedication to his work, his church, and his family. Rev. Dooley worked for McDonnell Douglas Co. for thirty years without missing a single day. His devotion to his job was matched by his devotion to his church. He served as pastor of the Revelation Missionary Baptist Church from 1966 until his retirement in 2004.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends, and the community made it evident to all what an extraordinary person Rev. Dooley was. His wife, children, fourteen grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren are a great testament to who he was as a person. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his life.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

HON. RUSH D. HOLT OF NEW JERSEY

IN HONOR OF THE AUDUBON CENTER AT ERNEST E. DEBS PARK, LOS ANGELES, CA

HON. RUSSELL C. CARNAHAN OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are to pay tribute to the life of the Reverend Mr. Charlie Dooley, of St. Louis, MO, husband of Lonnie Merl Dooley. Rev. Dooley’s life was defined by dedication to his work, his church, and his family. Rev. Dooley worked for McDonnell Douglas Co. for thirty years without missing a single day. His devotion to his job was matched by his devotion to his church. He served as pastor of the Revelation Missionary Baptist Church from 1966 until his retirement in 2004.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends, and the community made it evident to all what an extraordinary person Rev. Dooley was. His wife, children, fourteen grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren are a great testament to who he was as a person. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his life.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION ACT AND THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 BATTLEFIELDS COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce two new bipartisan bills to provide more federal support for the preservation and protection of the endangered Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battlefields and related historic sites in New Jersey and many other states. I am especially pleased that U.S. Representatives Alan Doggett, Maurice Hinchey, John McHugh, Ed Markey, John Sweeney, and Mark Souder have joined me as original cosponsors of this much-needed legislation.

In 1996, the Congress enacted the American Battlefield Protection Act, which established the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) within the U.S. National Park Service (NPS). At the same time, the Congress directed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a comprehensive study of endangered Revolutionary War and War of 1812 sites for
submission to the Congress, to the U.S. Secre-

tary of the Interior, and to the Office of Man-
agement and Budget. The U.S. Park Service
study is to be completed in the coming spring
and completed for at least a 90-day public con-

In my home state of New Jersey, many
sites have already been surveyed and ranked
highly. Preliminary studies indicate that five New
Jersey sites are in the most jeopardy (the Trenton,
Princeton, and Monmouth Battlefields plus Fort
Lee and the Second Springfield Battlefield) and
three of those lie in the heart of the 12th Con-

Current federal law authorizes and appro-
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The latest controversy over China’s proposed anti-secession law highlights once again the political division between China and Taiwan. China is seeking to unilaterally change the status quo in the Taiwan Strait and force its own style of government on the 23 million people of Taiwan. China has ignored Taiwan’s contributions to China’s strong economy and Taiwan President Chen Shui-bian’s gestures of goodwill.

China’s latest move to enact the anti-secession law will not only destroy the goodwill between the peoples of Taiwan and China, it is also unnecessarily provocative and will escalate tension in the Taiwan Strait. The Taiwanese should not be expected to sit by and allow authoritarian Chinese government to mandate the annexation of democratic Taiwan. No freedom-loving people should be expected to do so.

By unilaterally changing the status quo in the Taiwan Strait, China is also challenging America’s will to stand behind the Taiwan Relations Act, which says unequivocally that it is the policy of the United States “to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people of Taiwan.”

The Taiwan Relations Act also affirms one of the objectives of the United States as “the preservation and enhancement of the human rights of all the people in Taiwan.”

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that China’s proposed anti-secession law is provocative and dangerous. It poses a grave threat to democracy, peace, and stability in the region.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE LATE OSSIE DAVIS

SPEECH OF
HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 2005

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the life of the great Ossie Davis. It is a fitting time to pay tribute to this exemplary African American as February is African-American History month. Ossie Davis was a constituent and someone whose counsel I came to value over the past many years. Sadly, he has just passed away.

Just last December I saw Ossie Davis when he was being honored at the Kennedy Center in Washington for his life and career. I made a point of going that night so that I too could honor him. It was a fitting tribute to a man I first saw perform on Broadway when I was a child. Years later, I was thrilled to meet him and be his Representative in Congress.

Ossie Davis made significant contributions to our culture through his talented work in film and his noble involvement in civil rights issues and efforts to promote the cause of African Americans in the entertainment industry. A resident of Mt. Vernon and New Rochelle in New York, he wrote, acted, directed, and produced for the theatre and Hollywood, and was a central figure among black performers of the last five decades.

In 1963, Davis participated in the landmark civil rights demonstration, the March on Washington. Two years later, he delivered a memorable eulogy for his slain friend, civil rights leader Malcolm X. Davis also left behind a vast body of work in film. He starred in such movies as The Joe Louis Story, Stavely, Let’s Do It Again, Grumpy Old Men and Dr. Dolittle, as well as Spike Lee’s School Daze, Do the Right Thing, and Jungle Fever. As a director, he is probably best remembered for 1970’s gritty Cotton Comes to Harlem, a precursor to the blaxploitation films of the decade, and 1973’s Gordon’s War.

I am also pleased to be a cosponsor of a resolution that honors the great life and work of the great Ossie Davis. Through his talents and dedication, Ossie Davis, like many other African Americans, has left his mark as a positive leader in his community and significant contributor to our culture.

As we reflect on the contributions of innumerable African-Americans during this month, I want to commend his work and his life to my colleagues. I have lost a valued constituent and America has lost a great leader and entertainer.

INTRODUCTION OF H. CON. RES. 53, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF THE 500,000TH DESIGN PATENT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that on December 12, 2004, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued the 500,000th design patent to DaimlerChrysler Corporation for the design of the Chrysler Crossfire.

As the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, I am well aware of the importance of intellectual property to our economy. Intellectual property rewards and encourages innovation and advancement; without it, we would not have the high-tech, biotech, and everyday inventions that we have come to rely upon in everyday life.

I also am proud of this patent because I happen to represent Detroit, the automobile capital of the world. It is no secret that Detroit boasts the finest auto workers in the world, and it should be no surprise that it is the design of an American car that received the award.

It is for these reasons that I, along with Judiciary Committee leaders on intellectual property and several members of Michigan’s congressional delegation, are introducing a resolution recognizing this occasion. The resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Patent and Trademark Office has contributed significantly to the Nation’s economy and that DaimlerChrysler and its employees should be commended for their achievement.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to secure the passage of this legislation.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 5, Class Action Fairness Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1219–S1310

Measures Introduced: Twenty-eight bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 341–368, S. J. Res. 3, and S. Res. 47–48. Pages S1259–60

Measures Reported:

- S. 288, to extend Federal funding for operation of State high risk health insurance pools, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
- S. 306, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Page S1259

Measures Passed:

Class Action Fairness Act: By 72 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 9), Senate passed S. 5, to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S1225–52

Rejected:

- By 37 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 8), Feingold Amendment No. 12, to establish time limits for action by Federal district courts on motions to remand cases that have been removed to Federal court. Pages S1225, S1232

Withdrawn:

- Durbin (Modified) Amendment No. 3, to preserve State court procedures for handling mass actions. Page S1225

National School Counseling Week: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 37, designating the week of February 7 through February 11, 2005, as “National School Counseling Week”, and the resolution was then agreed to. Pages S1308–09

Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 12 noon on Monday, February 14, 2005, the Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Chertoff, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, and that the nomination be debated for up to 6 hours; that at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, February 15, 2005, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, that the time until 4 p.m. be equally divided for debate, and that at 4 p.m., the Senate then proceed to a vote on the nomination. Page S1309

Appointments:

United States Holocaust Memorial Council: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, and Public Law 106–292, appointed the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 109th Congress: Senators Hatch, Collins, and Coleman. Page S1309


Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Allen Weinstein, of Maryland, to be Archivist of the United States. Page S1310

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Robert B. Zoellick, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State. Page S1310

Executive Communications: Pages S1258–59

D79
Executive Reports of Committees:  Page S1259
Additional Cosponsors:  Page S1261
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:  Pages S1261–S1308
Additional Statements:  Pages S1257–58
Authority for Committees to Meet:  Page S1308
Privilege of the Floor:  Page S1308

Record Votes:  Two record votes were taken today.  (Total—9)  Pages S1232, S1249
Adjournment:  Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 4:57 p.m., until 12 noon, on Monday, February 14, 2005.  (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1309.)

Committee Meetings

Committee on Armed Services:  Committee concluded a hearing to examine the proposed Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2006 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Peter J. Schoomaker, USA, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; General Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps; and General John P. Jumper, USAF, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

MORTGAGE MARKET

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:  Committee concluded a hearing to examine the role of government-sponsored enterprises in the mortgage market, focusing on promoting affordable housing and homeownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income Americans, after receiving testimony from John C. Weicher, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Commissioner; Allen J. Fishbein, Consumer Federation of America, and Richard K. Green, George Washington University School of Business, both of Washington, D.C.; Anthony B. Sanders, The Ohio State University Fisher College of Business, Columbus; and Susan M. Wachter, University of Pennsylvania Wharton School, Philadelphia.

2006 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget:  Committee held a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget for fiscal year 2006, after receiving testimony from John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury.

TSUNAMI RESPONSE

Committee on Foreign Relations:  Committee concluded a hearing to examine lessons learned regarding the tsunami response, focusing on inquiries from American citizens, coordinating government-wide mechanisms, and engaging the international community, after receiving testimony from Senator Frist; Alan Larson, Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business, and Agricultural Affairs; Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Andrew S. Natsios, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development; Daniel Toole, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), New York, New York; and Mary E. McPyler, InterAction, and Nancy Lindborg, Mercy Corps, both of Washington, D.C.

NEW HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:  Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine the new human resources system of the Department of Homeland Security, focusing on unlocking the potential of employees, pay and performance management, adverse actions and appeals, and labor-management relations, after receiving testimony from David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; Ronald J. James, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Homeland Security; Ronald P. Sanders, Associate Director for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management; and Darryl A. Perkinson, Federal Managers Association, Colleen M. Kelley, National Treasury Employees Union, John Gage, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, Richard N. Brown, National Federation of Federal Employees, and Kim Mann, National Association of Agriculture Employees, all of Washington, D.C.

BANKRUPTCITY REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary:  Committee concluded a hearing to examine bankruptcy reform, focusing on S. 256, to amend title 11 of the United States Code, after receiving testimony from Kenneth H. Beine, Shoreline Credit Union, Two Rivers, Wisconsin, on behalf of the Credit Union National Association; Maria T. Vullo, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison, LLP, New York, New York; Malcolm Bennett, International Realty and Investments, Inc., Los Angeles, California, on behalf of National Multi Housing Council and National Apartment Association; Phillip L. Strauss, National Child Support Enforcement Association, San Francisco, California; David McCall, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, Columbus, Ohio; and R. Michael Stewart...
Menzies, Sr., Easton Bank and Trust Company, Easton, Maryland, on behalf of the Independent Community Bankers of America; Elizabeth Warren, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Todd J. Zywicki, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.
Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 50 public bills, H.R. 739–788; 1 private bill, H.R. 789; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 53–56, and H. Res. 84–86, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fossella to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

REAL ID Act of 2005: The House passed H.R. 418, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, by a yea-and-nay vote of 261 yeas to 161 nays, Roll No. 31. The measure was also considered yesterday, February 9.

According to the provisions of H. Res. 75, the manager’s amendment (printed in part A of H. Rept. 109–4) was adopted and considered as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Rejected the Reyes motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 30.

Agreed to:

Sessions amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 109–4) that promotes the goal of 100 percent repatriation of all aliens ordered deported by clarifying obligations under the Department of Homeland Security’s existing delivery bond authority;

Castle amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 109–4) that requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to enter into the appropriate aviation security screening database the appropriate background information of any person convicted of using a false drivers’ license for the purpose of boarding an airplane; and

Kolbe amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 109–4) that adds a Title III to the bill regarding Vulnerability and Threat Assessment, Ground Surveillance Pilot Program, Enhancement of Border Communications Integration and Information Sharing, and adds the Judiciary Committee to the reporting requirements and removes references to the “Select” Committee on Homeland Security.

Pages H544–46

Rejected:

Nadler amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 109–4), that sought to strike section 101 of the bill regarding preventing terrorists from obtaining asylum (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 28) (Earlier, objection was heard on the unanimous consent request to modify the amendment);

Farr amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 109–4) that sought to strike section 102 regarding the waiver of laws necessary for improvements of barriers at borders (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 29).

H. Res. 75, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 27.

Pages H546–48

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, February 14; and further that when it adjourn on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 15 for morning hour debate.

Pages H535–36

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, February 16.

Pages H568
the United States Group of the North Atlantic Assembly: Representative Hefley, Chairman; Representative Burton, Vice Chairman; and Representatives Regula, Gillmor, Ehlers, Bilirakis, Shimkus, and Reynolds.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and nay-votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings today and appear on pages H535–36, H558, H558–59, H565–66 and H566. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005


MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Current Issues Related to Medical Liability Reform.” Testimony was heard from Jose Montemayor, Commissioner of Insurance, Department of Insurance, State of Texas; and public witnesses.

FLU SHOT SUPPLY—PERPLEXING SHIFT FROM SHORTAGE TO SURPLUS

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled “The Perplexing Shift from Shortage to Surplus: Managing This Season’s Flu Shot Supply and Preparing for the Future.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Julie L. Gerberding, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and Jesse L. Goodman, M.D., Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, FDA; Robert B. Stroube, M.D., Commissioner, Department of Health, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 DRUG BUDGET

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2006 Drug Budget.” Testimony was heard from John P. Walters, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; and a public witness.

PROPOSED BUDGET—TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

Committee on Homeland Security: Held a hearing entitled “The Proposed Fiscal Year 2006 Budget: Enhancing Terrorism Preparedness for First Responders.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Penrose Albright, Assistant Secretary, Science and Technology Directorate; and Matt A. Mayer, Acting Executive Director, Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness; and Dennis Reimer, Director, National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism.

BRIEFING—MIDDLE EAST PROCESS

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on The Way Forward in the Middle East Peace Process. Testimony was heard from former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES—BOOKER/FANFAN DECISIONS IMPLICATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held an oversight hearing on the Implications of the Booker/Fanfan Decisions for the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. Testimony was heard from Christopher A. Wray, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; Ricardo H. Hinojosa, Chairman, United States Sentencing Commission; and public witnesses.

INDIAN TRIBE RECOGNITION

Committee on Resources: Held a hearing on 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. Testimony was heard from Michael Olsen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Robin M. Nazzaro, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—FEDERAL POWER GENERATION

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held an oversight hearing entitled “Opportunities and Challenges on Enhancing Federal Power Generation and Transmission.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.
ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND COMMERCIAL APPLICATION ACT; COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION


Prior to this action, the Committee met for organizational purposes.

PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR BUDGET REQUEST—IMPACT UPON SMALL BUSINESS; COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION; OVERSIGHT PLAN

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on the President’s Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request impact upon small business. Testimony was heard from Hector V. Barreto, Administrator, SBA; and public witnesses.

Prior to the hearing, the Committee met for organizational purposes.

The Committee approved an Oversight Plan for the 109th Congress.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways, Transit, and Pipelines met for organizational purposes.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION; OVERSIGHT PLAN

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Met for organizational purposes.

The Committee approved an Oversight Plan for the 109th Congress.

MEDICARE PAYMENTS TO PHYSICIANS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Medicare Payments to Physicians. Testimony was heard from Bruce Steinwald, Director, Health Care Economic and Payment Issues, GAO; Glenn M. Hackbarth, Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and public witnesses.

WELFARE REFORM REAUTHORIZATION PROPOSALS; COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on Welfare Reform Reauthorization proposals. Testimony was heard from Representative Woolsey; Wade F. Horn, Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; Kevin M. McGuire, Executive Director, Family Investment Administration, Department of Human Resources, State of Maryland; David Hansell, Chief of Staff, Human Resources Administration, Department of Social Services, New York City; and public witnesses.

Prior to this action, the Subcommittee met for organizational purposes.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight met for organizational purposes.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL UPDATES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on Global Updates. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on Security Clearance Process. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 14 through February 19, 2005

Senate Chamber

On Monday, at 12 noon, Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Chertoff, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, for up to six hours of debate.

On Tuesday, at 4 p.m., Senate will vote on or in relation to the nomination of Michael Chertoff, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

During the balance of the week Senate will consider any other cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: February 15, to hold hearings to examine priorities and plans for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and to review the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2006 for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

February 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Paul Woodley, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, Buddie J. Penn, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Adm. William J. Fallon, to be Admiral, 4 p.m., SR–222.

February 17, Full Committee, to resume hearings to examine the proposed Defense Authorization Request for
Fiscal Year 2006 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

**Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine the semiannual monetary policy report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–106.

**Committee on the Budget:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine transparency of budget measures, 10 a.m., SD–608.

**Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:** February 15, to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security’s Transportation Security Administration and related programs, 10 a.m., SR–253.

**Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:** February 15, Subcommittee on Energy, to hold hearings to examine the future of liquefied natural gas, focusing on the prospects for liquefied natural gas (LNG) in the United States and to discuss the safety and security issues related to LNG developments, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

February 16, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 11:30 a.m., SD–366.

February 17, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine National Park Service’s implementation of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

**Committee on Finance:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine the President’s budget proposals for fiscal year 2006, 10 a.m., SD–215.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Daniel R. Levinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, Harold Damelin, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of the Treasury, and Raymond Thomas Wagner, Jr., of Missouri, to be a Member of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board, 10 a.m., SD–215.

**Committee on Foreign Relations:** February 15, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert B. Zoellick, to be Deputy Secretary of State, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

February 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine CIA document disclosure under the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

February 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget for fiscal year 2006 for foreign affairs, 10 a.m., SD–419.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine democracy in retreat in Russia, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

**Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine the realities of safety and security regarding drug importation, 10 a.m., SD–430.

**Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:** February 15, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to continue hearings to examine the United Nations management and oversight of the Oil-for-Food Program (OFF Program), focusing on the operations of the independent inspection agents retained by the United Nations and their role within the OFF Program, including the administration of the OFF Program by the U.N. Office of the Iraq Program and the findings of the U.N. Office of Internal Oversight Services, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

February 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine transforming government for the 21st Century, 10 a.m., SD–342.

February 17, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine an overview of the Government Accountability Office high-risk list, focusing on ensuring Congressional oversight by bringing attention to government-wide management challenges and high-risk program areas, 10 a.m., SD–342.

**Committee on Indian Affairs:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine the President’s fiscal year 2006 budget request for Indian programs, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

**Committee on the Judiciary:** February 16, Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights, to hold hearings to examine obscenity prosecution of the First Amendment, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

February 17, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

**Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:** February 17, to hold hearings to examine the President’s budget for fiscal year 2006 for the Small Business Administration, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

**Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:** February 15, to hold hearings to examine the Administration’s proposed fiscal year 2006 Department of Veterans Affairs budget, 10 a.m., SR–418.

**Select Committee on Intelligence:** February 16, to hold hearings to examine the world threat, 10 a.m., SH–216.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

**House Committees**

**Committee on Agriculture:** February 16, to meet for organizational purposes, and to consider the following: an Oversight Plan for the 109th Congress; and Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2006 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 11 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

**Committee on Appropriations:** February 15, to meet for organizational purposes, 5 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Agriculture, 9:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Force Protection, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

February 16, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, on Secretary of State, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, on Social Security Administration, 10:15 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies, on Quality of Life, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn
February 17, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Office of the Inspector General, Agriculture, 9:30 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Defense, on the Secretary of Defense, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on The Department of Homeland Security, on Department of Homeland Security Management and Operations, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, February 16 and 17, to continue hearings on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense budget request, 10 a.m., on February 16 and 9 a.m., on February 17, 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, February 16, hearing on National and Homeland Security: Meeting the Needs, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

February 17, hearing on Domestic Entitlements: Meeting the Needs, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, February 15, Subcommittee on Education Reform, hearing on H.R. 366, Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 16, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, to mark up H.R. 29, Spy Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.


February 16, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Terrorist Responses to Improved U.S. Financial Defenses,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 17, full Committee, hearing on Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, February 16, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, hearing entitled “Is There Such a Thing as Safe Drug Abuse?” 2:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability, hearing entitled “Improving Internal Controls—A Review of Changes to OMB Circular A–123,” 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

February 17, full Committee, to consider pending business; followed by a hearing entitled “Wounded Army Guard Reserve Forces: Increasing the Capacity to Care,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 18, hearing entitled “The Capital Region’s Critical Link: Ensuring Metrorail’s Future As a Safe, Reliable and Affordable Transportation Option,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


Committee on International Relations, February 16, hearing on United States Policy Toward Iran: Next Steps, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, hearing An Overview of Transatlantic Relations Prior to President Bush’s Visit to Europe, 1 p.m., room to be announced.

February 16, Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia and the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation, joint hearing on Iran: A Quarter-Century of State-Sponsored Terror, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 17, Full Committee, hearing on the International Relations Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 17, Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, hearing on H.R. 683, Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, February 16, oversight hearing on the Status of the Indian Trust Fund Lawsuit, Cobell v. Norton, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.


February 17, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on GAO Five Year Update on Wildland Fire and Forest Service/Bureau of Land Management Accomplishments in Implementing the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, February 16, hearing on An Overview of the Federal R&D Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, 11 a.m., 2328 Rayburn.

February 17, hearing on NASA’s Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Proposal, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 17, to consider Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2006 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, and to hold a hearing entitled “Medical Liability Reform: Stopping the Skyrocketing Price of Health Care,” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 16, Subcommittee on Water Resources, hearing on Agency Budgets and Priorities for Fiscal Year 2006, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, February 16, hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, February 17, Subcommittee on Trade, to meet for organizational purposes, 1:30 p.m., 1129 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, February 15 and 16, executive hearings on Threats, 2:30 p.m., on February 15 and 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., on February 16, H–405 Capitol.

February 17, executive, Briefing on Global Updates, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
12 noon, Monday, February 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Chertoff, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, for up to six hours of debate, equally divided.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 noon, Monday, February 14

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 12 noon.
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