The House met at 10 a.m. The Reverend Kevin Gormley, Pastor, St. Peter Church, Marshall, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

God, Creator of all life, we bow our heads and ask Your guidance to carry out the awesome responsibilities we have before us. May we be at peace among ourselves and at peace individually with the decisions we have made. As we serve here in the hallowed House, keep us aware that we have our family house demanding our time and attention.

We celebrate the 60th year since the end of World War II. President Harry S Truman, from my great State of Missouri, had to make tough decisions at a difficult time in our country’s history. He started his presidency by making the prayer of Solomon his own prayer:

“God, give me the wisdom I need to rule Your people with justice and to know the difference between good and evil. Otherwise, how can I lead this great people of Yours?”

Father, may we who are leaders and all the leaders in this great Nation turn to You for guidance and listen to Your response as we seek a lasting peace in our troubled world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. TERRY led the Pledge of Allegiance:

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1295. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the availability of $400,000 in life insurance coverage to servicemembers and veterans, to make a stillborn child an insurable dependent for purposes of the Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance program, to make technical corrections to the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, to make permanent a pilot program for direct housing loans for Native American veterans, and to require an annual plan on outreach activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1786. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make emergency airport improvement project grants-in-aid under title 49, United States Code, for repairs and costs related to damage from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

INTRODUCING THE REVEREND FATHER KEVIN GORMLEY

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to my House colleagues our guest chaplain, Father Kevin Gormley, pastor of the St. Peter Catholic Church in Marshall, Missouri. Father Gormley was born in Ireland and studied for the priesthood at All Hallows College and Seminary in Dublin. Following his ordination in 1964, Father Gormley came to the United States. Since that time, he has spent 41 years serving in the parishes of Central Missouri where he is widely known, highly respected, and very much loved. Father Gormley became an American citizen in 1975. In July, 2000, he became the pastor of St. Peter Catholic Church in Marshall, Missouri where he currently serves and resides.

Father Gormley also serves as pastor of Holy Family Church, Sweet Springs, Missouri, and as the administrator of St. Peter School. Father Gormley also serves the community as a member of the Ministry of Alliance and as the Catholic Chaplain for the Marshall Habitation Center.

I thank Chaplain Coughlin for his kind invitation to Father Gormley to offer the opening prayer, and would like to thank Father Gormley for traveling to our Nation’s capital to be with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minutes on each side.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, these past few weeks have tested our Nation's emergency response system, our compassion, and the Congress' ability to set spending priorities.

One thing is clear, Republicans are still the party of fiscal responsibility which has helped grow the economy and bolster jobs. In fact, over the past 2 years, our Nation has created millions of jobs, the unemployment level has dropped dramatically, and our economy has grown.

Like families, we make tough decisions. Over the past year, we terminated 98 programs which will save taxpayers over $4.3 billion. But given our new challenges, I am pleased that the House will exercise oversight of disaster expenditures to ensure that the funds are being spent properly by implementing several checks and balances: Sending investigators to the gulf to monitor disaster expenditures,
convening dozens of hearings to hear from officials at all levels of government on how funds are utilized, and mandating weekly reports on expenditures, and conducting audits and investigations on disaster assistance.

While I hope we will do more to cut spending and provide accountability, we all know that the Democratic plan is simply to spend, spend, and spend some more.

**EXPIRING MEDICARE PROGRAM NEEDS URGENT CONSIDERATION**

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House a matter that really needs urgent consideration. There are 160,000 elderly and disabled Americans who depend on Medicare part B, a program called the QI program, qualified individual. That program is due to expire on Friday. That program, that benefit, pays Medicare part B benefits to people with incomes that are 120 percent to 135 percent of the Federal poverty level. How that works is that people who are making less than $1,092 per month as an individual or $1,459 per couple, they are due to lose their benefit which, for some people, would be almost 10 percent of their income. The Medicare part B program covers medical services like physician service, lab service, durable medical equipment, outpatient and home health visits. We have a bipartisan bill sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LaTOURETTE), H.R. 3800. We have to act in the next 24 hours to save the financial condition for 160,000 elderly and disabled Americans.

**ENERGY SECURITY**

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, we have all gained firsthand experience on the effects of America's outdated energy system with gas prices going up and down. Atlanta, my home, has seen gas prices anywhere from $3 to $6 a gallon. The results of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita show how terribly dependent we are on foreign sources of oil.

This is a large and complex issue and not a challenge easily solved. Our recently adopted new national energy policy will put us on the right track, but more is needed. It is critical that we address some of the systemic failures that have kept us dependent on others for energy and kept us from aggressively developing a reliable alternative source. While our economy expanded over the past decades, our ability to refine oil actually decreased. Since 1981, we have lost over half of our refineries. The most dynamic Nation in the world has not built a new refinery in 25 years. We are more dependent now on foreign oil than ever before.

We must move away from foreign fuel sources and move toward a solution that maximizes alternative fuel. Mr. Speaker, energy independence is not just energy security, it is national security.

**MORE MONEY FOR GUARD EQUIPMENT NOW**

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago, I traveled to Fort Hood, Texas, to see my Guard unit before their deployment to Iraq. I was surprised to see that they were using radios that their families had bought for them at a place called GI Joe's, a good store in Oregon in the Northwest. But the point is they did not have the equipment they needed, they could not train on the equipment they were going to use in Iraq, and now it turns out that that equipment is not available in the United States of America to the National Guard.

Yesterday, Lieutenant General Steven Blum, chief of the National Guard Bureau, said he has about 34 percent of what is needed for the National Guard for equipment for homeland security, for emergencies, disasters or terrorist attacks. Thirty-four percent. He has radios, he said, that cannot communicate with the Army radios because they are Korean War vintage radios. This is an embarrassment for this country. This administration must give the Guard the tools it needs. We don't have to talk about a bigger role for the active duty military. We need to give the National Guard, who does not have problems with posse comitatus and other things, who performed admirably in this disaster, the tools they need for future disasters.

More money for Guard equipment now.

**HURRICANE SAFETY ON THE CAPE VINCENT AND CAPE VICTORY**

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, as the howling winds and incessant rain from the eyewall of the hurricane "Rita" moved closer to southeast Texas, 90 percent of the population in my district evacuated, but the first responders in Beaumont and other towns were worried about where to ride out the looming summer storm and potential floods.

Docked in the Port of Beaumont were the Cape Vincent, helmed by Captain David Scott, and the sister ship Cape Victory, with Captain Kevin Brooks. These two massive vessels transport military cargo to Iraq and Afghanistan.

The captains and the mayor, Guy Goodson, met briefly. The plan: Use the ships. The ships were loaded with first responders and police cars, fire trucks, ambulances, city dump trucks, front end loaders and even police helicopters. The expert ship crews coolly but quickly took little time in safely securing our first responders and their equipment in the port operated during the howling hurricane winds to secure the ships.

In this operation, there was no senseless red tape, no forms were filled out, no committees met, no permission from bureaucrats was sought. The people of Texas appreciate Captain Brooks and Captain Scott and their crews, as we say in Texas, “Gittin’ er done.”

**GAMING INDUSTRY AND TAX BREAKS**

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, when Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast, homes and businesses were destroyed and people were left with nothing. To help those in Louisiana and Mississippi return home and go back to work, the gulf coast region must be rebuilt. The gaming industry will invest billions of dollars as it rebuilds the gulf region, making it an essential part of restoring employment, economic growth and tax revenue. Congress must not withhold incentives to rebuild from any employer that provides good jobs and tax revenue if we want to revive the economy of this region.

There is a movement in Congress led by the self-righteous anti-gaming police to single out the gaming industry and prohibit it from receiving needed tax incentives to rebuild. I did not see any Members of Congress, and certainly not FEMA officials, handing out paychecks to out-of-work employees in the gulf coast region. I did see CEOs of gaming companies standing there in the muck up to their ankles handing out checks to their employees.

Contrary to the biased view of some, the gaming industry should be fairly and equally like any other business when Congress develops legislation to help rebuild this region. The gaming companies remain committed to the communities and the people in the affected regions.

**IMMIGRATION REFORM**

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, we need comprehensive immigration reform. Specifically, we need reform to support those who enforce our laws, instead of rewarding those who break them. The United States may need a temporary worker program, but definitely not an amnesty program. Our immediate need is more border patrol agents and diligent cooperation from local and State law enforcement agencies.
American Party

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

Mr. Emanuel. Mr. Speaker, I find the debate over how we are going to pay for the reconstruction and revitalization of the Gulf Coast ironic because in the past few years this body has allocated nearly $400 billion for the war in Iraq, without a peep, just a rubber-stamp Congress.

We have added $3 trillion to our national debt with annual deficits at $400 billion, far as high as the Japanese, and we have not been filing. If it has been filed, I would ask that it be placed in the RECORD if it has been filed. If it has been filed, I would ask that it be placed in the RECORD.

This has become the Congress known for hot checks. Yet when this Congress faces a tab for rebuilding America and American lives that is less than half of what we have spent in Iraq, suddenly everyone here is wearing green eye shades.

In Iraq, we have spent millions to rebuild the Sweet Water Canal System, rebuilding and repairing the levee system; and here in America, we cut the levee construction down in Louisiana by 90 percent.

Tuesday’s Christian Science Monitor reported that the National Guard’s response to Katrina was hampered by a lack of equipment because two-thirds of that equipment is in Iraq.

We need a new direction with new priorities. We need a Congress that is going to put some checks and balances and not act like a rubber stamp.

In the coming weeks, I intend to reintroduce the American Party Act, a bill to ensure that, as we rebuild Iraq, we ensure that we also rebuild America.

This Congress cannot have one set of books, one set of priorities for Iraq, and another one for the American people.

Providing for Consideration of H.R. 3824, Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Resources, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 470

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 consideration of the bill (H. R. 3824) to amend and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide greater results conserving and recovering listed species, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be limited to two hours equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent, not to exceed ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources in the nature of a substitute. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. All points of order against such amendments are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed, or the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, 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. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and reenter the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and amendments to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill or any amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text.
Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today, this House stands at a very important crossroad. We are faced with a decision that will have severe consequences for years to come. On one side, we have this bill, the Threatened and Endangered Species Act, facing off on the other side against land, science-based environmental policy.

The Republican leadership had a unique opportunity to provide us with a carefully constructed bill, one that strengthens current protections for endangered species while also finding the necessary balance between property rights and environmental concerns. But, instead, the bill that we have before us essentially guts the Endangered Species Act. It is as simple as that, and it certainly comes as no surprise.

In 1984, many Republicans were elected to this body promising to repeal the Endangered Species Act. There are dozens of news stories describing rallies and press conferences held by opponents of the Endangered Species Act. For many who now sit on the Committee on Resources, including the distinguished chairman, eliminating the Endangered Species Act was almost a singular campaign promise. Two years after the Republicans took control of the House, they may be one step closer to repealing one of the most successful environmental laws in the history of the country.

Repealing the Endangered Species Act has also been a top priority of the Bush administration. One of the sad realities of the Republican control of our government is their absolute contempt for the environment. Since they have taken control of the Congress, they have been rolling back environmental protections nonstop. This bill, unfortunately, falls into that tradition.

Make no mistake about it. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not about fixing the Endangered Species Act. It is about gutting it. In fact, just months ago, legislation was drafted and subsequently circulated by the Chair of the Committee on Resources that would have completely eliminated endangered species protections over the next 10 years. Fortunately, that bill failed to ever come before the committee for consideration.

Instead, here we are with their next best thing, or should I say the next worst thing, H.R. 3824. While this legislation does not go as far as to formally repeal the Endangered Species Act, it burdens the current system with a weakened mandate, limited funding, and minimal protections.

Let us be clear about what we are debating here today. The bill before us is a major first step toward complete elimination of the Endangered Species Act. For proof, we only have to look at the Endangered Species Act itself. Over 30 years ago, the Endangered Species Act was signed into law by President Richard Nixon, and in the years that followed, it became renowned as one of our Nation’s most
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I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will take a close look at this legislation and recognize it is not our only option.

Yes, the Endangered Species Act could benefit from revisions. Everyone today would agree with that. But this bill is not the answer. And it is for this reason that I would urge my colleagues to support the Miller-Boehlert substitute, and I commend my colleagues for their hard bipartisan work.

Together, they have drafted a substitute that protects private landowners from unnecessary government regulation while also preserving current initiatives that have proven successful. On a smaller scale, a similar approach has been overwhelmingly successful in my home State of Massachusetts. In 1985, the piping plover, a small shore bird, was in steep decline. There were approximately 130 pairs remaining in the United States. But in just 14 years, they have made a dramatic comeback, largely due to the result of coordinated efforts between conservationists and private land managers.


"After 32 years of success, the Endangered Species Act may need streamlining and adjustment to the realities of the continued development of rural areas of the country. It should not be eliminated flatly by a last resort solution to a law that would give all the advantages to business interests and allow the Secretary of the Interior to play God with the nation’s biodiversity."

The Miller-Boehlert amendment is proposed to modernize responsibly the Endangered Species Act. It is clear that times have changed since President Nixon signed this bill into law. But the challenge is to update the Endangered Species Act responsibly, and H.R. 3824 does not do that. A vote for this bill is a vote to once again threaten national treasures like the bald eagle, the grey wolf, the Florida manatee, and the piping plover with extinction, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the RECORD the editorial I quoted from earlier:

"AN ENDANGERED ACT"

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 12, 2005]

Since President Richard Nixon signed it in 1973, the Endangered Species Act has prevented the extinction of hundreds of species of American plants and animals, restoring many to sizable populations. In the process of designating 1,370 species eligible for protection, the act also has generated court battles between opponents who are pushing legislation that would gut what some consider the most important environmental law in U.S. history. U.S. Rep. Richard Pombo, R-Calif., who chairs the House Resources Committee, has offered a draft bill that would replace the Endangered Species Act and cancel all agreements to protect threatened species.

Environmentalists charge that Pombo’s bill eliminates any provision to help species recover from near extinction and effectively forbids the designation of critical habitats on virtually all federal land. The existing law requires that species be protected if they are endangered in a significant portion of their range. Pombo’s draft narrows that requirement to species threatened throughout their range.

This month the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service adopted similar reasoning when it proposed the removal of the wolf from the list of threatened species. The Supreme Court recently refused to hear a challenge to enforcement of the act brought by developers in a dispute involving the endangered Kretschmarn Cave mold beetle in Texas. Pombo’s bill would allow the Secretary of the Interior to determine what species are endangered and give the Secretary the power to overturn decisions by federal biologists and wildlife managers. It would saddle agencies with massive paperwork and create an appeals process that could be launched by anyone affected by an agency decision or habitat conservation plan.

After 32 years of success, the Endangered Species Act may need streamlining and adjustment to the realities of the continued development of rural areas of the country. It should not be eliminated flatly by a last resort solution to a law that would give all the advantages to business interests and allow the Secretary of the Interior to play God with the nation’s biodiversity."

When Congress returns from its summer recess, Texas representatives and Sens. Kay Bailey Hutchison and John Cornyn should insist that any changes to the Endangered Species Act be aimed at improving its effectiveness. Texans are justly proud of the vast array of wildlife that thrives in protected forests, mountains and marshes across the state. Let’s make sure that natural treasure is preserved for the benefit of future generations.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), a valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that both sides of the aisle
have recognized the need of some modifications in the Endangered Species Act.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, introduce you to a man by the name of John Gochnauer. John Gochnauer was the shortstop for the Cleveland Indians in 1902 and 1903. In 1902, playing full-time at shortstop for the Indians, he hit a paltry .185 and committed a whopping 48 errors in that position. Nonetheless, he came back the next year to play for them, the same way. He was a full-time player, hit .385, and this time set a major league record, which has yet to be broken, of committing 98 errors as shortstop, which means out of every five times, he touched the ball, he booted or threw it away once.

The Endangered Species Act has established 1,300 species for preservation and has been able to preserve 12 of them, giving that act a batting average of .091, if you round up. Whereas John Gochnauer hit .385, the Endangered Species Act hit .091. And we mean the Endangered Species Act is the most inept program we have in the Federal Government. The Endangered Species Act is the John Gochnauer of Federal programs.

This is not quite simple. The Endangered Species Act creates more harm than it does good. Because if you are a good steward of the land, your practices that create and preserve habitat make you then open to government control and government regulations and produce an attitude of distrust and hatred.

The Endangered Species Act is not there to prevent development or to change land use. It actually penalizes the practices that help in the process, which is one of the reasons why this bill before us recognizes that, and especially in 13(d), a section that is in the bill but not in the substitute. It is there to provide grants to encourage cooperative conservation, not to encourage people running away from the fear of the Federal Government's control.

I think that probably one of the reasons why this bill is one of those unique bills to come before this body in which a majority of both parties in committee voted to support this particular bill. This bill is indeed one of modifications. It is a modification.

I want to introduce you to one other person. I will call him Jim, simply because I do not want to give the full name. Jim should today be a middle-aged person with a family, running a business, and living a healthy life in California. But in 1995, in California, there was a levee that was in need of repair. On that levee they found 43 bushes. The bushes were not part of the Endangered Species Act, but a beetle who could potentially live in those bushes was, even though no beetle was found in those 43 bushes that grew up on that levee after it was built. Nonetheless, a mitigation plan was mandated, even though the directors of the levee said that it would weaken the levee. Sure enough, 1 year later, that levee broke. Five hundred homes were destroyed and three lives were taken, including Jim’s.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Endangered Species Act over the decades here has been one of jobs lost, property restricted, of homes destroyed and, sadly, of human lives lost. That is why it desperately needs modification. The bill before us does that type of modification.

Mr. MCOBERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Utah, but he uses statistics very selectively.

Let me cite a more important statistic, and that is more than 1,000 species currently protected by the Act are still with us. Only nine have been declared extinct. That is an astonishing success rate of more than 99 percent. So this has been a successful Act.

I will also provide for the RECORD an article that appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune by Ben Long, who is a contributor to the Writers on the Range, a Service of High Country News, who has written a great article about how the Endangered Species Act succeeds with flying colors.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 24, 2005]

SPECIES ACT SUCCCEEDS WITH FLYING COLORS
(By Ben Long)

The Endangered Species Act—which is being reviewed by Congress this week—is a soaring success story.

Look skyward for a while and you might spy an American bald eagle. Hundreds of them live in my home state of Montana. Across the United States, the bald eagle is a living, flying example of what works about the Endangered Species Act.

Rep. Richard Pombo, R-Calif., is spearheading the effort to change the landmark, 30-year-old anti-extinction law. “The act isn’t working to recover species now,” Pombo said in a recent speech in Washington state. “At the same time it has caused a lot of conflicts.”

Pombo evidently spends too much time inside his stuffy Washington office. If he got out into the forest he might know the story of the bald eagle.

The American symbol was listed as endangered in 1978. That year, surveys turned up only 12 bald eagle nests in all of Montana. Then, environmental laws such as the Endangered Species Act and a federal ban on the pesticide DDT kicked in. They protected the birds from extinction and prevented destruction of habitat and nest sites.

The results were gradual, but dramatic. By 2005, the number of bald eagle nests in Montana multiplied to 300 nests—25 times the number before the bird was included on the endangered species list.

That’s just one state. Eagles were similarly successful in other states as well. In 1999, the bald eagle’s status was upgraded from “endangered” to “threatened.” If trends continue, they will soon be officially recovered and all America will celebrate.

Today, Montana is one of the top 10 eagle-breeding states in the United States. In a recent winter, I watched more than 30 eagles clean up a carcass in a rancher’s back pasture. Bald eagle congregations have been touristic attractions at places like Canyon Ferry and Libby dams, where they feed on fish in the winter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there are some seeds for potential bipartisan agreement. We do need to reauthorize, update, and improve Endangered Species Act. I think there is some fair consensus on that. But we also do not want to go to a time where we have the next passenger pigeon, for instance, where we extinguish a species forever. That is a long time. I wore my eagle tie today in the hope that we will continue to protect the bald eagle, the symbol of our country.

There are some serious problems with the bill that was unveiled last week, hastily pushed through the Committee on Resources, and further changed last evening by a manager’s amendment which few have seen. Among them, and one that has to give pause to this body as we wrestle with how we are going to pay for Hurricane Katrina and other essential things that need done, how much of the money borrowed in the name of future generations, is a section regarding compensation.

Now, I had hoped to offer an amendment to say that we would compensate people for property taken over by the federal government. If you grow timber and you cannot cut the trees, you get compensated for the trees. If you ranch and you cannot graze your cattle, you get paid the value of the area on which you cannot graze your cattle. If you grow a crop and there is some sort of restriction and you cannot grow that crop, then you would be compensated.
But the bill goes so far beyond that, it is extraordinary. It goes to speculative, proposed, possible, potential use. This is going to create a wonderful new market for speculators. If people across America thought that this was going to become law as written, which it will not, it would have been rammed down the throats of the Senate members. They would be out right now purchasing, on a speculative basis, or getting options on property that in any way was restricted by the Endangered Species Act. If the Senate acts, if they do act, they would be out right now purchasing, on a speculative basis, or getting options on property that in any way was restricted by the Endangered Species Act.

Now, there is a low-ball estimate for this new entitlement, and who knows how much it could be, but they are saying, oh, no, it will only be $5 million to $10 million a year. Come on, only $5 million to $10 million a year? This is going to be hundreds of millions, if not billions a year of a new entitlement. And, remember, the compensation is in an amount no less than the fair market value.

So taxpayers are going to be obligated to borrow money for speculative, possible potential future profits, and maybe even a little on top of that because the Secretary cannot compensate less than the fair market value. It does not say that the Secretary is restricted to the fair market value; if the Secretary feels generous, borrow more to the fair market value; if the Secretary cannot compensate maybe even a little on top of that be the fair market value. It does not say that the Secretary cannot compensate this amount no less than the fair market value; if the property owner says my speculative value was $2 million profit a year if the property owner says my speculative value was $2 million profit a year for the next 30 years. Please pay me $30 million. And the government has 180 days to come up with that money.

This is going to create a wonderful new entitlement, and who knows what the impact will be. It is going to pay for that speculative value. We will compensate you for the loss of the property owner says my speculative value was $2 million profit a year for the next 30 years. Please pay me $30 million. And the government has 180 days to come up with that money.

Now, there is a low-ball estimate for this new entitlement, and who knows how much it could be, but they are saying, oh, no, it will only be $5 million to $10 million a year. Come on, only $5 million to $10 million a year? This is going to be hundreds of millions, if not billions a year of a new entitlement. And, remember, the compensation is in an amount no less than the fair market value.

So taxpayers are going to be obligated to borrow money for speculative, possible potential future profits, and maybe even a little on top of that because the Secretary cannot compensate less than the fair market value. It does not say that the Secretary is restricted to the fair market value; if the Secretary feels generous, borrow more to the fair market value; if the Secretary cannot compensate maybe even a little on top of that be the fair market value. It does not say that the Secretary cannot compensate this amount no less than the fair market value; if the property owner says my speculative value was $2 million profit a year if the property owner says my speculative value was $2 million profit a year for the next 30 years. Please pay me $30 million. And the government has 180 days to come up with that money. This is going to create a wonderful new entitlement, and who knows what the impact will be. It is going to pay for that speculative value. We will compensate you for the loss of

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLENT), chairman of the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. BOEHLENT. Mr. Speaker, to my distinguished colleague from Utah for whom I have great respect, I point out that the infiel for the Cleveland Indians has improved significantly since the reference on top of that they have a very able player, and they are hot in the middle of a pennant race. That assurance to the gentleman is very important, as is this assurance: both bills offer landowners technical assistance, but it is only the bipartisan substitute that allows the Secretary to give priority to smaller landowners who cannot afford expensive consultants.

Having said that, I rise in strong support of the rule and in strong opposition to the bill. It is my hope with a substitute, the bipartisan substitute, to improve substantially and make it a product worthy of the support of the entire House.

But, frankly, we should not be having this debate today. The current version of the bill was not available until Monday afternoon. Everyone concerned with endangered species both inside and outside of government has been scrambling to understand what is H.R. 3824. The Congressional Research Service, a bunch of outside groups that we look to for some advice and counseling, they are scrambling. There has not been enough time for Members to fully digest the bill or work out any differences. I do not think that it should go forward in this manner. There is no reason for this rush except to limit discussion and maybe confuse us as we try to understand the full implications.

The other body is not exactly about the other side to amend the rule to make his amendment in order. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), a member of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of this rule. I also want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Resources. He has been in Congress for seven terms. He has worked very hard on the things that he believes in. He has been relentlessly patient to deal with a number of issues that have affected his district and those in the western areas of the United States, and he has presented to us today a bill that will reform, refine, and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act.

Now, I do not agree with everything in the chairman’s bill or his approach, but I want to state here this morning that I respect his courage and his relentless patience to take years to bring something to the floor that he believes in.

The substitute which I support, and I hope my colleagues in this body will support, is not a whole lot different than the base bill. We went through the base bill hour after hour after hour, members and staff; and we changed a few words here and there that we feel will present the approach to protecting endangered species in the most appropriate way. Most people who are concerned about the Endangered Species Act are concerned because, like the
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chairman here from the Committee on Rules stated this morning, if you see a dam and it creates deep water and you can get your barges down with your grain, you appreciate the fact that the dam is there. So you have some concern.

Or if you are downstream and you want more coho salmon and you believe the dam is degrading the habitat for coho salmon or other species of salmon, you are less likely to appreciate the dam; but both sides look at the Endangered Species Act for their reducing their economic viability or reducing species viability. I think we need to do a number of things that we have done in the substitute. We have taken the words out of the base bill. We create a scientifically acceptable procedure, look on page 2 of the substitute, methods, practices and procedures that are acceptable science.

We have made a requirement for making a determination for what species are listed. Look at page 4 of the substitute, five specific criteria before you can list that species. We are reviewing all species every 5 years to see if the change of status is there, page 5. We repeal the critical habitat requirement of the bill and replace it with a slightly different recovery plan.

The recovery plan has a number of significant and important elements: a time frame for that recovery plan; objective measurable criteria; a description of where the site should be, and the emphasis is on Federal land and not private land; and an estimate of the cost and time it will take to recover that species. Look on page 20.

There are a number of changes that we have made here to the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) which I think improves on the bill. Support the substitute.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer).

Mr. Blumenauer. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the rule and the bill. No matter how the proponents of the bill classify putting soft words and talking about it being reasonable or a compromise, it does not make it so. This is less about reform of the ESA and protecting species, and more about making it easier for the exploitation of the environment.

We have been in a state of stalemate for a number of years because the goal has not been reasonable refinement. There are things we could do right now to make the Endangered Species Act more efficient, more effective, for instance, adequately funding the enforcement and conservation mechanisms. But the goal was not modest reform and improvement; it was a radical adjustment.

The batting average analogy of my friend from Utah simply misses the point. It is not about just the species that have been restored. It is the protection that has been extended across America to make it possible that we are not losing environmental ground, and given the environmental circumstances, that is no easy task.

I have literally watched it work in my own backyard. I have an urban creek that flows 28 miles through the city of Portland. The salmon listing under the Endangered Species Act prompted action by four local cities and two counties. We were able to come forward with an innovative streamlining agreement to meet the criteria to get higher priority with the Endangered Species Act and move quickly through the permitting process. We have been able to make progress. I have seen it work when people are committed to doing so.

There are many troubling aspects of this legislation. Putting in the hands, we have seen in this administration, of political appointees really perverting the decisionmaking in the name of science, these are not people that I think we ought to turn this over to willy-nilly.

But the most troubling part of the legislation is found in the new entitlement program contained in section 14. It goes far beyond paying people to obey the law, far beyond compensating for loss of customary use. It actually would create a perverse incentive for developers to propose the most environmentally destructive projects possible in order to get higher payment from the government. If you think we have litigation under the Endangered Species Act now, wait until you see people coming forward right and left with bizarre proposals for development seeking compensation for things that were never customary use.

It is not only an unfunded mandate. It is providing a form of environmental blackmail and promotes endless legal battles. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule and this radical rollback of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Herger).

Mr. Herger. Mr. Speaker, today in support of the rule and this radical rollback of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Hastings. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo).

Mr. Pombo. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my comments to the members of this committee. Let me say today that the base bill, the Endangered Species Act which will help property owners feel by moving the listing process of habitat from the government to the landowners feel by moving the listing process of habitat from the government to the landowners, it will relieve significant frustration of landowners.

Second, the substitute will make sure that we try to use public land first when we try to protect habitat to take care of these species.

Third, and importantly, it will have a conservation grant program to allow the use of federal funds to help private landowners who will agree to use their lands to help in the preservation of these species.

These are three very significant changes to the Environmental Protection Act which will help property owners avoid some of the frustration that now exist while still moving forward with the purposes of this Act.

But we then need to vote “no” on the underlying bill for these two reasons: First, the underlying bill is a massive entitlement program that could be subject to massive fraud because the language is so loose and so speculative, we would be expecting the American taxpayers to shell out literally millions of dollars on highly speculative developments. When a developer comes in to buy up land that is used for a wheat field and says he wants to put in a strip club or a casino, American taxpayers, under the underlying bill,
would now have to pay entitlement funds where there is no money in this bill appropriated to do it, or even especially authorized for these highly speculative enterprises. Why should the taxpayers have to pay for this flim-flam type of speculation?

And, by the way, nowhere in American law is any taxpayer required in any jurisdiction in this country to do that right now. This is a radical change which exposes the taxpayers to millions of dollars of loss that is not required by the U.S. Constitution and makes no common sense.

And second and lastly, very importantly, the underlying bill provides no enforceable protection for the habitat of these species. Sure, it says that the agencies have to draw these maps, but what is a map if they do not have to follow the map? Five reasons. Members can vote for this with honor, go home and tell their constituents this they have relieved their frustration and protected the taxpayers. Respect for the taxpayers and respect for God's creatures at the same time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and I and others have written and coordinated on. In September 29, 2005, the Fish and Wildlife Service said that 4.7 million acres of California had to be set aside for the red-legged frog, 1.7 million acres for vernal pools and fairy shrimp. This is not a new entitlement program. This is compensating landowners when their property is taken away. Those in support of the substitute have been distributing a handout, and in the substitute it says virtually everything that the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and I and others have written and coordinated on. In fact, about 90 percent of this bill was written by Democratic staff. I will say that I have a notion of the amount of money serving energy and warnings on how to keep me from electrocuting myself, but nowhere does it detail what I am paying for. How much is for generating power and how much is for transmission costs and how much is for the ESA?

I would like to thank the chairman for including language in the bill that consolidates jurisdiction of the Endangered Species Act management of species under NOAA. This was prior to the gentleman's term in Congress. I introduced legislation that did just that, and I am pleased to see the concept is finally moving forward.

NOAA Fisheries originally was part of the Department of Interior until 1970, when NOAA was created under the Department of Commerce to address federal management of commercial and tribal fisheries. This was prior to the Fish and Wildlife Service's role under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Now the Agency's mission of managing commercial and tribal harvests of salmon and recovering endangered species is in conflict.

NOAA Fisheries and the Fish and Wildlife Service have differing processes for handling and permitting thousands of activities that must undergo federal conciliation under the ESA and competing science on how best to manage the species. It would be better for the species and more cost-effective government management to have one process that works.

Consolidation of agencies managing the ESA will eliminate duplication and allow scarce Federal resources to be focused on achieving the true objective of the Endangered Species Act, the recovery of species through science-based management.

I encourage Members to support the rule, the gentleman's amendment, and the bill and oppose the Miller-Boehlert substitute that lacks all the property rights protection that the Committee on Resources has worked so hard to restore. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue, and I look forward to the passage of this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

I am put in the unenviable position today, as a lifelong Democrat, to have to stand and oppose the Democratic position on this rule.

As I have sat here and listened to the debate on the rule, I simply do not feel that some of the statements by my colleagues are accurately reflecting what is in the bill. And I do appreciate, and I will fully support our colleagues in this effort to move forward.

The reality is that under the Endangered Species Act, most of the provisions of the Act, as it currently stands, will be in place. What we are talking about is compensating farmers if their land is taken away, and if they want to continue to farm and under the Act we have to protect a species, the farmer will be compensated for the right that has been taken away. That is a long-standing right of this country, to be compensated when government takes one's property.

We had a vote recently on this floor of over 400 Members who said exactly that in one of the eminent domain cases that was recently challenged, when the Supreme Court took someone's property.

We have a longstanding tradition here of protecting personal property rights and it comes to the Endangered Species Act. In my State, the Fish and Wildlife Service said that 4.7 million acres of California had to be set aside for the red-legged frog, 1.7 million acres for vernal pools and fairy shrimp. This is not a new entitlement program. This is compensating landowners when their property is taken away.

Those in support of the substitute have been distributing a handout, and in the substitute it says virtually everything that the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and I and others have written and coordinated on. In fact, about 90 percent of this bill was written by Democratic staff. I will say that I have a notion of the amount of money serving energy and warnings on how to keep me from electrocuting myself, but nowhere does it detail what I am paying for. How much is for generating power and how much is for transmission costs and how much is for the ESA?

I would like to thank the chairman for including language in the bill that consolidates jurisdiction of the Endangered Species Act management of species under NOAA. This was prior to the gentleman's term in Congress. I introduced legislation that did just that, and I am pleased to see the concept is finally moving forward.

NOAA Fisheries originally was part of the Department of Interior until 1970, when NOAA was created under the Department of Commerce to address federal management of commercial and tribal fisheries. This was prior to the Fish and Wildlife Service's role under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Now the Agency's mission of managing commercial and tribal harvests of salmon and recovering endangered species is in conflict.

NOAA Fisheries and the Fish and Wildlife Service have differing processes for handling and permitting thousands of activities that must undergo federal conciliation under the ESA and competing science on how best to manage the species. It would be better for the species and more cost-effective government management to have one process that works.

Consolidation of agencies managing the ESA will eliminate duplication and allow scarce Federal resources to be focused on achieving the true objective of the Endangered Species Act, the recovery of species through science-based management.

I encourage Members to support the rule, the gentleman's amendment, and the bill and oppose the Miller-Boehlert substitute that lacks all the property rights protection that the Committee on Resources has worked so hard to restore. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue, and I look forward to the passage of this bill.
Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his very important work on this vital piece of legislation. I rise to support the rule and the underlying legislation and to begin by praising the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo), who was very distinguished chairman, for all of the effort that he has put in to assembling a bipartisan compromise on this.

I will say I am somewhat disturbed with what I just heard from the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) that 90 percent of this legislation was, in fact, crafted by Democratic staff. But I will say that if it embraces the core Republican goals that the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) is pursuing, I still will be supportive of it. But I think that that is demonstration of the fact that we are working in a bipartisan way and the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) has demonstrated his willingness to do just that.

When I think about the long struggle which the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) has been involved in for a decade to try to bring about reform of the Endangered Species Act, I think back to one of the challenges that we have from California, and the gentleman from California (Mr. Cartoon), who has worked long and hard on this, represents part of Riverside County, and I recounted up in the Committee on Rules yesterday the fact that the Stephens’ kangaroo rat, an endangered species, we had conflicting directives that came from government.
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The fire department in Riverside County said you should clear the brush away from your homes to ensure that you do not face the threat of fire. The County of Riverside said to comply with the Endangered Species Act we would be jeopardizing the Stephens’ kangaroo rat’s life. And, by the way, the Stephens’ kangaroo rat had been found in great numbers later in Texas, but we would jeopardize if you did clear the brush away from your home.

What happened? To their benefit, many people who followed the directive of the fire department, their homes were saved; and, of course, those who did not tragically lost their homes because of fire.

We right now in Southern California are dealing with tremendous fire problems in that area; and, frankly, I do believe that the kind of reform that is going to be assembled in a bipartisan way on the Endangered Species Act will go a long way toward preserving property and to make sure that we diminish the kind of threat that does exist out there.

Recovery efforts, coupled with compensation for private property, that is a big effort for California. I congratulate, again, the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo); and I know the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) has been working very hard on this, obviously, because he has had a lot of impact, as he just outlined. Mr. Speaker, I think that we can come with, I hope, a very, very strong vote from both Democrats and Republicans to implement this underlying legislation. I thank again my friend for his efforts on this.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Udall).

(Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico asked if he could extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) for working with me in a bipartisan way over the last several months to craft a bipartisan solution to the problems that we have got with the Endangered Species Act.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Rahall), the ranking member on the committee, for all of the work that he put in, and that his staff put in, particularly Jim Zoia, who did yeoman’s work in putting this bill together. Lori Sonken, Tod Willens, and Rob Gordon worked tirelessly to try to compromise and work out a bill that we could all be proud of, along with Hank Savage from the Office of Legislative Counsel.

We have come a long way, a long way, from where we were. This debate over endangered species has been raging across this country for years, and our effort was to throw away everything that we had tried to do in the past and put it aside and try to start again and say how do we sit down as members of the Committee on Resources and come to a solution that we can all agree with.

That is what we attempted to do. We knew that the Endangered Species Act had problems. We knew that there were things that had to be fixed, that just were not working in current law.

It is kind of ironic this morning to hear people come to the floor and talk about how radical the bill is and how quickly we moved on it. We have had over 50 hearings on the Endangered Species Act. We traveled around the country, going to places where people actually have to live with the implementation of the law and listened to them and what they told us. And we came back and we started to craft a bill.

I did not push through the bill that I wanted. I did not allow the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) or the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Rahall) to push through the bill they wanted. We sat down and worked it out.

It is amazing to hear all of this stuff that is supposedly in the bill. From what I see, all of these folks are going to vote “no” on the bill and they are going to vote “no” on the substitute, because the substitute claims to be the same thing. It claims to deal with all
to disprove. It basically does not put a dollar amount in the bill, because they are afraid of the dollar amount because it is an entitlement program for landowners that want to get the Endangered Species Act. But the estimates are 10, 20, 30, 40 billion. Who knows how much this will cost.

Mr. Speaker, the substitute, does not do that. It is modest. It says we should work with private landowners. It sets up a program so that the government goes out and works with those landowners to achieve the goals of the Endangered Species Act.

The majority bill, and this is another major difference, changes the Endangered Species Act in a radical, radical way, especially with the adoption of the manager's amendment. The substitute reforms the Endangered Species Act, while protecting the core provisions of that magnificent environmental law that has been on the books for 30 years.

At the end of this, we have not respected this institution by the way we brought the bill before the floor, the way we have worked in committee to put it on a rocket docket and speed it through, speed it through this process. We need to take a look at this and work in a bipartisan way.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would again urge my colleagues to, first of all, vote "no" on the rule, and I would also urge them to vote "no" on the underlying bill. I appreciate the work that the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) and others have put into this bill, but the bottom line is that the underlying bill eliminates habitat protections; it abandons the commitment to recovery of endangered species; it repeals protections against the interstate commerce that endangers those species; it politicizes scientific decision-making; it eliminates the vital check-and-balance of consultation; it requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow unfiltered habitat destruction; it would require taxpayers to pay developers, oil and gas companies and other industries, for complying with the law; and it is an entitlement.

I know the chairman has kind of objected to that characterization, but that is what the CBO has concluded. It is what our colleague from Illinois (Mr. Fink) who testified yesterday on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and the Republican Tuesday Group said last night in the Committee on Rules, that this bill creates an expensive new Federal entitlement program.

Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act has done a great deal to protect endangered species. Everybody agrees that there needs to be adjustments. Everybody agrees that we can come together and make those necessary adjustments. But what we object to is that the underlying bill guts the endangered Species Act. It is a bad bill; it is bad policy. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric thus far on the rule, and I suspect there will be a lot of rhetoric when we debate the bill; but there is one underlying thread here that needs to be mentioned. It was mentioned by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Bishop), the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Gilchrest).

That is that the Endangered Species Act needs to be updated.

I came here 10 years ago, and this is one of the big issues that was very important to my constituency when I first ran. There was talk then about amending the Endangered Species Act, but there was no agreement at all. We did get a bill out of committee. Unfortunately, it did not go any further.

But now we hear today that there is a 90 percent agreement on the need to change the Endangered Species Act, but there is violent 10 percent disagreement on what those means should be. I contend that is huge, huge movement from where we have gone in 10 years. I do not know what the reasons are, but I expect the reasons are the infirmity of the existing Act.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule.

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 (Mr. Terry). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 68, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. Putnam. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 469

Resolved. That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervening questions of point of order in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making continuing appropriations for the
fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution; (3) a motion to proceed pursuant to section 2908 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 shall be in order only if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending only if offered by the majority leader or his designee.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 469 is a rule that provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 68, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2006. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit the joint resolution.

Additionally, the resolution provides that suspensions will be in order at any time during the legislative day of Thursday, October 6, 2005, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman LEWIS) and the entire House Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle for sticking to the time-table they laid out at the start of this legislative session. In an impressive display of bipartisanship and just sheer hard work, the House passed all 11 appropriations bills prior to the July 4 District Work Period. Since July, the Senate has returned to us only the interior and legislative branch appropriations bills, which have each been signed into law by the President. Additionally, the Senate has passed six of its remaining 10 appropriations bills. These six are awaiting closure in conference. We are now just anticipating action from the Senate on those last four appropriations bills so we can move forward, finish the appropriations process, and avoid a cumbersome omnibus funding bill.

Unfortunately, the appropriations process within the two bodies has not been completed prior to the start of the new fiscal year, which, of course, begins this October 1. We must institute a continuing resolution in order to allow the government to function through the remainder of this fiscal year while we complete consideration of the remaining appropriations bills, waiting on the Senate to complete their final actions, and for the conference committees to do their work. This rule allows consideration of the imperative funding measure.

I am most impressed with the work of the Committee on Appropriations on this continuing resolution. Throughout the appropriations process, the committee has shown its commitment to the budget resolution and to fiscal responsibility. The committee has funded programs and activities at the lowest level of the House-passed level, the Senate-passed level, or the fiscal year 2005 current rate. For agencies for which the Senate has not passed a bill by the start of a new fiscal year, the funding rate is at the lower of the House-passed level, or the fiscal year 2005 current rate.

The legislation includes 10 language prohibiting agencies from initiating or resuming programs or procurements not funded in the fiscal year 2005, and prohibits agencies from awarding new grants and certain other forms of assistance during the period of the CR, which, of course, is through November 18 of this year. I again congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBRY) and the entire committee for their hard work this year. I urge Members to support this rule and the underlying CR so that we can finish the appropriations process, move down the road to responsible funding for the needs of this Nation, and avoid a cumbersome omnibus funding bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am confident that we will do right by those affected by the hurricanes, but we still need to ask ourselves where our financial and legislative duties are in response to Katrina construction, continued funding for Iraq and Afghanistan, and increasing fiscal deficit. Are we looking at the big picture? Are our priorities in line with our financial obligations? We know that because of Katrina, the victims, those displaced from their homes, are more likely to rely on Medicaid. With that known expense, can we honestly reduce the funding for this responsibility and still extend tax cuts?

Mr. Speaker, we need to take care of our fellow citizens, but what we do now should not mean we pass on an unsustainable debt to future generations, especially when we know there is a way we can offset these costs. For the costs of this year's installments of the tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003, $225 billion this year alone, we could pay for the Gulf States' recovery from Katrina. We know that we need some of these cuts, such as AMT relief, but let us at least be reasonable and put them on the table.

We must have an honest discussion about our fiscal situation. I urge my colleagues to step back and take a hard look at how we will move forward, not just this fall, but next year and the decades after that.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues have heard me talk about my granddaughter Anna, and we all have someone like her, someone we see as our future, someone that means the world to us. I believe that she will grow up to a better future. But, to do right by them, we must all step up to the plate, not as Members of one party or another, but as leaders and statesmen willing to accept the reality of our fiscal situation and make the difficult decisions.

Time and priorities in the coming months should not waver from the ultimate goal.

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I certainly agree that this debate about the budget and the appropriations process is always a debate about our future, and it is a debate about our priorities. Congress has a shift in priorities since that budget resolution passed. As a State that was hit by four hurricanes last year and had the beginnings of Katrina come across our State this year, our hearts go out to our brothers and sisters on the gulf coast, and we recognize that this government has a commitment to help lift up those citizens on the gulf coast and, where appropriate, we have a Federal responsibility in the rebuilding and reconstruction process in Louisiana and Mississippi and Alabama, and a lot of other places.

So I think that that reinforces the need for us to move ahead with this
That is why later today, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and perhaps the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), I will introduce a bill that I think could profoundly affect both. The bill is called the Stumbling Leadership in Cutting Expenditures Act, or the SLICE Act for short. It would do two things: First, it would authorize the President to identify specific items in Federal spending that he thinks should be cut; and second, require Congress to vote on each of those items.

The bill would apply both to appropriations and to spending items in the recently signed transportation bill. It would set deadlines for the President to propose cuts and for Congress to act on them. Under the bill, Congress would have to vote on each proposed cut. We could not ignore those proposals, as can be done under current law if a majority approved the cut, it would take effect.

The President has said we should pay for responding to Katrina and Rita through spending cuts. But that is not about the President’s own party and the majority in this House are divided on what to cut.

May disagree on budget and tax priorities, but one thing is certain. It is past time for a serious debate about specific proposals for ways to dig ourselves out of the deficit hole. This bill is intended to jump-start that debate.

I hope all of our colleagues will join us in this crucial effort to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation’s Capital.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita not only brought death and destruction across a wide swath of the Gulf coast. They also delivered a blow to the Federal budget and sounded a wakeup call about the fiscal and economic risks we have been running.

A full response to these natural disasters must include more than emergency repairs, humanitarian relief, and community rebuilding. We also need to consider serious questions about the limits of government, the wisdom of wartime tax cuts, and our national capacity to look beyond short-term political priorities.

If anything good can come from these terrible storms, maybe it will be recognition by both the Bush administration and Congress that now we need to face hard reality and not continue with budget policies based on the fiscal and economic risks we have been running.

Part of the answer is that budget and tax policy in Washington has been so captive to very partisan and extreme ideological voices that it has been hard to find common ground and moderate consensus.

So, it is not surprising that the appropriations process has not been marked by fiscal discipline. Unless the President or Congressional leaders proclaim a need for restraint, let alone sacrifice, why would Members of Congress not work to meet the transportation and infrastructure needs of their districts and seek funding for other valued purposes?

But all this cannot go on forever. Sooner or later, something has to give. And, if the result is a new sense of responsibility, so much the better—because there is an urgent need to rethink and revise our budget policies, including both taxes and spending.

It could be that, just as they revealed the problem, Katrina and Rita can provide a catalyst to beginning that overdue job.

The President has said the Federal Government will undertake to help rebuild the communities left devastated by the storms—and has said that spending for other purposes should be reduced to offset the costs.

I have serious doubts about the adequacy of that approach, about the desirability of whatever spending cuts the President may propose, and about the readiness of Congress to seriously consider any cuts at all. Much more, I and Congress went along with the President authority to require Congress to vote, up or down, on specific appropriations items the President deemed unworthy of funding—a workable and Constitutional
alternative to the line item-veto legislation that the Supreme Court struck down in 1998.

Now, I am introducing an updated version of this bill that focuses directly on the President's suggestion that disaster response costs be offset with spending cuts.

The bill is called the Stimulating Leadership In Cutting Expenditures or, "SLICE" Act.

That name fits because the bill would promote Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability on proposals to reduce other spending in order to offset the costs of responding to the recent natural disasters. Toward that end, it would authorize the President to identify specific items of Federal spending that he thinks should be cut and would require Congress to vote on each of those items. The bill would apply not only to regular appropriations, but also to the transportation bill that was passed and signed into law earlier this year.

The bill would establish a two-phase process: the President would have until November 1st to tell Congress which, if any, of the spending in the transportation bill should be cancelled. And he would have until the end of this year to identify any items in fiscal year 2006 appropriations bills we wants to eliminate.

In each case, if the President proposes a cut, Congress would have to vote on it—we could not ignore the proposal, as can be done under current law—and if a majority approved the cut, it would take effect.

Mr. Speaker, as our budget situation has grown worse, there has been a lot of talk about "earmarks," meaning funding allocations initially proposed by Members of Congress rather than by the Administration.

Some people are opposed to all earmarks. I am not one of them. I think Members of Congress know the needs of their communities, and that Congress as a whole can and should exercise its judgment on how tax dollars are to be spent. So, I have sought earmarks for various items that have benefited Colorado and I will continue to do so.

At the same time, I know—everyone knows—that sometimes a large bill includes some earmarked items that might not be approved if they were considered separately, because they would then be seen as unnecessary, inappropriate, or excessive.

Dealing with that problem requires leadership and accountability. My bill would promote both. Presidents are elected to lead, and only they represent the entire Nation. The bill recognizes this by giving the President the leadership role of identifying just which other spending he thinks should be cut in order to offset some of the amounts the Federal Government will be spending in response to recent natural disasters.

And, under the Constitution, it is the Congress that is primarily accountable to the American people for how their tax dollars will be spent. The bill respects and emphasizes that principle by requiring a vote on each spending cut proposed by the President.

I do not know exactly which spending the President might propose to cut, so I do not know whether I would support some, all, or any of those proposals. But I do know that we should stop wasting time in theoretical debates about whether we should make spending cuts and start debating specific proposals.

My bill is intended to get that debate started now. For the benefit of our colleagues, here is an outline of the bill:

**STIMULATING LEADERSHIP IN CUTTING EXPENDITURES (SLICE) ACT**

The purpose of this bill is to require Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability regarding reduction of other spending to offset the costs of responding to recent natural disasters.

The bill would amend the Budget Act to provide as follows:

The President would propose rescission of any budget authority provided in the recently passed transportation bill or an appropriations Act through special messages including draft bills to make those rescissions.

The President would have until November 1, 2005 to propose canceling spending items in the new Transportation Act and until January 1, 2006 to propose rescissions from FY 06 appropriations bills.

The House's majority leader or minority leader would be required to introduce a bill proposed by the President within two legislative days. If neither did so, any Member could then introduce the bill.

The relevant Committee would be required to report the bill within seven days after introduction. The bill could be made with or without recommendation regarding its passage. If the Committee did not meet that deadline, it would be discharged and the bill would go to the floor.

The House would debate and vote on each proposed rescission within 10 legislative days after the bill's introduction. Debate would be limited to no more than four hours and no amendment, motion to recommit, or motion to reconsider would be allowed.

If passed by the House, the bill would go promptly to the Senate, which would have no more than 10 more days to consider and motion to reconsider would be allowed.

If passed by the Senate, both houses would have 10 more days to consider and motion to reconsider would be allowed.

The House would debate and vote on each proposed rescission within 10 legislative days after the bill's introduction. Debate would be limited to no more than four hours and no amendment, motion to recommit, or motion to reconsider would be allowed.

If passed by both houses, the bill would go to the President for his signature. If the President signs it, the bill becomes law. If the President vetoes it, Congress can override the veto with a two-thirds majority vote in each chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Foley). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of H. Res. 470, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 388, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend the rules on H. Con. Res. 245, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3824, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 470 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 171, not voting 16, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Barrett (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aderholt</td>
<td>Bachus</td>
<td>Barton (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Barrett (SC)</td>
<td>Beanprez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING JULY 2005 MEASURES OF EXTREME REPRESSION ON PART OF CUBAN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unﬁnished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution. H. Res. 388.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution, The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 388, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were 383 nays, 360, not voting, 9 as follows:

[Roll No. 503]
expressing sense of congress that united states supreme court should speedily find use of pledge of allegiance in schools to be consistent with constitution

the speaker pro tempore. the unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, h. con. res. 245. the clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution. the speaker pro tempore. the question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from wisconsin (mr. sensenbrenner) that the house suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, h. con. res. 245, on which the yeas and nays are ordered. this will be a 5-minute vote. the vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 31, answered "present" 8, not voting 11, as follows:

([roll no. 504])

yeas—383

abercrombie
alcorn
alexander
andrews
baca
baldwin
barrett (sc)
barrett (tn)
bass
beauprez
becerra
berkeley
berman
biggerstaff
bilirakis
bishop (ga)
bishop (ny)
black (texas)
billings
brown (al)
brown (tn)
brooks
broun
broun (ga)
brooks (tn)
brooks (sc)
brown, corrine
brown, walter
brown, walter (tn)
burgess
burnett
buyer
byrd (va)
byrd (tx)
brown (oh)
brown (sc)
brown, corrine
brown, walter
budget
burgess
burnett
buyer
byrd (va)
byrd (tx)
brown (oh)
brown (sc)
brown, corrine
brown, walter
budget
burgess
burnett
buyer
byrd (va)
byrd (tx)
brown (oh)
brown (sc)

not voting—9

boebell
boehner
bolton
bonner
bono
boozman
bouie
boucher
boustany
boyd
brady (pa)
brady (tx)
brown (oh)
brown (sc)
brown, corrine
brown, walter
budget
burgess
burnett
buyer
byrd (va)
brady (tx)
brown (oh)
brown (sc)

annoucement by the speaker pro tempore

the speaker pro tempore (mr. foley) (during the vote). members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

1222

ms. jackson-lee of texas, mr. towns and ms. schakowsky changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." so (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

not voting—11

hayworth
hefley
hensarling
herger
herseth
higgins
hoekstra
holden
holter
hoskins
hoyer
huntsman
inglis (sc)
inouye
israel
isotook
jackson (il)

annoucement by the speaker pro tempore

the speaker pro tempore (during the vote). members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

1231

so (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and
the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on rollocall No. 504 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I was present in the Chamber and voted "yea" on H. Con. Res. 245. In a malfunction, my vote was not recorded. As the author of the legislation, you can rest assured that I am a "yea" vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material of any kind, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 469, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenue, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizations of the Government of the United States, for such purposes as are necessary for the period for which funds or authority for any project or activity during fiscal year 2005 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as a project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in the budget) that was not available for the current rate or the rate permitted by the pertinent Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 2005, is the same as the amount or authority that would be granted for the project or activity under the Act listed in subsection (a) as passed by the House of Representatives, or the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (in the Senate).

(b) Whenever the amount that would be made available or the authority that would be granted for a project or activity under an Act listed in subsection (a) as passed by the House of Representatives, or the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (in the Senate), is the same as the amount or authority that would be available or granted for the project or activity during fiscal year 2005, is the same as the amount or authority that would be made available or the authority that would be granted for the project or activity under an Act listed in subsection (a) as passed by the House of Representatives, or the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (in the Senate), or (2) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(c) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(e) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(f) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(g) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(h) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(i) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.

(j) Notwithstanding this section, the appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution shall be available during fiscal year 2005.
Sect. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of fiscal year appropriations, funds shall be available within the scope of obligations made by, or about November 1, 2005 and December 1, 2005 under sections 1022 of Public Law 109–13 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

Sect. 110. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 101(b) of Public Law 109–173 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2004 and 2005, and section 501A(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401A(a)(1)).

Sect. 111. No provision that is included in an appropriations Act listed in section 101(a), that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(3).

Sect. 112. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 101(b) of Public Law 109–173 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

Sect. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be available and obligated for mandatory payments whose budget authorization is provided by the House of Representatives.

Sect. 114. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was appropriated the fiscal year under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2005, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) In the case of section 106 of this joint resolution, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1, 2005 and December 1, 2005 shall continue in effect, notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation in section 101 and the provisions of sections 102(1), 103(1), 103(2), and 103(6) of Public Law 109–13 shall continue in effect, notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation in section 101 and the provisions of sections 102(1), 103(1), 103(2), and 103(6) of this joint resolution, or (2) with respect to any such section of Public Law 109–13, the date of the enactment into law of legislation that supercedes or, or the amendments made by, that section.

Sect. 115. The provisions of, and amendments made by, sections 1011, 1012, 1013, 1023, and 1026 of Public Law 109–13 shall continue in effect, notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation in section 101 and the provisions of sections 102(1), 103(1), 103(2), and 103(6) of this joint resolution, or (2) with respect to any such section of Public Law 109–13, the date of the enactment into law of legislation that supercedes or, or the amendments made by, that section.

Sect. 116. The authorities provided by section 106 of Public Law 107–314 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment into law of a defense authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, whichever is earlier.

Sect. 117. Section 6 of Public Law 107–57, as amended, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2005,” and sections 508 and 512 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2005, as passed by the House of Representatives, shall be made as applicable to fiscal year 2006 by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall not apply with respect to Pakistan through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

Sect. 118. (a) Funds provided in section 101 of this joint resolution for “Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses” may be used to complete the processing of applications filed prior to July 1, 2005 under sections 1828 and 1869 of the Social Security Act, notwithstanding section 931(b) of Public Law 108–173.

(b) The Social Security Administration may enter into a reimbursable agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to process, during fiscal year 2006, any appeals recognized as final for the period June 30, 2005 and prior to October 1, 2005.

Sect. 119. For the purposes of section 101 of this joint resolution, amounts obligated in fiscal year 2005, and for activities under the heading “Protection, Security and Oversight” that would impinge on final funding decisions or related to amounts designated as emergency requirements in previous defense appropriations Acts or supplemental appropriations Acts, are designated as appropriations for contingencies related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, to the extent that designates under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 469, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2006, which I and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

I remain committed to moving these appropriations bills and conference reports for “Department of Transportation-Federal Transit Administration-Administrative Expenses” at a rate for operations not exceeding the total of budgetary resources made available for fiscal year 2006, as passed by the House, or about November 1, 2005 and December 1, 2005 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2005.”

Sect. 131. Amounts made available by this joint resolution for the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006, as passed by the House, or about November 1, 2005 and December 1, 2005 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2005.”
to help the Senate with the difficult process of passing the Treasury, Transportation and Labor-HHS bills, we will continue to push the lower rate, long-term continuing resolution. I am convinced that this is the only way for us to go back to regular order. The House and Senate committees on appropriations are both committed to this goal.

With regard to the regular order appropriations bills, the Interior and Legislative branch conference reports have been completed and we are looking forward to the Senate Energy and Commerce subcommittee. The Energy and Commerce subcommittee concludes this morning, and we expect to file a conference report today.

The Senate has now passed eight appropriations bills, and the ninth is expected to be completed by early next week. We have begun giving notional allocations to Energy and Water, Foreign Operations, Science, Justice, State and Commerce and Agriculture subcommittees so they can begin negotiating. We are making very good progress.

This continuing resolution is an important step toward achieving our goal of restoring regular order to the congressional appropriations process.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know quite what to say about this continuing resolution. I have a lot of notes here, most of which I will not use, but let me simply note that this is another case of the failure to effectively govern by the Republican President and the Republican majority in this Congress. We are here facing an end of the fiscal year situation 3 days from now. We have failed in the basic test of governing, and I think it is important to understand why.

Throughout the year, we on the Democratic side of the aisle, in the minority, have worked with the majority on every possible procedural issue and cooperated with them procedurally at every juncture so that we could enable this House to pass the 10 appropriation bills that are necessary to pass, even though we disagreed in most instances with the content of those bills.

When I was asked by numerous Members of my caucus and a number of members of the press why we were cooperating, especially when we opposed the substance of many of the bills, I made it clear. I said we were cooperating because I wanted the record to show at the end of the year, when the Republican majority failed to pass its appropriation bills by the end of the year, I wanted the record to show clearly why.

Now we are here and in spite of our procedural cooperation, the Republican majority has managed to pass only two of the 10 appropriation bills under our responsibility. Why? In my view it is because the majority caucus has such a fundamental disrespect for the basic functions of government that it has sacrificed and squeezed so many education and health and veterans and other programs in order to pay for huge, supersize tax cuts for the most wealthy among us, that, in the end, they have not been able to convince their Senate colleagues to go along and go on the road with them. So now we are faced with a stopgap funding bill which is brought to the House floor by the gentleman from California.

Normally, if Congress fails to pass its appropriation bills, then it continues funding those funds in the prior year's law. The pending continuing resolution is different. The Senate Energy and Commerce subcommittee will get its act together. Instead, this bill does something quite different. It says that for the time period under the continuing resolution, we will be spending at the lower of either last year or the House-passed bill. That results in a number of, I think, extremely inequitable realities. It, for instance, means that we are effectively cutting $800 million below last year and $400 million below the President's budget for education. It means that we are cutting essential job training programs below last year and cutting job training formula grants by $138 million.

In health care, it means that we are cutting maternal and child health care and we are cutting rural health outreach programs. It means that we are cutting the Community Service Block Grant, a program which deals with the needs of the poorest people in this society by 50 percent. It means that we are eliminating the 10 percent increase that this House had planned for veterans health care. It means that we are cutting the FBI by $616 million below the House-passed bill. It means that we are freezing low-income heating assistance at a time when the cost of home heating for low-income Americans is going to rise by 40 to 50 percent. But it leaves intact, it leaves intact the huge, supersize tax cuts for the top 1 percent, ten times as much as Katrina is being estimated. The right question to ask is: How are we going to do so that we can afford to pay for the Katrinas that come along and the Iraqi War, where we have a war of choice driven by a President who has misled us into that war by giving us false and misleading information? So if the Members vote for this continuing resolution today, they are voting to keep those giant tax cuts in place. They are voting to do not one blessed thing to deal with the long-term fiscal impact that they have on the country and, yes, will be chiseling on some of the programs that I just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a motion to recommit, which does a number of things. I am going to offer a motion to recommit, which, number one, would provide that the funding levels in this bill be at the current rate rather than the three-headed rate spelled out by the gentleman, so that we do not, even for a month, cut back on what we are doing on job training or community service block grants or low-income heating assistance or other programs like that. Second, it will ask the White House to give away to the wealthiest people in this society, the top 1 percent, over $1 trillion in tax cuts over the next decade? We are going to give away, in tax cuts to the top 1 percent, ten times as much as Katrina is being estimated. So the right question to ask is: 'How are we going to do so that we can afford to pay for the Katrinas that come along and the Iraqi War, where we have a war of choice driven by a President who has misled us into that war by giving us false and misleading information?'

Second, it will restore Davis-Bacon prevailing wages. It will countermand the President's unilateral edict. And that is basically what I will be asking the House to do.

Under the rules of the House, as they have been jury-rigged, under the rule of the House, if a Member of the House lodges a point of order, this motion to recommit will not be allowed to obtain a vote. But if persons on the majority side of the aisle refrain from lodging a point of order, the House would be allowed to vote on a measure which restores equity to the farm programs, on a measure which restores equity to...
funding levels for all programs, and it would restore Davis-Bacon protections for workers as well. And it would also, I should add, instruct the Congress to come back with a change in the Tax Code so that we limit the size of the tax cut for those people who make over $40,000 to the size received by persons in the top 5 percent of the economy. That means they still get at least a $9,000 tax cut on average. That is not bad.

To those in the majority side of the aisle who say that we should not be doing that, I would say that does not surprise me because that represents the economic philosophy of the majority party. Those on the Democratic side of the aisle who might find it a little nerve-racking to vote to scale back tax cuts even for those well-off folks, my suggestion is if they cannot even stand up and do that, they might as well go and cross the aisle.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following correspondence for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2005.
Hon. JERRY LEWIS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Lewis: I am writing concerning H.J. Res. 68, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes, which is currently scheduled for floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over matters concerning Medicare. There are two areas within the introduced resolution that are within the authorizing jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Section 110 of the resolution allows the Social Security Administration to continue hearing Medicare appeals pending the transfer of that authority to the Department of Health and Human Services. Secondly, Section 121 extends for one year the availability of an appropriation provided to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Social Security Administration under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forego action on this resolution. This is being done because of the agreement reached by our respective committees’ staff. An e-mail on this issue, sent by the committee, states, “We are happy to concede your jurisdiction in this matter, and included the language solely because of OMB’s [Office of Management and Budget] request that we do so. We don’t believe that it prejudices any future discussion on your part.”

I will place a copy of this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, our country has been made brutally aware that there are in fact two Americas that exist in this country. Recently released census data shows that in 2004, 37 million people were living in poverty. In addition, this data shows that 1 in 6 children were living in poverty. Yet despite the overwhelming evidence of growing poverty rates and recent images of evacuees unable to leave New Orleans due to their economic situation, this Congress is proposing drastic cuts to Community Service Block Grants funding.

CSBG gives funding to a vast array of programs, including senior citizen congregate meal sites, home delivered meals, transportation programs, job training programs, Head Start, energy crisis assistance, housing programs, education programs, and many other programs to address the needs of low-income families and individuals.

The 50 percent cut to CSBG in the Continuing Resolution would have a devastating effect on evacuees and on low-income individuals. At a time when our country has been severely impacted by natural disasters, it is extremely important that Congress maintain CSBG funding at its current level so that the delivery of much needed services to low-income people is not disrupted.

We have a responsibility to ensure that all Americans have an opportunity to share in America’s prosperity. It is irresponsible that we approve a Continuing Resolution that cuts funding for CSBG by 50 percent below current funding levels when there is such an obvious need for the services that this funding provides.

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

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

Mr. FOLEY. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment and pursuant to House Resolution 469, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The Speaker pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. OBEY. I most certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOLEY. All time for debate has expired.

At the end of the joint resolution add the following new sections:

SEC. 1. Amounts made available by this joint resolution that are amounts designated as emergency requirements in previous appropriations Acts, other than amounts to which section 131 applies, are hereby designated as emergency requirements pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (95th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

During fiscal year 2005, notwithstanding the proclamation by the President dated September 8, 2005 or any other proclamation issued pursuant to section 3147 of Title 40, United States Code (and the provisions of all other related acts to the extent they depend upon a determination by the Secretary of Labor under section 3142 of such title, whether or not the President has the authority to suspend the operation of such provisions to all federally-funded contracts to which such provisions would otherwise apply that are entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act, to be performed in the jurisdictions affected by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

Section 1502(f) and (g)(1) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7862) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 1506(5) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2005”.

SEC. 2. Section 201(b) of H. Con. Res. 95 (relating to revenue reconciliation in the House of Representatives) shall be applied as if “(1)” was inserted after “(b)” and the following new paragraph was added at the end:

(2) REDUCTION IN TAX CUTS FOR TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES IN THE TOP 1 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall also include in the reconciliation bill reported pursuant to paragraph (1) changes in tax laws to increase revenues by reducing or offsetting the tax reductions received during 2006 by the top 1 percent of taxpayers as a result of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 such that the average tax cut received by that class of taxpayers is equal to the average tax cut resulting from those Acts for the top 5 percent of taxpayers.”
Mr. OBEY (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.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, section 1 of the motion to recommit would simply provide that we fund the programs covered under the continuing resolution at the current rate rather than at the lower of either the current rate of the House-passed or the Senate-passed bill. I have already explained the impact of that on program. Section 2 would simply repeal the President’s edict that workers in the Katrina-affected region would not be subject to the protections of Davis-Bacon wage protections. Section 3 would simply guarantee that the MLC program remains in the same length of time as other titles of the farm bill. And section 4 would require a reduction in the size of the tax cuts for taxpayers with incomes of over $400,000, as I just described in my previous remarks.

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

We bring up today the Endangered Species Reform Act with the purpose of trying to deal with what some of the real issues are, what some of the real problems are that we have had and have developed over the last 30 years. If one goes back and reads the original Endangered Species Act, it becomes difficult to be critical of specific language that is it in because the purpose of the Endangered Species Act was to, first of all, prevent species from becoming extinct but, more importantly, to recover those species. And as we look at what has happened over the intervening 30 years, we begin to realize just what problems are with the Act and the way it is being implemented today.

I came into this debate originally because I did not like the way that private property owners were treated under the implementation of the law. That became a big issue in my district and throughout much of the West. Private property owners felt threatened and throughout much of the West. Private property owners were treated like they could lose their property and that they could lose control and the ability to use their private property under the implementation of the law.

That became a big problem, and it is something that we began to work on, to try to have some kind of property rights protections in the law.

But the more I got into the Endangered Species Act, the more I realized that the law was just not working in terms of recovering species. Some species have been listed under the Endangered Species Act. Of those 1,300, 10 have been removed because they were recovered. More species have been removed from the list because they became extinct than were recovered. That less than 1 percent is a complete failure, so we began to really look at the law and see are species really doing better under the Endangered Species Act, and we came to the conclusion that they were not. About three-quarters of the species are either declining in population or the Fish and Wildlife Service has no idea. That is not a success.

When people talk about the act and its importance, they are right, it is important. It is something we all share in terms of preserving wildlife and preserving species. But when the law is not working, we have to respond to that and step in and reauthorize the bill, put the focus on recovery and protect property owners.

As we have gone through this last several months, I have had the opportunity to work with the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and I thank them for all of the work that they put into this bill to get us to this point. We worked extremely hard to try and find a compromise bill.

In the end, there were a few issues that we just disagreed on, there were issues we could not come to a conclusion on, but the vast majority of what is in the underlying bill was an agreement that we were able to work out and that I stand by. I believe it is good work and that is something that is extremely important.

But I will say that, in the end, private property rights, the protection of those property owners, has to be in the final bill, because the only way this is going to work is if we bring in property owners to be part of the solution and be part of recovering those species.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California and I have been working together for the last several months to try to find common ground on the amendments to the Endangered Species Act. As the chairman knows and many of my colleagues, I came to our discussions with the view that the ESA does not need amendment, that most of its problems could be fixed by additional appropriations or administrative changes that this administration is not willing to make.

Recognizing reality, I decided to enter into good-faith negotiations with
my chairman, and that is what they were. I salute the manner in which the gentleman from California conducted himself and the manner in which his staff treated the minority during this entire process. It was a fair process; and, indeed, what we had problems with were found in the communication that was received from the other side of the aisle, and I appreciate that. In the end, however, we could not reach agreement.

I do not support the pending legislation, but I must admit that we have come a long way. Yet we still have differences that divide us, differences in some instances that I have yet to discover. In fact, the manager's amendment has been redrafted so many times, the latest version is still hot off the presses.

I wish the bill, because of these latest changes in the manager's amendment, were not being rushed to the House floor. I wish that the driving force was not the zeal to pass anything that could be labeled ESA reform, but instead could be labeled truly species recovery.

With a little more time to consider how much this bill is going to cost the American taxpayers, we could at least have the opportunity to see how much we are going to lose in the exchange. In the last several hours, the bill passed out of the committee has completely blown apart. For example, the manager's amendment abandons the definition of jeopardy in favor of a species was agreed upon in committee. Instead, the Secretary of the Interior will use existing Federal requirements to register pesticides.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, if this is enacted into law, it will increase direct spending and would cost almost $3 billion to implement from the years 2006 to 2010.

So in my view, this bill offers endangered species less protection at far greater cost. Not only was fiscal responsibility thrown to the wind in this process, but we have turned back the clock to an era in which DDT was commonly known as "drop dead twice."

H.R. 3824 includes a provision adopted in the Committee on Resources that would repeal the Endangered Species Act protections for threatened and endangered species from the harmful impact of pesticides.

H.R. 3824 would insulate those who use pesticides from the Endangered Species Act prohibitions against killing endangered and threatened species. As long as corporations comply with Federal requirements to register pesticide users, they will have no obligation to meet the requirements in the Endangered Species Act. The economic and environmental implications of this provision are staggering.

But where the budget really leaks is from the gaping hole created by a new, potentially open-ended entitlement program for property developers and speculators. This, I might add, is where we truly broke down in our negotiations.

Section 14 would establish the dangerous precedent that private individuals must be paid to comply with an environmental law. If this language were applied to local zoning, no mayor, no city council could govern a community without fear that their decisions might bring the community into financial ruin. This section pays citizens to comply with the law. What is next, paying citizens to wear seat belts, to comply with speed limits, to pay their taxes?

This bill also contains provisions that would severely weaken the consultation process, the very heart of the ESA. Under current law, the Fish and Wildlife Service analyzes a proposed action to gauge if it is likely to place the consultation process, the very heart of the ESA. Under current law, the Fish and Wildlife Service analyzes a proposed action to gauge if it is likely to place a species in jeopardy. This process is grounded in science and must meet reasonable criteria.

This bill, quite to the contrary of current practice, wipes away any standards for that process. It wipes away review by wildlife experts. Gone. Proponents claim this change is justified because of the service's heavy workload. Instead of fixing the problem by giving Fish and Wildlife Service more resources, the bill simply changes the rules and undermines species recovery.

Finally, Mr. Chairman. I oppose another provision that would further weaken the consultation requirement when applied to state cooperative agreements. Under section 10 of H.R. 3824, no additional consultations will be required once the Secretary enters into a cooperative agreement with a State. It is questionable whether consultation would ever occur, even in those situations causing jeopardy to a listed species.

These provisions, taken together, raise a whole host of questions and concerns about the bill. It is time to end our tenuous species' ability to recover. Quite likely it will result in even more extinctions, the loss of more of the creatures God has placed in our care. Frankly, we cannot be good stewards of His creation and pass this bill.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 3824. However, I have worked, as I said in the beginning, well with the gentleman from California on this bill; and I do salute his tenacity, his patience, and his courage in bringing this bill to the floor.

I would have preferred we keep trying to resolve our differences, but that is not the situation we are in today, so I would urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3824.

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

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, would the chairman of the Committee on Resources agree to enter into a colloquy?

Mr. POMBO. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would.

Mr. HERGER. First let me say to the gentleman that I am very appreciative of his efforts here to make the ESA a better law.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the legislation would provide the President the authority to waive or expedite any provision of the act in the event of a major national disaster. I also understand that the legislation would require the Secretary to
Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 36 minutes remaining.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3824 pursuant to H. Res. 470 that the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) may control 20 minutes of any time.

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

There was no objection.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 470 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3824.

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to amend and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide greater results conserving and recovering listed species, and for other purposes.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to amend and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act of 1973, to provide greater results conserving and recovering listed species, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTROLLING TIME OF GENERAL DEBATE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3824, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3824 pursuant to H. Res. 470 that the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) may control 20 minutes of any time.

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

There was no objection.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) had 36 1/2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) had 36 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, when the Endangered Species Act was adopted by Congress in 1973, it was heralded use of environmental legislation for the protection and conservation of threatened and endangered species. At that time, it was clearly understood that the ultimate goal of the act was to focus Federal resources on listed species so that, in time, they could be returned to a healthy state and be removed from the list.
I fully support the goal of species protection and conservation and believe that recovery and ultimately delisting of species should be the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s top priority under ESA. I am in full support of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act that I am introducing today because I think it is an innovative and creative approach to ending the long-running conflict between protecting species and enforcing conservation actions on private land.

The question no question that ESA is due for an update since the suit offered by many of my colleagues eliminates critical habitat in much the same manner as H.R. 3824. For good reason, too. Currently, the system of critical habitat designations is so dysfunctional that it seems to defy logic.

For example, in 2002, the service proposed to designate 1.7 million acres as critical habitat in California and Oregon for a small fish species. This is approximately one-third of the entire acreage of Merced County, where I live, would have been designated as critical habitat.

In 2003, the service proposed over 4.1 million acres in California as critical habitat for the red-legged frog. One must wonder, if it can be found on 4 million acres, then is it truly endangered; or, on the flip side, are all 4 million acres truly critical habitat?

The Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act will fix the problems associated with critical habitat by replacing it with a recovery plan which will shift the focus from litigation to biology and recovery; provide for greater cooperation between the service and landowners and States; establish new incentives for voluntary cooperation efforts.

Coming up with a thoughtful way to enable recovery of endangered species without litigation has been a top priority for me since being elected to the Congress, and I am pleased that this bill does just that. My original bill, H.R. 2933, from the 108th Congress, tied the development of a recovery plan to the designation of critical habitat. The Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act takes that idea one step further and elevates the recovery plan system to the primary mechanism to protect species.

I am placed on this bill, however, to mention a few things that this bill does not do. This bill does not, and I repeat, does not weaken current law; it does not create a sweeping new entitlement program for landowners; it does not allow for pesticides to be used at random to harm farm workers and at-risk species; and it most definitely would not in any case allow for national treasures like the bald eagle and the grizzly bear to become extinct. That has been reported by a number of my colleagues, and it is simply not true.

In fact, I think many of my colleagues would be interested to know that my office has been inundated by representatives from so-called industry lobbyists requesting that certain provisions that were once included in this bill be put back in. This bill is in no way a home run for anyone. In my opinion, it is a true balance between the sides, no side getting everything they want; and, when you achieve that, you usually have the best policy.

I think it is unfortunate that the media and some members of the environmental community have chosen to vilify this bipartisan legislation over the past few weeks and provide nothing but a knee-jerk negative analysis because they have already prejudged Chairman Pombo’s bill as being the enemy.

Now we are here battling it out on the floor against one another, and another opportunity could be lost for us to move the ball forward. I am proud of this bill, and I am proud of the work that Chairman Pombo and his staff have done to create a document that is truly a compromise, and it is a real shame we could not agree on these last few things.

Whether some people want to admit it or not, the ESA is not working to the best of its ability to protect the species, and it is our job as Members of Congress to do something about it. We can do better, and better is voting in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Watson).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, we must protect what we can never get back. We are not only protecting wildlife, but we are defending our citizens as well.

The stringent regulations in the Endangered Species Act have benefited many species in our great country. Our national symbol, the bald eagle, is one of the most profound stories of recovery in progress. The American alligator, the Peregrine falcon, and the California condor are but a few examples of species that have benefited by the provisions in the bill. According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, nearly half of the species that had been on the list more than 7 years were stable or improving, and those are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3824 is full of giveaways to large development companies and other special interests. The Pombo legislation includes provisions that require the government to use taxpayer dollars to pay developers and other special interests not to violate the Endangered Species Act, instead of creating commonsense incentive programs that would foster greater involvement in conservation efforts.

Congress should choose to send a national message regarding the mindful stewardship of our country. If not, further abuses will occur as evidenced by Governor Schwarzenegger in my own home State of California. Tuesday, the Governor fired all six members of the State Reclamation Board, an agency that oversees flood control. The board had recently become aggressive about slowing development on the flood plains.

Is the Governor’s protection of developers and big landowners worth the devastation that oversight can avoid? Congress would be wise to take notice, in light of the no-bid contracts, pleas to exempt all environmental regulations in the Gulf States after Katrina, and the same old companies slurping up Federal funds in egregious excess.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California’s bill is not the legislation we need. It would also allow the unlimited use of dangerous pesticides at the expense of the people, plants, and wildlife. This bill would repeal all Endangered Species Act provisions that regulate the use of pesticides like DDT, which nearly resulted in the extinction of the American bald eagle in the mid-20th century and decimated the California brown pelican population in my own State.

We must protect what we can never get back.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) for their outstanding work on this legislation.

This legislation will reform the 1973 Endangered Species Act so that real species recovery can be achieved while minimizing conflict with landowners, public land managers, and communities, and particularly the farmers and ranchers of America that my committee represents.

Since the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) introduced this bill, we have heard groups on both sides of the issue recite statistics with the intent of proving or disproving the effectiveness of the law. Well, I do not believe I can change many minds simply by pointing out that over 99 percent of the species placed on the list fit it. I would like to make a comparison that may put this dismal success rate in perspective.

If, for instance, ran a hospital where only one half of 1 percent of the critical patients who checked in recovered, I could hardly claim to be doing a good job. What we need is an endangered species law that not only protects the species, but allows them to recover, to expand and to get off of the endangered species list as a thriving species. This is precisely what the record the Endangered Species Act has today compiled, one where only one half of 1 percent of the species have recovered.
Its proponent, nonetheless, continue to claim that that is a success. Along with its glaring shortcoming, the law contains numerous unintended consequences that have proven to be extremely harmful to landowners and local communities. In fact, landowners have made it clear that Endangered Species Act as it has evolved into a giant regulatory menace.

Under the current law, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has the power to halt lawful landowner activities if an endangered species is identified on their property and it is determined their actions would take that species. The landowner and his right to use his land are then simply left to the mercy of the courts.

Private property rights are fundamental rights embodied in the Constitution, and Congress periodically needs to take steps to ensure that government is protecting them, not trampling on them.

In my own committee, the Committee on Agriculture, we have recently examined another example of the infringement of property rights through the use of eminent domain. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) for working with us to address that problem as well. TESRA achieves a balance between environmental concerns and property rights protection through its compensation and cooperative conservation provisions. In these provisions, this legislation will fairly compensate landowners when they must forego use of their property and provide varied and unique ways to work with landowners.

The bill also makes other important changes, such as doing away with the Act’s emphasis on designating critical habitat by placing emphasis instead on functional recovery plans. These reforms will not only be more effective in achieving recovery, but also in a flexible, non-adversarial manner. I believe the protection of endangered species is exceedingly important, however, a law that forces Federal wildlife officials to simply catalog declining species while alienating landowners and discouraging good management practices is a bad thing. Support this legislation.

Failing to improve the lot of species in more than 99 cases out of 100 isn’t working. TESRA is a commonsense step towards improving and modernizing the 35-year-old law, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Cardoza. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. Costa).

Mr. Costa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the California Endangered Species Act. In my district, Kern County, part of which lies in my State, the second largest number in the Nation, we have 39 threatened and endangered species in the State, the second largest number in the Nation. We also have 11 million acres of designated critical habitat of which 30 percent is publicly owned.

In order to understand the status and the challenges of the various species that are listed, is it the chairman’s understanding that the reference to units of local government in section 8 of the bill would include water districts?

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

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

Mr. Pombo. Yes, that is our intention.

Mr. Costa. I thank the gentleman very much for that clarification.

Mr. Rahall. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Udall).

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

Mr. Udall of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Miller-Boehlert substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the substitute amendment in opposition to H.R. 3824.

H.R. 3824 is being promoted as a piece of legislation that is good for business. As a senior member of both the Small Business committee and the Resources committee, I think I have an important perspective on this issue.

I would like to draw your attention to the Endangered Species Act and landmark legislation that has been passed by Congress to protect the health and safety of workers. One could easily and logically argue, if they were so inclined, that child labor laws and occupational safety and health laws were bad for business. But we don’t because we intuitively understand that supporting the very foundation of business, the people who do the work, is a long-term economic benefit for society, even though it may cost a few dollars up front.

This goes to the basic fact that practically every adult in America has worked hard at a job for a business or a corporation at some point in his or her life. All of us can easily relate to the problems caused by unfair labor practices and unsafe working conditions. However, very few of us are scientists. We are not a scientifically literate society.

I am not here to say whether that is good or bad but just to offer one explanation why we find it so difficult to grasp that the health of our environment and the continuity of all the species in our environment is as important to the health of our society and the strength of our economy as sound labor practices. Legislation that hurts the health of the worker is not
good for business. Laws, like the one being proposed today, that undermine the very foundation of our society’s well-being and economic infrastructure, are not good for business.

When we undermine the basic tenets and goals of the Endangered Species Act, do we do so at our own peril? Most of us in the House were alive in the early 1960s when Rachel Carson published her book, *Silent Spring*. The silence of which she spoke caused by the extermination of our society’s symbol, the bald eagle, because it shattered their shells. DDT nearly exterminated the endless flocks of brown pelicans flying low over the ocean’s horizon, because the shells of their young. In my lifetime, I have witnessed the near extinction of these birds. And, thank God, I have witnessed their return because we banned that chemical.

Even though the birds have returned, did we ban DDT too late, because we all know that every one of us harbors residues of DDT in our bodies, that DDT is found in our mother’s milk? Or, were the eagle and the pelican sentinel, helping us to right our wrongs just in time, before they disappeared from this planet and our own bodies weakened along with them.

The Environmental Protection Agency banned DDT a year before the ESA was passed and here we are, 35 years later, about ready to pass a so-called “ESA reform bill” that would suspend all Endangered Species Act provisions related to pesticides.

The Endangered Species Act is really about a single species—us, human beings. I am not going to be dramatic and suggest that our species faces extinction. At six and a half billion and growing, I think the human species is going to be around for a good long time. But the existence of today’s young people is not the existence I remember from my youth.

Bottled water, mercury poisoning the womb, rates of asthma attacks skyrocketing, beaches closed because E. coli pollutes the water and sickens our children.

The Endangered Species Act is not about saving the tiny silvery minnow that lives in the Rio Grande and it is not about saving the spotted owl that exists in mature forests. It is about the fact that our rivers no longer sustain fish and our forest no longer sustain birds. The Endangered Species Act sounds the five-minute buzzer for humanity and says “Watch out!” Our fellow creatures are sickening. The animals that share our water, our air, our soils are dying. Something is wrong and we better do something about it before it begins to weaken and sicken us and we have to scramble to pick up the pieces.

Let me close where I began—whether or not a drastic weakening of the Endangered Species Act is good for business. The simple cost/benefit analysis often applied to endangered species protection only reflects what can be easily given a monetary value. This highly selective economic analysis only counts what can be most easily quantified—the cost of timber not cut, the cost of water not sold, the cost of crops not sprayed with pesticide. These economic analyses do not account for the cost if environmental protections are not put in place—an aquifer that dries up, a forest on which we depend for shelter, crops to which we are struck with cancer from unsafe pesticides. It is easy to hold up the first balance sheet and say, “Business will suffer” in the same way one could say that by prohibiting the labor of children, “Business will suffer.” But the cumulative effects of a thousand cuts into the environment that sustains us as humans will be borne by everyone in society, consumers and businesses alike. Without environmental laws, our economy polluted our rivers, darkened our air, paved our wetlands, and drained our rivers. The Endangered Species Act does not take property from private entities; it protects the property, the health and the wealth of all Americans.

Mr. RAHALL, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member on the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. (Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my dear friend, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), not only for his friendship, but for all the good things he has done on behalf of the species and other matters on nature and conservation of natural resources.

I want to pay tribute to my friend, the chairman of the committee. He has behaved in all manners in this connection with this, as he always does, as a complete gentleman. I greatly regret that we were not able to conclude our negotiations in a way which enabled us to together support this legislation. But he has made an honest effort and I want him to know of my appreciation and respect.

Having said that, endangered species is a very important piece of legislation that has worked well. It has served the Nation splendidly well. Large numbers of species which would have been extinct are saved by the fact that this has been in place. And the government now has the tools and guidelines for its behavior.

This is not new legislation. It passed in 1973. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONVERS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGE) all supported it. It passed by a heavy bipartisan vote in the House. It passed 92 to nothing in the Senate.

I would note that there are few real differences between the substitute which will be offered shortly and the legislation as it is before us. They are, however, noteworthy. I would note that the success of the Act I do not believe would be furthered by the adoption of the manager’s amendment, but it would be by the substitute to be offered.

I would note that there is reason to constantly review the legislative pronouncements of the Congress and to see how it is working and what needs to be done to make it work better and more fairly. I would note that it is working well and fairly. 56 percent of the top prescription drugs in the world contain natural compounds from plants found in the wild, many of which come from endangered plants. We have saved large numbers of other things which might otherwise have been extinct. I would note that there are also economic benefits. In a sense, we do good by doing well.

I would note that wildlife has created recreation for more than $108 billion in revenue and more than a million jobs in both the public and private sector at the local and national level.

There are problems with this. Science is the core of ESA and should not be lowered. The Endangered Species Act is really about conservation and sustainable economic development. It would be furthered by the adoption of the recovery plan but not in terms of whether the animal should be listed or the species should be listed.

Economics are treated in the same way. They become a part of the decision making rather than in the creation of the recovery plan. It is unfortunate that the legislation allows threatened species to dwindle until they become endangered, making the problem of recovery still more difficult.

We can and we should address the real needs of small farmers, landowners, ranchers and others; and we can do this, I believe, without allowing unlimited claims upon the Treasury. This would, I think, entail an intelligent review of this matter, something which the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and I tried to do.

I would note that the President has expressed concerns in his statement of the administrative policy on September 29 and he says, “Requirements related to species recovery agreements, new statutory deadlines, new conservation and programs for private property owners provide little discretion to Federal agencies and could result in a significant regulatory impact on private property owners.”

So if you want locally and financially responsible legislation, legislation which, in fact, protects the species, which is fair to all, which makes progress and which is close to the area of the legislation but which has broad citizen support, something which the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOHLENT) This is the way to go.

We can continue our efforts to try in good faith as has been done by both the
Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act, H.R. 3824.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).
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Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act. I commend the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for this legislation.

This legislation modernizes the Endangered Species Act, or ESA, to allow for more scientific review, better conservation plans, and to focus on a recovery process that is based on collaboration and not conflict.

After more than 3 decades, the ESA has failed. This legislation is a bipartisan effort to fix the flawed law.

Less than 1 percent of endangered species have recovered, less than 1 percent. The ESA has only helped 10 of 1,900 species listed under the law. Thirty-nine percent of the species are unknown. Twenty-one percent are declining, and they are declining, and 3 percent are extinct. This law has a 99 percent failure rate.

We need to update and modernize the ESA to strengthen the species recovery by turning conflict into cooperation and allowing the use of sound science.

In the Inland Empire, the ESA has prevented or increased costs for free-way interchanges, economic development, and things as simple as trash removal. There are certain areas that are blighted in portions of our communities. It is like walking into a mine. You have got to watch every step that you take because you are afraid you are going to step on an endangered species.

In my district, we have two infamous endangered species. I want to point to one, the Delhi sand flower-loving fly, and of course, the other one is the kangaroo rat.

Look at this fly. If anyone were to see this fly, we would swat it. It is our first, immediate reaction, and we have always heard the buzz at night when we are hiking. We go there and look at it to see if it is an endangered species. Immediately we react; we swat it.

Now, when we look at this fly, and it was buzzing around, I would swat it. What would happen if a cow swatted this fly? Would we fine the cow or the owner? It seems pretty ridiculous. This is what is going on.

ESA has many ridiculous examples. As we can see in these posters next to me, the fly costs San Bernardino County Medical Center $3 million to move the hospital about 200 feet when the fly was found in the property. That is about $600,000 per fly. Can my colleagues imagine what it would do to our communities, $600,000 to move a hospital? They reserved a certain area that is full with blight that is over-looking the hospital.

Also in my district, ambulances driving to this emergency room at Arrowbear Medical Center downtown so that the endangered flies will not hit their windshield. Can my colleagues imagine someone who needs emergency services cannot get to the hospital, has to slow down because they are afraid the fly might run into the windshield?

That is ridiculous. It is about a life that we need to save, not a fly.

It has even been suggested that traffic be slowed down on Interstate 10. Interstate 10 goes into Palm Springs. It is a route that moves traffic back and forth. It is ridiculous. They are saying, all right, this fly only comes out between July and September. So people are suggesting when we travel on that freeway that you should reduce your speed limit from 65 miles an hour because we might endanger this fly and hit this fly. Can my colleagues imagine the traffic congestion in the area, the impact it would have in that area, on the flow of goods and others that would not be able to move? That is ridiculous.

The Inland Empire is indeed species rich, but we have been hit hard by jobs lost by ESA. That is why we need to take into account the human cost.

For example, in the cities of Colton and Fontana, California, a handful of flies, yes, flies are responsible. The city of Fontana alone has spent $10 million in legal fees associated with the ESA, and it has been forced to put aside $50 million worth of land that has been intended for development. A scrapped commercial center with a supermarket would have generated $5 million in revenue.

Can my colleagues imagine what this would have done to the area, better schools, more police officers, new fire stations, teen centers, paving the streets, fixing our potholes? Yet we have not been able to generate the kind of revenue that we need.

The ESA is related to the development that led the city to default on bonds. Will the Federal Government restore the city's credit rating? No. It has hindered us.

Imagine if endangered species suddenly thrive in the areas flooded by the hurricanes. Do we stop the hurricane construction?

This law affects more people than what we think. Think of the farmers not able to harvest their crops because an endangered species is found in the field.

Local cities have offered land for habitat, changed development plans and tried to partner in that process; but ESA, as written, will not permit that.

I support this legislation, and I think this is good legislation. I ask my colleagues also to support the passage of this.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Chairman, there is probably not a Member of this body that cannot get up and tell some horror story with the current administration of the Endangered Species Act. We all agree there is need for reform and change.

The previous gentleman, while not speaking in halation whatsoever, should take note, and he has referred to the cost to a hospital in his district that had to pay some enormous costs, but it is important to realize anytime we allow species to go extinct we lose enormous potential to understand and hopefully improve our world and to create medicines that many times can save people’s lives. Nowhere is that more evident than in the world of medicine.

I have my chief of staff who has returned from the hospital, thank the Lord to many medicines that have been produced from nearly extinct species. It has made him well and brought him to this floor, and I could go down the list. There are a number of important medicinal possibilities possibly the next effective treatment of cancer, AIDS, or heart disease that can come from species that we are trying to protect and save on this world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of my class.

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

Everybody has been talking gloom and doom about the Endangered Species Act. Let me give my colleagues a few success numbers. This comes from the National Wildlife Federation.

According to the National Research Council, the Endangered Species Act has saved hundreds of species from extinction. A study published in the “Annual Review of Ecological Semantics” calculated that 72 species would potentially have gone extinct during the period from 1973 to 1998 if Endangered Species Act protection had not been implemented.

According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, 90 percent of the species ever listed under the Endangered Species Act remain on the planet today. That is not a failure. That is an enormous success.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 90 percent of the listed species whose condition is known, 68 percent are stable or improving, and 32 percent are declining. The longer a species enjoys the Endangered Species Act protection, the more likely its condition will stabilize or improve.

Now, I just want to say something. Everybody has been saying that H.R. 3824 has been this great effort in terms of collaboration, and I respect that. I respect the way that the chairman and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAITH) have approached this thing.

I come from the State of Washington. No part of the country has been more affected by the Endangered Species Act than the State of Washington with the spotted owl listings and the marbled murrelet listings; but I believe that this legislation, H.R. 3824, is a step backwards. It is not going to help protect these species that we want. It will hurt them. I think that the ESA should be reformed in a responsible manner.

In fact, the substitute amendment that I have cosponsored with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOREN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOEHLERT), and others that will be debated later today embodies those kinds of practical reforms which still provide us the kind of potent tools necessary to prevent extinction of species and to work towards their recovery.

There are some aspects of this bill that I agree with to a point. Over time, many supporters of the ESA have come to question the way in which habitat is designated as critical in order to help species recovery. While it is vitally important that habitat be set aside, these critical habitat designations have led to much controversy.

The substitute amendment also eliminates the critical habitat designation, but replaces it with the requirement that the Interior Secretary identify specific areas that are necessary for the conservation of species and then enforce these designations.

In addition, the substitute amendment will require that Federal land be considered first for designation as habitat necessary for species’ survival and recovery before private landowners are burdened.

Another provision of this bill is one offered by my friend from Oregon, but the idea that we are not any longer going to have EPA consult on pesticides is a tragic mistake. This is enough to defeat this bill in its own right. This is a terrible mistake. Sixty-seven million birds each year die because of pesticides; and if we let this pesticide protection go, it will be the most damaging thing I can think of for birds and other wildlife.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, the Endangered Species Act is broken and needs to be fixed. Those are not my words, those are the words of a city counselor from Santa Barbara, California. In a hearing we had on endangered species last year, she described California as being the greenest State, Santa Barbara as being the greenest of the greenest. She explained why she was being the greenest of the green. She said that the Endangered Species Act is blocking people from making additions onto their homes, it is keeping the beach closed, it is stopping development in their town, and they are tired of it. They either want it eliminated or fixed.

Elimination of the Act is too extreme. The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), our chairman, has taken a very good stance in reforming it. In New Mexico, we have the silvery minnow. In order to keep the flow in the Rio Grand River at the level that the biologists said we had to have, we have some storage that we had been building up for 50 years in four different reservoirs. And storage for water like that in New Mexico is not easy to get. When we emptied those, we cannot maintain the flow. So one of the most important provisions in this bill is that sound science must be used for any decision.

We also are affecting the outcome for our private property owners, and so I thank the gentleman for his hard work on this and I support the bill.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the substitute amendment, one of the most important reform legislation because it is an issue that is very important to me and many of my constituents in my district.

As we all know, the challenge we face in reforming the ESA is to create a balance between the important goals of conservation and preservation of our Nation’s species and making sure property owners, businesses, workers and communities do not suffer unnecessarily for these efforts. Under the current structure of the Endangered Species Act, these two goals have unfortunately been at odds and have been a barrier to important economic development.

By reforming the current law, we have the opportunity to craft balanced legislation that brings all stakeholders together in common interest. I feel strongly that this legislation achieves that balance and, therefore, should be approved.

A community in my district seeking this balance is Durant, Oklahoma, which is in part of the “historic range” of the American Crow. The leaders of Durant have worked hard and have had success in bringing business to their area of far southeastern Oklahoma, but each year, the construction of new sites for these businesses is brought to a screeching halt, always looking for the burying beetle, but no presence of the beetle has been found for a number over years. This disruption costs the community time, money, and the potential for future job growth.

There must be a better way to balance the needs of the species and the needs of the communities. This bill provides important reform. It does not gut the law, but actually continues to provide important protections for endangered species which we all care about deeply. This reform should provide a recovered process and provide real success in saving our national treasures.

I commend the hard work of those who have brought us here today.
Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time in opposition to the Threatening Endangered Species From Recovering Act.

This legislation, as many of us know, will do nothing to improve our ability to help species recover. As a matter of fact, this legislation will repeal all Endangered Species Act provisions that protect threatened and endangered plants and wildlife from the harmful impact of pesticides.

Let us focus on this for a moment. Every schoolchild in America is aware that pesticides are threatening to birds. Our own national symbol, the bald eagle, is threatened with the provisions of this bill that would repeal the pesticides provisions that currently exist and which help protect endangered species. So, we are really doing here in pesticides on a bald eagle, would we? And if we would not do that, why would we vote for this bill? Pesticides have played a large part in the decline of many species, including the bald eagle.

The eagle is one of the symbols of our national unity. There is something about the Endangered Species Act which represents something even greater than talking about plants and wildlife. There is a recognition that plants and wildlife and human beings are all part of the same interconnected process; that we are interdependent; that we are all one. To act as though plants and wildlife and insects are just here for our use, for our commercialization, for our disposal actually rejects our own humanity. There are deeper questions here about who we are as human beings that are reflected in legislation like this.

I could talk for a while about how this bill will not provide giveaways to developers at the expense of wildlife and endangered species. I could talk about how it is going to require the government to use taxpayer dollars to pay big developers to not violate the Endangered Species Act. I could talk about how this Threatening Endangered Species From Recovery Act would call for a tentative schedule for developing recovery plans for species that are currently protected. I could talk about all that, but I want to stress that my main point here in voting for this bill is rejecting the whole idea of interdependence and interconnection; rejecting the idea of a bald eagle which stands for national unity and that is precisely the reason we need to reform it, because everybody can find not just one but two or three or a dozen examples in their own State of how the current law is not leading to recovery; but it is, rather, tying people up and making individuals and organizations simply pay for a regulation rather than recovery.

The purpose of this bill is to lead to the recovery of species, and that is what this is all about. My own State of Arizona has had its own issues with the Endangered Species Act. Many times, those who manage water resources have been tied up with regulation that has squandered money on that rather than the recovery of species. This will make it far easier to do that.

This bill will also mean a deal between a landowner and a Federal agency is a deal. So for many reasons, I would support the bill.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I wish to engage the chairman of the Committee on Resources in a colloquy.

For many years, Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has engaged in river management practices that have harmed several species of native wildlife that live in and near the Missouri River and undermine the economic livelihood of many communities along the upper Missouri River basin. My State, and others in the upper reaches of the basin, have repeatedly endeavored to influence the Corps as it makes critical river management decisions.

The interagency consultation provisions found in the current law are one of the few tools at our disposal. So I am concerned that the alternative procedures defined but not specified in section 12 of the Threated and Endangered Species Act would create a way for the Corps to disregard the consultation requirement, and I want to make sure the alternative procedures provision is not designed as a way to eliminate consultation between Federal agencies.

Therefore, under the new bill, would the Corps be required to manage the Missouri River in a manner that meets current standards under the ESA?

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. Yes, they would.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for recognizing my concern and clarifying the intent of the bill. I am satisfied the bill will not weaken the interagency consultation requirement, and I appreciate your consideration.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a very valued member of our Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate to refer to the first Endangered Species Act in Genesis.

"Bring out every kind of living creature that is with you, the birds, the animals, and all the creatures that move along the ground, so that they can multiply on the earth and be fruitful and increase in number upon it."

Are we acting in the spirit of Noah written, the maps will hang up may vote, for a bill that would prevent protecting the bald eagle from pesticides, when DDT almost removed it from the treasure-trove of American icons? Are we acting in the spirit of Genesis? I think Americans think we are not. When we act to remove any meaningful enforcement provisions to protect the habitat, are we acting in the spirit of Genesis? Americans think not.

What is a fish without a river? What is a bird without a tree to nest in? What is an Endangered Species Act without any enforcement mechanism to ensure their habitat is protected? It is nothing. This is not a modernization of the Act, this is a dismantling of the Act, and I will tell you why.

The underlying bill says that we are going to have these maps of habitat that will be developed, and that is a wonderful thing. And under the bill, as written, the maps will hang up the walls of these agencies in beautiful pink and blue, and the Cub Scouts and the Girl Scout Troops can come through and look at the beautiful maps. But it has one missing thing. If we pass this underlying bill, we would have removed any single legal enforcement mechanism that those maps had whatsoever. The bipartisan amendment will say that those maps have some degree of teeth.

This underlying bill is a chimera. It is a total falsehood to say it does the first thing for habitat because there is no enforcement mechanism for those maps.

I want to tell my colleagues of a woman who was in my office the other day. She wants habitat protection so she can see those salmon. And just to make sure no one thinks this is just some esoteric thing, her name is Gail Flake. She lives in Miller Bay in Washington State, Kitsap County. She told me about the thrill of seeing the salmon going up the stream on Miller Bay, and they do that because we have an enforceable mechanism to protect habitat. She knows that if we pass this bill, we will remove the ability to protect the streams. We remove the enforcement mechanisms.
Mr. Chairman, that is why we need to do this substitute, which has a better way of identifying habitat in the recovery process so we do not have this frustration with the landowners, so we do not waste 3 years just bothering landowners and not recovering species, but we have a mechanism to get this job done.

I want to reiterate what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) suggested. To suggest that an Act that saves 99 percent of the species from extinction is a failure is not a way to keep score. If you want to know how to do more, let us make sure that the executive branch enforces this law. Clinton listed 500. The first Bush listed 250. This administration has done zero without a court order.

Let us pass the substitute bill and reject this underlying bill. Honor creatures, honor the taxpayer, honor yourself.

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

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

Mr. Rahall. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Farr).

Mr. Farr. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise as a Member probably more affected by this law than anybody else in the United States Congress. I probably represent more critical habitat in the coastal counties of Monterey Bay than anybody. That is the Big Sur, Carmel, Pebble Beach, Santa Cruz region.

That critical habitat has made us a lot of money on what is watchable wildlife. Watchable wildlife is the largest business, fastest-growing business in the United States. Of all the sports in this country, watchable wildlife exceeds them all. This bill undermines the greatest economic asset we have, which is our natural things by creating a new lottery on private property.

You argue the bill is broken because the administration has not been able to administer it.
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Well, it is not the bill that is at fault; it is the United States Congress and the President of the United States that are at fault.

I am on the Committee on Appropriations, and in 2003 the Fish and Wildlife Service said it needed approximately $153 million to address the critical backlog of listings of critical habitat; yet the President only asked for $18 million. This is the way to kill an organization if you do not fund it, and say look, the law does not work, you have a backlog.

So let us take the law. Every city councilmember, every city supervisor in the United States ought to wake up and look at this law because now they give you 1 minute to do what is the law. If you do not like the way the law is, you have trees in your backyard that the government says, the community says you ought to preserve, you do not have to worry about that now because you can say that is a taking. Pebble Beach, cut all of your cypress trees and pine trees, which are the Monterey cypress and the Monterey pines, because not instead of beautiful scenery you can build hotels all over that land. And if they do not allow you to do that because of the trees, the government will pay you.

Mr. Speaker, guess what, the government has no money. It cannot even pay the bureaucrats that are responsible for carrying out the law. This bill is a gun to the head. This bill says if you do not grant that development, by God, government, you have to pay it. The lawyers say, government, you have no money, you better grant the request.

This is a full development rights. It is an attack on America's greatest heritage. It endangers wild and scenic species.

Mr. Pombo, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brady).

Mr. Brady of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in Washington everything looks perfect on paper and people hate to admit they made a mistake; but the truth of the matter is that works in real life is completely different, and we have a responsibility to make those changes.

I strongly support this recovery act and thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) for his leadership and the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) for his hard work. My east Texas district, which was hit very hard by Hurricane Rita, is jam packed with trees. The piney woods are our heritage. They are our economy; and they provide habitat for the red cockaded woodpecker, among other endangered species.

But for decades, responsible landowners have been afraid that the Federal Government would swoop in and take the habitat away for the sake of this bird due simply to the outdated and unsubstantiated burdens of the Endangered Species Act.

America's farmers and ranchers and private property owners in east Texas have spent long enough fearing the Federal Government. Unfortunately, current law has created incentives for landowners to destroy species habitat to rid their properties of liability. I strongly support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to engage in a col­loquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo).

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is critical for us to make sure we do not change the regulatory landscape on property owners regulated under existing law. These individuals, our constituents, are committed to doing what the Federal Government asked them to do in order to secure authorization to proceed with various activities. We should not grant the landowners to renegotiate what they have already agreed to under the new rules of this bill after it is enacted.

Based on that premise, I believe the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act should include a grandfather clause to cover any ESA permits or approvals issued prior to the date of enactment of this bill, not just habit­ation comments as currently suggested. I would inquire, is that the intent of the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo)?

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

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

Mr. Pombo. Mr. Chairman, that is the intent, yes, sir.

Mr. Rahall. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Kind), a valued member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. Kind. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the approach that the committee is taking in trying to revamp and revise the Endangered Species Act. This has been a vitally important and successful act throughout recent decades. And while there is wide agreement here on the House floor that it should be amended and tweaked and improved on in light of past experience and modern times we need to do; and I believe that responsible approach is better reflected in the substitute that is being offered here today.

Unlike some in this Chamber who believe that the Endangered Species Act has been an unmitigated failure, there are countless success stories around the country. In my home State of Wisconsin, an example of how well it has worked, working with local officials and the stakeholders involved, the Hig­gins eye muskellunge has come back in the Mississippi River, which acts as a great filtration system in the river basin. The Karner blue butterfly, on the verge of extinction in Wisconsin, due to the Endangered Species Act and the recovery plan that was in place, is making a healthy comeback.

The whooping crane is making a strong comeback in the Necedah Wildlife Refuge, as has the granddaddy of them all, which has been referenced here today, the American bald eagle. If Members would like to see some bald eagles, come to western Wisconsin along the Mississippi during the spring and fall ice flows, and you will see literally thousands of them. There are new nests that are going up in habitat they had never found before. They are on the verge of being delisted because of their success story. EPA identified the adverse effects of DDT, Congress took action, and the bald eagle is resur­ging today.

And the grizzly bear that is about to be delisted in Yellowstone and portions of Montana from the threatened species list, I can personally attest to the strength of their comeback, having just been in Glacier Park in August and coming within 20 yards of a big bear that had two cubs. Fortu­nately, I was able to retreat, or I would have been a threatened or endangered species during that time.
The act has worked, and the point is there is a responsible approach that recognizes the bureaucratic red tape that we streamline, working with private property owners and also putting in place a strong recovery plan for species that makes more sense. That is the approach I encourage my colleagues to support the substitute.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Pasage).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I serve a very rural district, a lot of landowners. Currently, a landowner with an endangered species on his land often sees the species as a threat to his survival. That is not good for the species, and it is certainly not good for the landowner. It is not working. It is largely adversarial. H.R. 3824 provides incentives for landowners to preserve endangered species, and this will help the species, and it will help people as well.

In 1978, 50 miles of the Central Platte River in Nebraska was designated as critical habitat for whooping cranes. Only 3 to 4 percent of the whooping cranes visit the Platte River annually. The great majority of whooping cranes never see the Platte River, never visit it at all; and so many have questioned this designation because this designation has led to a cooperative agreement between Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming involving thousands of acres of lands, hundreds of thousands of feet of water to support critical habitat; and it is still not complete after 8 years of spending millions of dollars.

So we have case after case after case like this where this thing simply is not working well. Hopefully, applying the best available current science required by this legislation will improve this process. I think it will. I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman Pombo) for his efforts, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza), and ask support for H.R. 3824.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Gilchrest).

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

I, too, come from a rural area. The two major industries in my district are agriculture and fishing. So we know the landscape and people cooperate. The present ESA, maybe it is because we are on the coast, the present ESA bill is working fine. I know we need to tweak it because it does not work the same way all over the place, but I would urge my colleagues to support the substitute. Here are some reasons why:

In the substitute, there are specific criteria for science laid out. Members want good science; the methods, procedures, and practices are laid out. What species should be determined endangered? Five criteria laid out on page 4 of the substitute. Members should review all species that are designated every 5 years.

We have repealed the critical habitat designations, but we have replaced it with recovery plans found on page 20 of the substitute. It has time frames and objective, measurable criteria. It has a very specific description of where that species should be recovered, and the substitute provides that should not be recovered is not private land; it is public land. The emphasis is on public land; but whenever you go on private land, there should be some restitution, some sharing of Federal dollars with those private landowners; and 10 percent of the appropriated amount on an annual basis of this substitute will go for that very specific purpose.

What if livestock are endangered or threatened by a reintroduced species? That is taken care of. Landowners are going to be reimbursed for that lost livestock.

What about national security? Take a look at the substitute. There is a very specific exemption. Page 43 of the substitute, there is a national security exemption.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a specific, balanced ESA bill. Vote for the substitute.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Moran).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, my friend, for yielding me this time.

“Shortsighted men, in their greed and selfishly committed, rob our country of half its charm by the reckless extermination of all useful and beautiful wild things.” So said Republican President Theodore Roosevelt almost 100 years ago, and how relevant his remarks are today.

If we cannot find a way to live in harmony and conserve our natural resources in a sustainable way, we humans may, too, be doomed to extinction. The Endangered Species Act is a test to which we are willing to conserve our livable environment.

To date this act has succeeded. Its success rate is 99 percent. Only 7 out of 1,200 species, according to Fish and Wildlife Service, have become extinct, and they became extinct because of their status before they were listed.

There are problems with the Act that need to be addressed, but many of the changes embodied in this bill are not designed to eviscerate the law. They are designed to eviscerate the law. The proposal before us today will gut the law by making any recovery plan unenforceable and by creating a new compensation program for those who own land that may host a threatened or endangered species.

We are a Nation of laws and constitutional rights, but where in the Constitution does it say property rights are an immutable and an open-ended entitlement?

Where would we be as a Nation if the law did not allow reasonable government regulations of private property without payment of compensation if undertaken for the public good? That kind of regulation occurs every day in every State in every locality throughout the country. It occurs as a result of practically every regulatory statute we pass. It is a long-standing principle of the jurisprudence of our courts. But this bill turns that principle on its head, and in so doing it creates a very dangerous precedent that this body should not knowingly adopt.

Section 13 of the bill establishes a new program of conservation aid; and under this program the government must provide compensation to landowners whenever an ESA restriction prevents a particular use of property, regardless of the fact that other uses of the property remain and those uses are very valuable.

This new aid program, therefore, requires the payment of compensation to landowners even though no governmental taking of their property has occurred. And no provision for compensation being required where a restriction essentially strips property of all of its valuable uses, the standard under the takings clause, which exists today, this bill requires compensation whenever a restriction prevents a single use of property.

It is a standard for compensation that goes far beyond the standard imposed under the Constitution’s “taking” clause, and it does not exist in any other Federal statute. If enacted, this bill will set a very dangerous precedent that could lead to the insertion of similar provisions in other environmental and regulatory statutes. It has to be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I know that there are some problems with the implementation of this Act. The current “critical habitat” designation needs to be revised and should be established later in the process during the development of species recovery plans.

In that regard, the approach taken by the substitute put together by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) and others is the right way to go and should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, Federal land belongs to all of us. The Endangered Species Act is a vehicle through which we can conserve our land and balance the needs of all against the short-term and destructive interests of the few. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act, but strongly support the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE) assumed the Chair.
Mr. Chairman, Psalms 104, verses 25, 26: 'You send Your spirit, they are created; and the sea, vast and spacious, teeming with creatures beyond number, living with one another.

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time to speak on an issue that is very important to me and my constituents.

The Endangered Species Act plays a prominent role in my State of Missouri. But this particular legislation, I will speak on an issue that is very important to me and my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, the ESA is broken and needs to be fixed. Over the last 30 years, less than 1 percent of all listed species have been removed, and most of them have been removed because of poor data. I thought the intent of the ESA was to recover species and not leave them on the list indefinitely. Also, landowners seem to be getting cheated when species are identified on their property, and threatened species located within the borders and nine in my district.
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hurting landowners while not recovering any species.

This is why I introduced H.R. 3300, the Endangered Species Recovery Act. I want to thank the chairman and staff for working with me to develop and incorporate into the overall ESA a bill. The language in section 10 of the bill creates “species recovery agreements.” Basically, it is an all-inclusive incentive program that will compensate landowners for their conservation efforts. It is my hope that this provision will develop a better working relationship with landowners and the Federal Government resulting in recovery of more species. My underlying goal is to protect landowners while keeping intact the spirit of the ESA.

As part of the farming community, I have heard stories of farmers afraid to report an endangered species on their land because of the implication it would have on their property and their farming operation. “Shoot, shovel, and shut up” has many times been the case when a species was identified on their property. My point is that the ESA was more of a burden on landowners, and without the cooperation of landowners, species recovery, I do not think, will ever be successful.

Another reason why I chose to get involved in this debate is because of the implication this Act has on the management of the Missouri River. The Missouri River is a vital waterway for Midwest farmers, providing cheaper and more efficient transportation for their grain. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to maintain flood control and navigation along the river. Then came the Endangered Species Act, and this all changed. The ESA seems to supersede the Flood Control Act, and now transportation along the river is unreliable. Ultimately, I would like to see the provisions in this bill fix the situation so navigation becomes more reliable.

Again, I commend the chairman on his efforts and look forward to working with him on this bill and getting it passed this afternoon.

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

I want to conclude by saying I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for his offering of working on this piece of legislation, and we do so in the spirit of cooperation. I also say, although, that in this Chamber where we have seen lofty rhetoric for a number of years, I personally having witnessed it for 26 since I was first an intern here, I have frankly never seen the rhetoric not coincide with the reality more than in this case oftentimes.

This bill does not eviscerate the Endangered Species Act. This bill does several positive things. It establishes recovery plans based on biology. It establishes recovery habitat based on those recovery plans. It encourages landowners to cooperate with biologists in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It lets landowners get answers to their biological questions, and it compensates landowners whose land is conscripted under the original Endangered Species Act.

I ask Members for their “aye” vote. Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we heard about Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, 100 years ago this year, Theodore Roosevelt created the Great Forests. He also created the Klamath Wildlife Refuge. He created the forest reserves for both the future home building needs of the country and for water, if we read his statements, and, of course, for nature as well.

He created the wildlife refuge in the Klamath Basin to ensure that we would have healthy wildlife populations for generations to come; and, indeed, the wildlife refuge is home to the greatest concentration of bald eagles in the United States, in the lower 48.

Ninety-six years after he created that refuge, this Federal Government decided to cut the water off to 1,200 farm families in that basin based on the Endangered Species Act and interpreted by the government scientists without peer review, without peer review. When the National Academy of Sciences reviewed those decisions, they said the agency made mistakes in the outcome under the Endangered Species Act; and further they went on to say that those decisions put in jeopardy potentially those very species, the sucker fish in the Upper Klamath Lake and the Coho Salmon in the Klamath River. It potentially could have damaged both of those.

This act changes that. This act changes that, because we put into law for the first time really clear criteria and guidance about science. And unlike science is critical.

Let me talk about the private property rights. I believe in them. When the government says it is going to build a highway across your property, the Con-
I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill, H.R. 3824, which would substantially weaken the essential protections we have in place for endangered plants and animals. Since being signed into law over 30 years ago, the Endangered Species Act has protected over twelve hundred species from extinction. Only nine species listed under the act have gone extinct, and five of them were later determined to be extinct by the time they were listed. Meanwhile, thanks largely to the act’s protections, we have fully recovered such species as the American alligator, grey whale, and peregrine falcon, and stabilized the populations of bald eagles, sea turtles, and many others, and hundreds more. And some species, such as the California condor and red wolf, would probably be extinct without the protections of the act.

From looking at the record of the Endangered Species Act, I would say that it has been a success. A study by the Congressional Research Service has shown that 41 percent of listed species have improved their status after being listed. The act certainly has not brought every endangered or threatened species to life, but many of these have only been listed a few years. Rebuilding a species takes time. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reported that only 4 percent of species listed for less than 5 years have recovered by any appreciable amount. But that number jumps to 36 percent for species listed for over 10 years. The fact that so many species have yet to be fully recovered is a call for more endangered species protections, not less.

And yet less protection is exactly what this bill is giving us. It eliminates the designation of critical habitat, which is one of the most important provisions in the Endangered Species Act. A recent study showed that species with defined critical habitat are far more likely to be recovering than species without such habitat. The bill includes a number of other unfortunate provisions, but perhaps none are more unfortunate, or more mind-boggling, than the proposal to pay off developers for what they should be doing anyway—obeying the law. This bill says that if a developer wants to build something but can’t do it because of the Endangered Species Act, the government must pay them for the loss of the income they would have received from the development, even when the development is economically unfeasible.

Think about this for a second. First of all, we are saying that the government will pay you for obeying the law. A power plant that doesn’t install pollution control devices will be more profitable than one that does, but we don’t pay off the cleaner power plant for obeying the law. And we certainly don’t pay someone for not robbing a bank, even though it would be very profitable for them to do so. This has nothing to do with the government providing compensation for taking private land. This is about developers being encouraged to do an incredible service to the environment and then getting paid by the American taxpayer to not build them, because doing so would drive an endangered species to extinction. This is insane, and would ensure that all the money in the endangered species program would go to developer payoffs, and not species protection.

There are a number of reasons why we need to focus our resources on protecting endangered species. Wildlife means millions of dollars to local economies, both through tourism and outdoor recreation. Just in two counties in southern New Jersey alone, red knot watchers spend over $4 million a year. Nationally, sportmen and wildlife enthusiasts spend an estimated $100 billion each year on outdoor activities. This species is about more than just economic value and being good stewards of the Earth. It is also about our health. A recent study by the National Cancer Institute showed that in the past 20 years, 78 percent of new antibiotics and 74 percent of new vaccines were linked to natural products. Every species that goes extinct decreases our chances of finding the next miracle drug to fight infection, Alzheimer’s, cancer, or AIDS.

The substitute amendment being offered by Mr. MILLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, and others is a considerable improvement on the underlying bill. It eliminates payoffs to developers, puts more teeth into recovery plans, and ensures that scientific standards don’t get watered down. It is not an ideal substitute, but it will certainly do more protecting endangered species than H.R. 3824.

The Endangered Species Act is something we should be proud of, and something we should look to tweak to improve species recovery, not gut to give egregious and unwarranted payoffs to developers. I hope my colleagues to join me in defeating H.R. 3824.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying “The South will rise again!” Well, the bill before us today is proof the “Era of Big Government has come again!” Let no mistake be made, this bill cannot claim to be dedicated to fiscal responsibility and smaller government. This bill blows another hole in the Federal deficit.

I oppose this sham overhaul of the Endangered Species Act. Enacted in 1973, this landmark legislation has been hugely successful in saving many species from becoming extinct and has been an important conservation tool. The Endangered Species Act must be strengthened not decimated.

Of the more than 1,800 plants and animals protected under the act, over 1,300 domestic species listed as threatened or endangered and nearly 400 foreign species have been declared extinct. Those species that have survived continue to grow and flourish. Newly named, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act ignores this success and carves out loopholes in the Act that will allow developers and others to avoid the law’s protections.

The Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act eliminates extremely critical habitat designations, giving many species no opportunity to survive. It is a travesty that the leadership in this House, is yet again giving business the upper hand over sensible and effective environmental protection law. Prior to this bill we now have no incentive to protect their land. In fact, the Federal Government will now pay landowners for merely abiding the law!

Mr. Chairman, this Act does not “modernize” or “reform” the Endangered Species Act, it guts it and should be called the landowner and developer welfare act.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Chairman POEMO that the Endangered Species Act is in need of reform, and the way in which critical habitat is currently administered is one of the glaring problems with the act today.

For instance, in my district the Fish and Wildlife Service recently issued a critical habitat map for an endangered species which encompasses 74,000 acres including downtowns, streets and existing apartment complexes.

However, there are aspects with this bill in its current form that concern me and unfortunately, I cannot support legislation contained with section 3 of H.R. 3824 which transfers all the responsibilities for implementation of the Endangered Species Act to the Secretary of Interior. I question the agency’s existing level of expertise on fishery issues and its fiscal and technical capacity to take on such a task.

I raise this as a concern also because their past actions have proven to me that they don’t have the capability or understanding needed to protect listed salmon.

In 2002, the Department did not listen to warnings from NOAA Fisheries—the agency that currently manages and protects threatened and endangered salmon—and State biologists who warned months ahead of time that due to a drought and the existing management practices in the Interior, there could be a fish kill on the Klamath River. Unfortunately, the Department did not listen to these warnings, and that September some 80,000 adult fish died. This fish kill had, and continues to have a catastrophic impact on my district and the fishing related community—too south of San Francisco. The immediate result was obvious, but commercial fishing season was cut in half this year due to poor salmon returns caused by the fish kill, and fishery biologists expect the fishing season throughout the region to be cut like this for years to come.

Finally, I am concerned with how quickly this bill has moved through the House. I believe the process to make these important decisions regarding the existence of a species and our livelihood needs to be open, transparent and inclusive. In 1994, Representative CARDOZA and I helped pass revisions to the California Environmental Quality Act. As you can imagine, Mr. Chairman, this process was long and difficult. However, we formed a workgroup that included mainstream environmental, sportmen, agriculture and industry organizations. In the end, all parties supported this bill. Unfortunately, the reforms we are voting on today do not have that same level of endorsement. However, I strongly believe that if the process was more transparent and inclusive, we could find a balance that would be more agreeable to all parties.

In closing, I believe that the Endangered Species Act must be reformed and hope to work with you in reforming it to make it work better. However, for the reasons stated, I unfortunately cannot support this bill in its current form.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a co-sponsor of H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act. Alabama ranks in the top five states in the number of listed species, and passage of this legislation will move us closer to achieving the goal of protecting and recovering the Nation’s threatened and endangered species by adding a layer of common sense.

The Endangered Species Act, ESA, although enacted with honorable intentions, has strayed from its original purpose of conserving plants and wildlife. Currently, there are nearly 1,300 domestic species listed as threatened or
endangered. Since the enactment of the ESA, only 10 species, less than 1 percent of those listed as endangered, have been recovered. This is just one of the numerous reasons why this legislation needs updating.

Most importantly, the manager’s amendment included a significant provision that requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to consider the economic and national security impact of listing a species. This impact analysis is an important tool that provides vital information to Congress, federal agencies, states, and landowners about the potential effects of the ESA within their jurisdictional areas deemed to be essential for the species’ survival and recovery. Private property owners ought to have this information at the time a species is proposed for listing. Such timely notice serves to let everyone know whether they should be interested in the listing process and, ideally, brings them to the table to participate. I would like to thank Chairman Pombo for all his hard work on crafting this important piece of legislation, and I am very appreciative of his efforts to include this provision in his manager’s amendment.

By enhancing the rights of private property owners and improving the impact analysis of the listing process, the ESA will actually work to protect endangered species. I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Udall of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this bill as it stands.

I support much of the thrust of the original bill. I support putting more emphasis on recovery plans and on steps to provide incentives for landowners and other private parties to help with recovering species. And the Resources Committee did make improvements in the original bill.

Unfortunately, though, other needed amendments were not approved—and as a result I concluded that the bill’s defects were still so numerous and so serious that it should not be approved without further changes.

That was why I supported the bipartisan substitute. Had it been adopted, we would have kept the best parts of the bill as reworded. Those provisions worry the Bush Administration, which has told us that they would be unacceptable. The Preble mouse, for example, has kept the best parts of the bill as reworded.

Propponents of the reported bill say the Endangered Species Act has led to too many lawsuits. But according to the Bush Administration’s analysis of the bill as reported, “the new duty of jeopardy in the bill, as well as various statutory deadlines, may generate new litigation and further divert agency resources from conservation purposes.” The substitute did not have the same problems.

Similarly, the substitute did not include the reported bill’s vague provisions that would set up a new entitlement program—a program without clear boundaries that would increase federal spending to an extent that cannot be easily calculated.

These provisions worry the Bush Administration, which has told us that they “provide little discretion to Federal agencies and could result in a significant budgetary impact.”

And after reviewing the bill as reported, the nonpartisan budget watchdog group, Tax-
change of environmental law in the past three decades.

I have grave concerns about provisions in the bill that give political appointees the power to remove species from the endangered list based on political decisions rather than on sound science. Habitat destruction is the leading cause of species decline, and this bill proposes to eliminate critical habitat designations. I do not understand how eliminating protected areas can result in greater protection of endangered species.

The Endangered Species Act needs an update, but we must not reverse course on significant progress and results for endangered species. We have a solemn obligation to maintain responsible stewardship of America’s bounty, and this legislation would abandon that responsibility. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 3824, and to vote in favor of the balanced, bipartisan substitute legislation for ESA reform.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act.

The Republican majority has already dismantled nearly every Government program for people, and now it appears they’re moving on to other species. They constantly preach that God’s creations are precious, yet once again they are showing their hypocrisy that they would sacrifice the lives of God’s creatures. Perhaps if some of these endangered species were in a persistent vegetative state, Republicans would come rushing to their aid. Perhaps if scientists would concede these same plants and animals were fashioned during the week of God’s creating the world, the right wing would be willing to help.

The Republicans want us to believe that this bill represents a fair and balanced way to protect endangered species without infringing on property rights. Not true. This bill grants unprecedented and immeasurable subsidies to land owners rather than ensuring their fair costs are covered; so much so in fact, that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office cannot estimate the potential impact to the Federal budget.

This bill is nothing more than an assault on our environment. I urge my colleagues to join me, and every environmental organization on God’s green Earth, in opposing this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the unwisely, unwise, and unsubstantiated policy changes contained in H.R. 3824—misleadingly named the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.

I am deeply concerned about the elimination of all critical habitat provisions of the Endangered Species Act and the elimination of any mechanism to protect habitat needed for species recovery. I am troubled by the removal of protections for “threatened” species and the weakening of endangered species recovery teams.

Moreover, I believe that sound science produces accurate data from which sound policy decisions can be made. When we choose not to respect the role of science in our regulatory decisions, we are cheating ourselves out of valuable information and we run the risk of making poor or erroneous judgments about crucial conservation decisions. By allowing a political process to develop a definition of “best available science” and increasing barriers to access to scientific data, I believe that this bill needlessly politicizes scientific decision-making, and I fear that we are setting ourselves up for many unsound policy choices as a result.

I am not only motivated by the harms this bill will have on the plant and animal species, but by the threat to the health and well-being of the human species. The provisions of this bill seem to indicate a willingness to endanger the lives of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, their families, and their children. This weakening of pesticide standards poses a serious threat to public health, and I cannot support any bill that does not take seriously the health and safety of the American public.

We also do a disservice to the American people when we are not wise stewards of their taxpayer dollars. Using those dollars to pay developers for complying with the ESA’s regulations is a clear violation of the fiduciary duty with which we are all endowed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to again voice my opposition to H.R. 3824, and I encourage all of my colleagues who care about conservation to do so.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. The legislation before us today turns back the clock on 35 years of progress in responsible environmental stewardship by gutting the current Endangered Species Act and replacing it with little to preserve endangered wildlife for future generations.

Over 99 percent of the species that have been listed as threatened or endangered under current law have been saved from extinction. But had this bill been the law of the land over the last 30 years, the Fish and Wildlife Service points out that the Bald Eagle—an icon of American freedom—would exist only in our memories.

Any law that is 35 years old should be looked at with a fresh eye, and so I am supporting unprecedented attempts to update and improve the Endangered Species Act. Indeed, in my home state of Connecticut, we are concerned that oysters, a key aquaculture product, may be unnecessarily characterized as an endangered species. And so we should be willing to consider smarter laws.

But that is not the intent of the underlying bill. Rather, the purpose of this legislation is to remove obstacles inconvenient to special interests with whom the Republican leadership is in partnership. For this majority and their supporters—developers, the oil and gas industry—laws protecting the air and water are not a priority—they are a nuisance. As such, this legislation would eliminate conservation measures on tens of millions of acres of land around the country, the “critical habitat” of endangered species, and prevent such conservation activities in the future.

It also reveals the majority’s clear disdain for sound science. Current law requires a review of all scientific and commercial data by a panel of outside scientists. This, Mr. Chairman, ensures that the peer-review process—a central tenet of sound scientific research—guides the process, not ideology and politics. Instead, this bill would allow the Secretary of the Interior to make a determination about whether a species is endangered based on “all available information”—that is to say, information formed for the purpose of phony science supporting special interests.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the bill fails the fiscal responsibility test. By allowing for payments to land owners who do not develop land that is home to protected species, it actually creates a system where people and businesses—mostly big oil and gas companies—are paid for following the law. If only we were all so fortunate.

This bill is nothing more than yet another entitlement program for special interests—as always, with this majority, at the expense of the taxpayer. Little wonder that even conservative groups like Taxpayers For Common Sense have expressed their grave concerns regarding this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Endangered Species Act is a statement of our priorities as Americans. It is an affirmation of our belief that, just as we desire better economic opportunity for our children and future generations, so too do we hope to leave them a healthier environment.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill will accomplish neither. This is simply the continuation of a decade-long assault by the majority on our clean air, our clean water and our environment. And it should be rejected.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan substitute and in unwavering opposition to the underlying Threatened and Endangered Species Act of 2005, which does not defend endangered species as it purports, but rather protects the special interests of private industry and landowners.

I am concerned about the environmental and fiscal health of our great nation and the path chosen by many of America’s leaders whose policies are painfully lacking in promoting conservation. Although Americans may debate the need to update the Endangered Species Act of 1973, TESA is absolutely not the answer. In fact, TESA is a step back, furthering the degradation of species and compounding man’s conflict with the environment.

What exactly is the urgency by which the majority has brought this issue at this time? America is still in mourning as we enter the early stages of rebuilding the Gulf Coast and fighting a war in Iraq and Afghanistan costing our nation hundreds upon hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars.

Particularly egregious is that TESA will cost nearly $3 billion in new spending in just the next 4 years, which will be used not to protect threatened and endangered species, but rather the interests of private landowners. Developers should not be subsidized by the fiscal irresponsibility of this Congress. If we have $3 billion to give away, let’s give it to families in need by renewing TANF or to expand rather than cut Pell grants so that students who wish to attend college can meet the financial demands.

In my district, hardworking families are struggling to absorb the high costs of fuel into their budget while putting food on their tables and sending their children to college.

Mr. Chairman, the narrow-vision and short-term policy decisions made by this Congress do not reflect middle-class values. At what point will a clean environment and healthy future for our children and grandchildren become a priority?

The American public deserves a future that includes true protection of our endangered species and the development of fuel sources that are clean, renewable and promote conservation and energy security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the underlying legislation to reform the ESA and support the bipartisan substitute.
Mr. HOLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005. Despite the deceptive title of this bill, it is a measure designed to weaken the protections secured under the landmark Endangered Species Act (ESA).

While scientists are uncertain about the exact rate of extinction, they estimate that it is probably thousands of times greater than the rate prior to human civilization. In 1973 Congress enacted the ESA to address this problem of extinction. The ESA is a comprehensive legal measure that is used to identify and protect species that are determined to be the most at risk. Under this law, once a species is designated as either "endangered" or "threatened," powerful legal tools are available to aid in the recovery of the species and to protect its habitat. Without these strong federal protections hundreds of species including the bald eagle, grizzly bear, Florida panther, and the manatee would all be extinct.

The bill we are debating today is flawed in many ways, but I am particularly concerned with it in the form it presents the ESA. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is a powerful legal tool used to identify and protect species that are determined to be the most at risk. Under this law, once a species is designated as either "endangered" or "threatened," powerful legal tools are available to aid in the recovery of the species and to protect its habitat. Without these strong federal protections hundreds of species including the bald eagle, grizzly bear, Florida panther, and the manatee would all be extinct.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3824. I strongly believe that this is a very sensitive issue and should be looked at very carefully. While it is important to protect and save the many precious animals of this earth, it is also important not to take the property of the many Americans who have worked hard to obtain their homes and land. This issue needs to be looked at from a bipartisan perspective and with fairness. Furthermore, one of the Miller substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California.

Citizen input and oversight are vital to good government. Recovery plans require not only that we protect species from extinction but also that we recover species to the point where protection is no longer needed. Merely maintaining the survival of a species contradicts the spirit and letter of the ESA. The Miller substitute guarantees that individual property owners will be protected from the use of the property when the Secretary concludes that the use of the property would be a taking. The compensation will be made available as aid through a grant program. This is a fair and long-overdue process that will actually promote preservation and conservation of endangered species and at the same time protect private property rights.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3824. I strongly believe that this is a very sensitive issue and should be looked at very carefully. While it is important to protect and save the many precious animals of this earth, it is also important not to take the property of the many Americans who have worked hard to obtain their homes and land. This issue needs to be looked at from a bipartisan perspective and with fairness. Furthermore, one of the Miller substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California.

The Miller substitute is a responsible alternative to the Pombo bill. The amendment not only addresses the current problems in the law, but it also improves the current law. Congressmen MILLER and BOEHLERT have presented Congress with a creative, workable solution that promises better results for recovering endangered species and reducing burdens on landowners. Among other things, the amendment protects habitat for species recovery by maintaining habitat protections and puts the primary obligation for recovery on federal agencies by clearly defining "jeopardy." It also makes clear that any federal agency action that impairs species recovery will jeopardize the continued existence of the species and, therefore, is prohibited.

Furthermore, the substitute guarantees that federal agencies consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize threatened and endangered wildlife. Additionally, it ensures that all newly listed species have recovery plans within 3 years and species already on the list have recovery plans within 10 years. Recovery plans will identify all areas necessary for the conservation of listed species. Prior to the development of recovery plans, the Miller substitute encourages the development of guidance that identifies particular types of activities that could negatively impact recovery. One of the most important aspects of the Miller substitute is that it provides real landowner incentives for conservation through cost sharing and technical assistance. It provides for the role of the states in helping conserve endangered species through improved cooperative agreements and greater federal-state consultation. Because of these factors, I support the Miller substitute.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Resources Committee Print dated September 26, 2005. The amendment in the
nauer of a substitute shall be considered.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
tives of the United States of America in Congress as-sembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.”

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendment references.
Sec. 3. Definitions.
Sec. 4. Determinations of endangered species and threatened species.
Sec. 5. Repeal of critical habitat require-ments.
Sec. 6. Petitions and procedures for determinations.
Sec. 7. Reviews of listings and determinations.
Sec. 8. Secretarial guidelines; State com-
ments.
Sec. 9. Recovery plans and land acquisitions.
Sec. 10. Cooperation with States and Indian tribes.
Sec. 11. Interagency cooperation and consulta-
tions.
Sec. 12. Exceptions to prohibitions.
Sec. 13. Private property conservation.
Sec. 14. Public accessibility and account-
ability.
Sec. 15. Annual cost analyses.
Sec. 16. Reimbursement for depredation of livestock by reintroduced spe-
cies.
Sec. 17. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 18. Miscellaneous technical corrections.
Sec. 19. Clerical amendment to table of con-
ten.
Sec. 20. Certain actions deemed in compli-
ance.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference is considered to be made to such section or other provision of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) BEST AVAILABLE SCIENTIFIC DATA.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (21) in order as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), respectively, and by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

“(2)(A) The term ‘best available scientific data’ means scientific data, regardless of source, that are available to the Secretary at the time of a decision or action with which such data are required by this Act and that the Secretary determines are the most accurate, reliable, and relevant for use in that decision or action.

“(B) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary shall issue regulations that establish criteria that must be met to determine which data constitute the best available scientific data for purposes of subparagraph (A).”

(C) If the Secretary determines that data for a decision or action do not comply with the criteria established by the regulations issued under subparagraph (B), do not com-
ply with other provisions of this Act, or do not comply with this Act, the Secretary shall conduct, at least once every 5 years, based on the information collected for the biennial reports to the Congress required by paragraph (3) of subsection (f), a review of all species included in a list that is published pursuant to paragraph (1) and that is in ef-
effect at the time of the review; and

“(ii) determine on the basis of such review and any other information the Secretary considers relevant whether any such species shall

“(i) be removed from such list;

“(II) be changed in status from an endangered species to a threatened species; or

“(III) be changed in status from a threatened species to an endangered species.

“(B) Each determination under subpara-
graph (A)(i) shall be made in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF CRITICAL HABITAT REQUIRE-
MENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 4(a) (16 U.S.C. 1533(a) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1532), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by striking paragraph (6) and by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (22) in order as paragraphs (6) through (21).

(2) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)), as other-
wise amended by this Act, is further amended by striking paragraph (2), and by redesign-
gign paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively.

(3) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is further amended in paragraph (2), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking subparagraph (D).

(4) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is further amended in paragraph (4), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking “determination, designation, or revision referred to in subsection (a)(1) or (3)” and in-
serting “determination referred to in sub-
section (a)(1)”.

(5) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is further amended in paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking “and all that fol-
ows through the end of the sentence and in-
serting a period.”

(6) Section 4(c)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence—

(i) by inserting “and” after “if any”; and

(ii) by striking “, and specify any” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting a period; and

(B) in the third sentence by striking “, design-
ignation,”.

(7) Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 1534), as amended by section 9(a)(3) of this Act, is further amended in subsection (j)(2) by striking “section 4(b)(7)” and inserting “section 4(b)(6)”.

(8) Section 6(c) (16 U.S.C. 1535(c)), as amended by section 10(1) of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (3) by striking “section 4(b)(3)(B)(iii)” each place it appears and inserting “section 4(b)(3)(B)(iii)”.

(9) Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2) in the first sentence by striking “or result in the destruction or adverse modification of any habitat of such species” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting a period;

(B) in subsection (a)(4) in the first sentence by striking “or result in the destruction or adverse modification of any habitat of such species” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting a period;

(C) in subsection (b)(3)(A) by striking “or its critical habitat”;

(10) Section 10(j)(2)(C) (16 U.S.C. 1539(j)(2)(C)), as amended by section 12(c) of this Act, is further amended by striking “that—” and all that fol-

low through “solely” and inserting “that”;

and
(B) by striking "and" and all that follow through the end of the sentence and inserting a period.

SEC. 6. PETITIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATIONS AND REVISIONS.

(a) TREATMENT OF PETITIONS.—Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended in paragraph (2), as redesignated by section 5(b)(2) of this Act, by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following: "The Secretary shall not make a finding that the petition presents substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that the petitioned action may be warranted unless the petition provides to the Secretary a copy of all information cited in the petition.".

(b) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—

(1) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended in paragraph (4)(A), as redesignated by section 5(b)(2) of this Act—

(i) in clause (i) by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking "to the State agency in" and inserting "to the Governor of, and the State agency in;"

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking "such agency and" and inserting "such Governor or agency;"

(iv) in clause (ii) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (i); and

(v) by adding at the end the following: "(iii) maintain, and shall make available, a complete record of all information concerning the determination or revision in the possession of the Secretary, on a publicly accessible website on the Internet, including an index to such information; and"

(B) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Paragraph (5) of section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)), as amended by section 5(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following: "(i) A final regulation to implement such a determination or revision in the possession of the Secretary, on a publicly accessible website on the Internet, including an index to such information; and"

(B) by striking subparagraph (A).

SEC. 7. REVIEWS OF LISTINGS AND DETERMINATIONS.

Section 4(c) (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)) is amended by inserting and after the following:

"(B) Each determination under paragraph (2)(B) shall consider one of the following:"

"(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this section in the recovery plan for the species required by section 5(c)(1)(A) or (B);"

"(B) If the recovery plan is issued before the criteria under section 5(c)(1)(A) and (B) are established or if no recovery plan exists for the species, the factors for determining that a species is an endangered species or threatened species set forth in subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1);"

"(C) A finding of fundamental error in the determination that the species is an endangered species, a threatened species, or extinct;

"(D) A determination that the species is no longer an endangered species or threatened species or in danger of extinction, based on an analysis of the factors that are the basis for listing under section 4(a)(1)."

SEC. 8. SECRETARIAL GUIDELINES; STATE COMMISSIONS.

Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 1534) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(b) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—

(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary, in developing recovery plans, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, give the priority to those endangered species or threatened species, without regard to taxonomic classification, that are most likely to benefit from such plans, particularly those species that are, or may be, in conflict with construction or other development projects or other forms of economic activity.

(2) In the case of a species determined to be an endangered species or threatened species after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary shall publish a final recovery plan for a species within 2 years after the date the species is listed under section 4(c).

(3)(A) For those species that are listed under section 4(c) on the date of enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005 and are described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall not later than 1 year after such date, publish in the Federal Register a priority ranking system for preparing or revising such recovery plans that is consistent with paragraph (1) and is based on the scientifically based needs of the species; and

(B) A species is described in this subparagraph if—

"(i) a recovery plan for the species is not published under this Act before the date of enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005 and the Secretary finds such a plan would promote the conservation and survival of the species; or

"(ii) a recovery plan for the species is published under this Act before such date of enactment and the Secretary finds revision of such plan is warranted.

(3)(C) The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, adhere to the list and tentative schedule published under paragraph (A)(ii) in developing or revising recovery plans pursuant to this paragraph.

(ii) The Secretary shall provide the reasons for any deviation from the list and tentative schedule published under subparagraph (A)(ii), in each report to the Congress under subsection (e).

(3)(D) The Secretary, using the priority ranking system required under paragraph (3), shall prepare or revise such plans within 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.

(3)(E) PLAN CONTENTS.—(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (E), a recovery plan shall be based on the best available scientific data and shall include the following:

"(i) Objective, measurable criteria that, when met, would result in a determination, in accordance with this section, that the species which the recovery plan applies be removed from the lists published under section 4(c) or be reclassified from an endangered species to a threatened species.

SEC. 9. RECOVERY PLANS AND LAND ACQUISITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively;

(2) in subsection (l), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, by striking "subsection (k)" and inserting "subsection (l)";

(3) by striking so much as precedes subsection (k), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, and inserting the following:

"RECOVERY PLANS AND LAND ACQUISITIONS.

SEC. 5. (a) RECOVERY PLANS.—The Secretary shall, with this section, develop and implement a plan (in this subsection referred to as a ‘recovery plan’) for the species determined under section 4(a)(1) to be an endangered species or a threatened species, unless the Secretary finds that such a plan will not promote the conservation and survival of the species.

(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary, in developing recovery plans, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, give the priority to those endangered species or threatened species, without regard to taxonomic classification, that are most likely to benefit from such plans, particularly those species that are, or may be, in conflict with construction or other development projects or other forms of economic activity.

(2) In the case of a species determined to be an endangered species or threatened species after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary shall publish a final recovery plan for a species within 2 years after the date the species is listed under section 4(c).

(3)(A) For those species that are listed under section 4(c) on the date of enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005 and are described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall not later than 1 year after such date, publish in the Federal Register a priority ranking system for preparing or revising such recovery plans that is consistent with paragraph (1) and is based on the scientifically based needs of the species; and

(B) A species is described in this subparagraph if—

"(i) a recovery plan for the species is not published under this Act before the date of enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005 and the Secretary finds such a plan would promote the conservation and survival of the species; or

"(ii) a recovery plan for the species is published under this Act before such date of enactment and the Secretary finds revision of such plan is warranted.

(3)(C) The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, adhere to the list and tentative schedule published under paragraph (A)(ii) in developing or revising recovery plans pursuant to this paragraph.

(ii) The Secretary shall provide the reasons for any deviation from the list and tentative schedule published under subparagraph (A)(ii), in each report to the Congress under subsection (e).

(3)(D) The Secretary, using the priority ranking system required under paragraph (3), shall prepare or revise such plans within 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.

(3)(E) PLAN CONTENTS.—(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (E), a recovery plan shall be based on the best available scientific data and shall include the following:

"(i) Objective, measurable criteria that, when met, would result in a determination, in accordance with this section, that the species which the recovery plan applies be removed from the lists published under section 4(c) or be reclassified from an endangered species to a threatened species.

SEC. 9. RECOVERY PLANS AND LAND ACQUISITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively;

(2) in subsection (l), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, by striking "subsection (k)" and inserting "subsection (l)";

(3) by striking so much as precedes subsection (k), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, and inserting the following:

"RECOVERY PLANS AND LAND ACQUISITIONS.

SEC. 5. (a) RECOVERY PLANS.—The Secretary shall, with this section, develop and implement a plan (in this subsection referred to as a ‘recovery plan’) for
such intermediate measures as are war-

anted to effect progress toward achievement of the criteria.

‘‘(iii) Estimates of the time required and the costs to carry out those consis-
tioned under clause (ii), including, to the extent practicable, estimated costs for any recom-

mendations, by the recovery team, or by the Secretary of the guidance,

determined, that any of the areas identified under clause (iv) be acquired on a willing seller

basis.

‘‘(iv) An identification of those specific areas that are of special value to the con-
servation of the species.

‘‘(B) Those members of any recovery team appointed pursuant to subsection (d) with relevant scientific expertise, or the Sec-

retary if no recovery team is appointed, shall, based solely on the best available sci-

tific data, establish the objective, measure-

able criteria required under subparagraph (A)(i).

‘‘(C)(i) If the recovery team, or the Sec-

retary if no recovery team is appointed, de-

termines in the recovery plan that insuffi-
cient best available scientific data exist to
determine the criteria or measures required under sub-

paragraph (A), the Secretary shall report in draft form to the Governor and the

State agency.

‘‘(ii) If a recovery plan does not contain the criteria and measures provided for by
clause (i) of subparagraph (A), the recovery team or the Secretary if no

recovery team is appointed, shall review the plan at intervals of no greater than
5 years and determine if the plan can be revised to

contain the criteria and measures required under subparagraph (A).

‘‘(iii) If the recovery team or the Sec-

retary, respectively, determines under clause

(ii) that a recovery plan can be revised to

to add the criteria and measures provided for

under subparagraph (A), the recovery team or the Secretary, as applicable, shall

revise the recovery plan to add such criteria and

measures within 2 years after the date of the determination.

‘‘(D) In specifying measures in a recovery plan

under subparagraph (A), a recovery team or the Secretary, as applicable, shall—

‘‘(i) whenever possible include alternative

measures; and

‘‘(ii) in developing such alternative mea-

sures, the Secretary shall seek to identify, among such alternative measures of

comparable or greater efficacy, the alternative measures that are least costly.

‘‘(E) Estimates of time and costs pursuant
to subparagraph (A)(iii), and identification of the least costly alternatives pursuant to
subparagraph (D)(ii), are not required to be

based on the best available scientific data.

‘‘(2) Any area that, immediately before the enactment of the Threatened and Endan-

gered Species Recovery Act of 2005, is des-

ignated as critical habitat of an endangered species or threatened species

described as an area described in subparagraph (A)(iv) until a recovery plan for the species is de-

veloped or the existing recovery plan for the species is revised pursuant to subsection

(b)(3).

‘‘(d) RECOVERY TEAMS.—(1) The Secretary shall

appoint regulations that provide for

the establishment of recovery teams for development of recovery plans under this

section.

‘‘(2) Such regulations shall—

‘‘(A) establish criteria and the process for select-
ing the members of recovery teams, and the process for preparing recovery plans, that
covers the subsection.

‘‘(I) is of a size and composition to enable
timely completion of the recovery plan; and

‘‘(II) includes sufficient representation

from constituencies with a demonstrated di-

rect interest in the species and its conserva-
tion or in the economic and social impacts of its continuing existence.

‘‘(B) include provisions regarding operat-
ing procedures of and recordkeeping by

recovery teams;

‘‘(C) ensure that recovery plans are sci-

entifically rigorous and that the evaluation

criteria in paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (1)(D) of

subsection (c) are economically rig-

orous; and

‘‘(D) provide guidelines for circumstances

in which the Secretary determines that the

appointment of a recovery team is not nec-

essary or advisable to develop a recovery

plan for a specific species, including proce-
dures to solicit public comment on any such
determination.

‘‘(3) The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 App. U.S.C.) shall not apply to recovery

teams appointed in accordance with regula-
tions issued by the Secretary under this sub-

section.

‘‘(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Sec-

retary shall report every two years to the

Committee on Resources of the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Envi-
rionment and Public Works of the Senate on the

status of all domestic endangered species and

threatened species and the status of ef-

forts to develop and implement recovery plans for all domestic endangered species and

threatened species.

‘‘(2) In reporting on the status of such spe-
cies since the time of its listing, the Sec-

retary shall include—

‘‘(A) an assessment of any significant change in the well-being of each such spe-
cies, including—

‘‘(1) changes in population, range, or

threats; and

‘‘(1)(i) of subparagraph (A); and

‘‘(1)(ii) the basis for that assessment; and

‘‘(B) for each species, a measurement of the
degree of confidence in the reported status of

such species, based upon a quantifiable pa-

rameter developed for such purposes.

‘‘(f) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—The Secretary shall, prior to final approval of a

new or revised recovery plan, provide public

notice and an opportunity for public review

and comment. The Secretary shall consider all

information presented during the public comment period prior to ap-

proval of the plan.

‘‘(g) STATE COOPERATION.—The Secretary shall,

prior to final approval of a new or revised

recovery plan, provide a draft of such plan and an

opportunity to comment on such draft to the Governor of, and State agency in, any

State to which such draft would apply. The

Secretary shall include in the final recovery

plan the Secretary’s response to the com-

ments of the Governor and the State agency.

‘‘(h) CONSULTATION TO ENSURE CONSISTENCY WITH DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—(1) The Secretary shall, prior to final approval of a new or re-

vised recovery plan, consult with any person

with a direct or indirect financial interest,

that includes

the criteria set forth in subparagraph (B) and are in accordance with the priority established in

subparagraph (C).

(2) A species recovery agreement entered into under this paragraph by the Secretary

with a person

‘‘(i) shall require that the person shall carry on, on the land owned or controlled by the

person, activities that—

‘‘(1) protect and restore habitat for covered

species that are species determined to be en-
dangered species or threatened species pur-

suant to section 4(a)(1);

‘‘(II) contribute to the conservation of one or

more covered species; and

‘‘(III) specify and implement a manage-

ment plan for the covered species;

‘‘(ii) specify such a management plan that includes

(1) provision for the conservation of the covered species;

(II) a description of the land to which the agreement applies; and

(III) a description of, and a schedule to carry out, the activities:

(1) shall provide sufficient documenta-
tion to establish ownership or control by the
person of the land to which the agreement applies; 

(iv) shall include the amounts of the annual payments or other compensation to be provided under subparagraph (A) and the terms under which such payments or compensation shall be provided; and

(v) shall provide—

(I) the duties of the person;

(II) the duties of the Secretary;

(III) the terms and conditions under which the person and the Secretary mutually agree the agreement may be modified or terminated; and

(IV) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(C) In entering into species recovery agreements under this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into account—

(1) whether the agreement addresses the following factors:

(i) the potential of such land to contribute significantly to the conservation of the status of a candidate species or a species with a comparable designation under State law;

(ii) the potential of such land to contribute significantly to the improvement of the status of a candidate species or a species with a comparable designation under State law;

(iii) the amount of acreage of such land;

(iv) the number of covered species in the agreement or agreements;

(v) the potential of the covered species to implement the conservation practices described in the management plan or plans under the agreement or agreements;

(vi) the potential of such land to contribute significantly to the conservation of species or threatened species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(B)(iii), or species subject to consultation under section 7; and

(B)(IV) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(D) The Secretary shall enter into a species conservation contract agreement sub-

mitted by a person, if the Secretary finds that the person owns such land and has sufficient control over the use of such land to ensure implementation of the management plan under the agreement.

(E) The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into a species conservation contract agreement with the Secretary pursuant to this paragraph, a person shall receive such assistance provided for in this subparagraph.

(F) If the person is implementing fully the conservation practices in the management plan or plans under the agreement, the person shall refund all or part of any payments received under this paragraph.

(G) Any person shall provide; and

(H) any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(V) the Secretary shall accord priority to agreements that apply to any areas that are identified in recovery plans pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(A)(iv).

(B) The Secretary and persons who own private land may enter into species con-

ser
dervation contract agreements with terms of 30 years or more that meet the criteria set forth in subparagraph (B) and standards set forth in subparagraph (D) and are in accordance with the priorities established in subparagraph (C).

(B) A species conservation contract agreement entered into under this paragraph by the Secretary with a person—

(i) shall provide that the person shall, on the land owned by the person—

(I) carry out conservation practices to meet the goals set forth in the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(ii) shall specify and implement a management plan for the covered species;

(iii) shall specify such a management plan that includes—

(A) the duties of the person;

(B) the terms of the agreement; and

(C) a schedule of approximate deadlines, whether periodic, for undertaking the conservation practices described pursuant to clause (II);

(A) a description of existing or future economic activities on the land to which the agreement applies that are compatible with the conservation practices described pursuant to clause (II) and generally with conservation of the covered species;

(B) a description of existing economic activities on the land to which the agreement applies that are compatible with the conservation practices described pursuant to clause (II) and generally with conservation of the covered species;

(C) a description of the land to which the agreement applies that is compatible with the conservation practices described pursuant to clause (II);

(A) a description of the existing economic activities on the land to which the agreement applies that are compatible with the conservation practices described pursuant to clause (II) and generally with conservation of the covered species;

(iii) shall provide—

(A) the duties of the person;

(B) the terms and conditions under which the person and the Secretary mutually agree the agreement may be modified or terminated;

(C) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary that shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(IV) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(V) the Secretary shall accord priority to agreements that apply to any areas that are identified in recovery plans pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(A)(iv).

(V) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(V) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.

(V) acts or omissions by the person or the Secretary shall be considered violations of the agreement, and procedures under which notice of and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the person or the Secretary shall be given.
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4(a)(1) in that State. Upon completion of consultation on the agreement pursuant to subsection (e)(2), any incidental take statement issued on the agreement shall apply to any such species addressed to the State and any landowners enrolled in any program under the agreement, without further consultation (except any additional consultation pursuant to subsection (e)(2)) if the species is subsequently determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species and the agreement contains an adequate and active program for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species.

(B) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under this subsection may also provide for monitoring or assistance in monitoring the status of candidate species, endangered species or threatened species, and any provisions established pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C) or recovered species pursuant to section 4(h).

(C) The Secretary shall periodically review each cooperative agreement under this subsection and seek to make changes the Secretary considers necessary for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species to which the agreement applies.

(D) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under this subsection that provides for the enrollment of private lands in such an agreement, any program established by the agreement shall ensure that the decision to enroll is voluntary for each owner of such lands or water rights.

(E) A party may enter into a cooperative agreement under this subsection with an Indian tribe in substantially the same manner as a party may enter into a cooperative agreement with a State.

(F) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘Indian tribe’ means

(i) with respect to the 48 contiguous States, any federally recognized Indian tribe, organized band, pueblo, or community; and

(ii) with respect to the States of Alaska, the Metlakatla Indian Community;”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “pursuant to subsection (c) of this section”;

(B) by striking “or to assist” and all that follows through “section 5(j)” and inserting “pursuant to section 4(a)(2); or

(C) in subparagraph (F), by striking “monitoring the status of candidate species” and inserting “developing a conservation program for, or monitoring the status of, candidate species determined to be at risk pursuant to subsection (c)(3);” and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting “(1) before the first sentence;

(B) in paragraph (1), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking “at no greater than annual intervals” and inserting “every 3 years”;

and

(C) by adding at the end of this paragraph:

(2) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary shall be subject to section 7(a)(2) through (d) and regulations implementing such provisions only before—

(A) the Secretary enters into the agreement;

and

(B) the Secretary approves any renewal of, or amendment to, the agreement that—

(i) addresses species that are determined to be endangered species or threatened species, are not addressed in the agreement, and may be affected by the agreement; or

(ii) includes information about any species addressed in the agreement that the Secretary determines—

(I) constitutes the best available scientific information; and

(II) indicates that the agreement may have adverse effects on the species that had not been considered previously when the agreement was entered into or during any revision thereof or amendment thereto.

(3) The Secretary may suspend any cooperative agreement established pursuant to subsection (c), after consultation with the Governor of the affected State, if the Secretary determines that the agreement is not amended or revised to meet such standards.

(4) The Secretary may suspend any cooperative agreement established pursuant to subsection (c), after consultation with the Governors of the affected States, if the Secretary determines that the agreement is not amended or revised to meet such standards.

(5)(A) Any terms and conditions set forth under paragraph (4)(B)(iv) shall be roughly proportional to the impact of the incidental taking identified pursuant to paragraph (4) in the written statement prepared under paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(B) If various terms and conditions are available to comply with paragraph (4)(B)(iv), the terms and conditions set forth pursuant to that paragraph shall be—

(i) must be capable of successful implementation;

and

(ii) must be consistent with the objectives of the Federal agency and the permit or license applicant, if any, to the greatest extent possible.

(c) B I O L O G I C A L A S S E S S M E N T S.—Section 7(c)(1) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1539(c) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking “permit or license” before “applicants”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting “permit or license” before “applicants”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(A) by striking “applicants” before “(i)”;

(4) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking “applicants” before “(i)”;

(5) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking “applicants” before “(i)”;

and

(6) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking “applicants” before “(i)”;
(4) in the second sentence, by striking “best scientific and commercial data available” and inserting “best available scientific data”;

(5) the elimination of Endangered Species Committee Process.—Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (a) by striking “and each” and inserting “and (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), and (n)”; and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (o) and (p) as paragraphs (e) and (f), respectively;

(iii) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (b) of this subsection—

(A) in the heading, by striking “EXCEPTION AS PROVIDING”; and

(B) by striking “such section” and all that follows through “such section before the initiation of such agency action.”;

and

(5) in paragraph (2), by striking “by” and inserting “in order to”;

(6) in paragraph (1)(G), by striking “federal authority” and inserting “federal agencies”;

(7) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking “such” and inserting “the”; and

(8) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “such” and inserting “the”.

SEC. 17. PROHIBITIONS TO PROHIBITIONS.

(a) Incidental Take Permits.—Section 10(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1539(a)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of clause (i) and inserting “and” before clause (ii); and

(ii) by striking “such” and all that follows through “the issuance of the permit.”

(b) E LIMINATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMITTEE PROCESS.—Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (a)(2) of this section—

(A) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) objective, measurable biological goals to be achieved for species covered by the plan and specific measures for achieving such goals consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B);”;

(B) by inserting clause (v) as clause (vi), and by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(v) the term of the permit is reasonable, taking into account—

(I) the period in which the applicant can be expected to diligently complete the principal actions covered by the plan;

(II) the extent to which the plan will enhance the conservation of covered species;

(III) the adequacy of information underlying the plan;

(IV) the length of time necessary to implement and achieve the benefits of the plan; and

(V) the scope of the plan’s adaptive management strategy.”;

and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(3) Any terms and conditions offered by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) to reduce or offset the impacts of incidental taking shall be roughly proportional to the impact of the incidental taking specified in the conservation plan on the area occupied by the species identified in the permit or incorporated by reference therein, the Secretary may not require the holder, without the consent of the holder, to adopt any new minimization, mitigation, or monitoring measures respecting activities with respect to any species adequately covered by the permit during the term of the permit, except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C) to meet circumstances that have changed subsequent to the issuance of the permit.

(B) For any circumstance identified in the permit or incorporated document that results in the absence of consent of the permit holder, require only such additional minimization, mitigation, or other measures as are already required by the permit or incorporated document for such changed circumstance.

(C) For any changed circumstance not identified in the permit or incorporated document, the Secretary may, in the absence of consent of the permit holder, require only such additional minimization, mitigation, or other measures as are already required by the permit or incorporated document for such changed circumstance.

(D) The Secretary shall have the burden of proof in demonstrating and documenting, with the best available scientific data, the occurrence of any changed circumstances for purposes of this paragraph.

(E) Any permit issued under this subsection on or after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, other than permits for scientific purposes, shall contain the assurances contained in subparagraphs (B) through (D) of this paragraph and paragraph (5)(A) and (B).

(F) Permits issued under this subsection on or after March 25, 1996, and before the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, other than permits for scientific purposes, shall contain the assurances required by subparagraph (D) of this paragraph.

(G) The Secretary shall revoke a permit issued under paragraph (2) if the Secretary finds that the permittee is not complying with the terms and conditions of the permit.

(H) Any permit subject to paragraph (4)(A) may be revoked due to changed circumstances only if—

(i) the Secretary determines that continuation of the activities to which the permit applies may be inconsistent with the criteria in paragraph (2)(B)(iv);

(ii) the Secretary provides 45 days notice of revocation to the permittee; and

(iii) the Secretary determines that the permit is necessary to address the extent of such impacts. In any case in which various terms and conditions are available, the terms and conditions shall be capable of supersedence and shall be consistent with the objective of the applicant to the greatest extent possible.

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “best scientific and commercial data available” and inserting “best available scientific data”;

(ii) by redesignating subsections (a) through (d) of this section before the initiation of such agency action.”;

and

(B) by striking “such section” and all that follows through “such section before the initiation of such agency action.”;

and

(3) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (b) of this subsection—

(A) in the heading, by striking “EXCEPTION AS PROVIDING”; and

(B) by striking “such section” and all that follows through “such section before the initiation of such agency action.”;

and

(4) in the subsection, by striking “any” and inserting “the”.

(4) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “information and inserting “information”;

(5) in paragraph (2)(C)(i), by striking “list” and inserting “determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species”.

(d) Written Determination of Compliance.—Section 10 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) Written Determination of Compliance.—(1) A property owner (in this subsection referred to as a ‘requester’) may request the Secretary to make a written determination that a proposed use of the owner’s property that is lawful under State and local law will comply with section 9(a), by submitting a written description of the proposed action to the Secretary by certified mail, return receipt requested.

(2) A written description of a proposed use is deemed to be sufficient for consideration by the Secretary under paragraph (1) if the description includes—

(A) the nature, the specific location, the lawful use under State and local law, and the anticipated schedule and duration of the proposed use, and a demonstration that the property owner has the means to undertake the proposed use; and

(B) any anticipated adverse impact to a species that is included on a list published under 4(c)(1) that the requester reasonably expects to occur as a result of the proposed use.

(3) The Secretary may request and the requester may supply any other information that the Secretary reasonably expects to occur as a result of the proposed use.

(4) The Secretary does not make a determination pursuant to this subsection because of the omission from the request of any information described in paragraph (2), the requestor may submit a subsequent request under this subsection for the same proposed use.

(5)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall provide to the requestor a written determination of compliance with the proposed use, as proposed by the requester, will comply with section 9(a), by not later than expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the request.

(B) The Secretary may request, and the requestor may grant, a written extension of the period under subparagraph (A)

(6) If the Secretary fails to provide a written determination before the expiration of the period under subparagraph (A), any extension thereof under paragraph (5)(B), the Secretary is deemed to have determined that the proposed use complies with section 9(a). The Secretary shall consider, with respect to agency actions that are subject to consultation under section 7, any use or action taken by the property owner in reasonable reliance on a written determination of compliance under paragraph (5) or on the application of paragraph (6) that is not treated as a violation of section 9(a).

(7) Any determination of compliance under this subsection shall remain effective

(A) in the case of a written determination provided under paragraph (5)(A), for the 10-
year period beginning on the date the
written
determination is provided; or

(B) in the case of a determination
under paragraph (6) the Secretary is
deemed to have made the determination if the Secretary determines that, be-
cause of unforeseen circumstances, the con-
tinuation of the use to which the de-
termination applies would preclude per-
novation measures essential to the survival of any endangered or threatened spe-
cies. Such a withdrawal shall take effect 10 days after the Secretary provides notice of the withdrawal to the requester.

(11) The Secretary may extend the period
that applies under paragraph (5) by up to 180 days if seasonal considerations make a deter-
mination impossible within the period that would otherwise apply.

(e) NATIONAL SECURITY EXEMPTION. —Sec-
tion 10 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

'(1) NATIONAL SECURITY. — The President, after notification to the appropriate Federal agency, may exempt any act or omission from the provisions of this Act if such ex-
exemption is necessary for national security.'

(f) DECLARATION AND PROTEC-
tion. —Section 10 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

'(m) DECLARATION AND PROTEC-
tion. — (1) The President may suspend the ap-
plication of any provision of this Act in any area for which a major disaster is declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)

(2) The Secretary shall, within one year after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, promulgate regulations re-
garding application of this Act in the event of an emergency (including circumstances other than a major disaster referred to in paragraph (1)) involving a threat to human health or safety or to property, including regulations:

(A) determining what constitutes an emergency for purposes of this paragraph; and

(B) to address immediate threats through expedited consideration under or waiver of any provision of this Act.'

SEC. 13. PRIVATE PROPERTY CONSERVATION.

Section 13 (consisting of amendments to other laws, which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

'PRIVATE PROPERTY CONSERVATION

'Sec. 13. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide conservation grants (in this section referred to as ‘grants’) to promote the voluntary conservation of endangered spe-
cies and threatened species by owners of pri-
vate property and shall provide financial incentives through this section referred to as ‘aid’) to alleviate the burden of conserva-
tion measures imposed upon private property owners by this Act. The Secretary may pro-
vide technical assistance when requested to enhance the conservation effects of grants or aid.

(b) AWARDING OF GRANTS AND AID.— Grants to promote conservation of en-
dergenced species and threatened species on pri-
vate property—

(1) may not be used to fund litigation, general outreach, technical assistance, lobbying, or solicitation;

(2) may not be used to acquire leases or easements of more than 50 years duration or fee title to private property;

(3) must be designed to directly con-
tribute to the conservation of an endangered

species or threatened species by increasing the species’ numbers or distribution; and

(4) must be supported by any private property owners on whose property any grants or aid are provided. The Secretary shall consult with the Department of Justice to establish policies and procedures to ensure that the activities under this section are carried out consistent with Federal and State law.

(c) PRIORITY.— Priority shall be accorded
among grant requests in the following order:

(1) Grants that promote conservation of endangered or threatened species on pri-
vate property while making economically beneficial and productive use of the private property on which the conservation activi-
ties are conducted.

(2) Grants that develop, promote, or use

techniques to increase the distribution or population of an endangered or threatened species.

(3) Other grants that promote voluntary

conservation of endangered species or threatened species on private property.

(d) ELIGIBILITY FOR AID.—(1) The Sec-
cretary shall award aid to private property owners who—

(A) received a written determination under section 10(k) finding that the proposed use of private property would not comply with section 9(a); or

(B) received notice under section 10(k)(10) that a written determination has been with-
drawn.

(2) Aid shall be in an amount no less than the fair market value of the use that was proposed by the property owner if—

(A) the owner has foregone the proposed use;

(B) the owner has requested financial aid—

(i) within 180 days of the Secretary’s issuance of a written determination that the proposed use would not comply with section 9(a); or

(ii) within 180 days after the property owner is notified of a withdrawal under section 10(k)(10);

(C) the foregone use would be lawful under State and local law and the property owner has demonstrated that the property owner has the means to undertake the pro-
posed use.

(e) DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS AND AID.—(1) The Secretary shall pay eligible aid—

(A) within 180 days after receipt of a request for aid unless there are unresolved questions regarding the documentation of the fair market value and resolution of questions regarding the fair market value;

(B) at the resolution of any questions concerning the documentation of the fair market value or the fair market value established under sub-
section (g).

(2) All grants provided under this section shall be paid on the last day of the fiscal year. Aid shall be paid based on the date of the initial request.

(f) DOCUMENTATION OF THE FOREGONE USE.—Within 30 days of the request for aid, the Secretary shall enter into negotiations with the property owner regarding the docu-
mation of the foregone use. The Secretary may present documentation of the foregone use through such mechanisms as contract terms, lease terms, deed restrictions, eas-
ement terms, or transfer of title. If the Sec-
retary and the property owner are unable to reach an agreement, then, within 60 days of the request for aid, the Secretary shall de-
termine how the property owner is unable to reach an agreement.

(g) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—For purposes of this section, the fair market value of the foregone use of the affected portion of the private property, including business losses, is the value that a willing buyer would pay to a will-
ing seller in an open market. Fair market

value shall take into account the likelihood

that the foregone use would be approved under State and local law. The fair market

value shall be determined within 180 days of the documentation of the foregone use. The Secretary may request a written determination

jointly by 2 licensed independent appraisers, one selected by the Secretary and the other selected by the property owner. If the 2 appraisers

reach an agreement, the Secretary shall approve the appraised fair market value. If the 2 appraisers are unable to reach an agreement, the Sec-
retary and the property owner shall jointly select a third licensed appraiser whose app-
raisal within an additional 90 days shall be binding on the Secretary and the private property owner. Within one year after the date of en-
mancement of the Threatened and En-
dergenced Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations re-
garding selection of the jointly selected ap-
praisers under this subsection.

(b) LIMITATION ON AID AVAILABILITY.—Any
person receiving aid under this section may not receive additional aid under this section for the same foregone use of the same property and for the same period of time.

(i) ANNUAL REPORTING.—The Secretary shall by January 15 of each year provide a re-
port of all aid and grants awarded under this section to the Committees of the House of Representatives and the Envi-
rnonment and Public Works Committee of the Senate and make such report electronically to the general public on the website required under section 14

(b) PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY AND ACCOUNT-
ABILITY. — Section 14 (relating to repeals of other laws, which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

‘PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY AND ACCOUNT-
ABILITY

'Sec. 14. The Secretary shall make avail-
able on a publicly accessible website on the Internet—

(1) each list published under section 4(c)(1);

(2) all final and proposed regulations and determinations under section 4;

(3) the results of all 5-year reviews con-
ducted under section 4(c)(2)(A);

(4) all draft and final recovery plans issued under section 5(a), and all final recov-
ery plans issued and in effect under section 4(d)(1) of this Act as in effect immediately before the enactment of the

Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005;

(5) all reports required under sections 5(e) and 16, and all reports required under sec-
tion 5(f) and 18 of the Act as in effect immedi-
ately before the enactment of the

Threatened and Endangered Species Recov-
ery Act of 2005; and

(6) data contained in the reports referred to in paragraph (5) of this section, and that were produced after the date of en-
mancement of the Threatened and Endangered Species Re-
covery Act of 2005, that are contained in databases

that may be searched by the variables in-
cluded in the reports.’

SEC. 15. ANNUAL COST ANALYSES.

(a) ANNUAL COST ANALYSES.—Section 18 (16
U.S.C. 1548) is amended to read as follows:

‘ANNUAL COST ANALYSES

'Sec. 18. (a) IN GENERAL.—On or before January 15 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress an annual report cov-
ering the preceding fiscal year that contains an accounting of all reasonably identifiable expenditures made primarily for the con-
servation of species included on lists published

and in effect under section 4(c).

(b) SPECIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES.—

Each report under this section shall speci-
fy—

(1) expenditures of Federal funds on a spe-
cies-by-species basis, and expenditures of
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Federal funds that are not attributable to a specific species;
(2) expenditures by States for the fiscal year covered by the report on a species-by-species basis, and expenditures by States that are not attributable to a specific species; and
(3) based on data submitted pursuant to subsections voluntarily reported by local governmental entities on a species-by-species basis, and such expenditures that are not attributable to a specific species.

(c) ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION OF DATA BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide a means by which local governmental entities may—
(1) voluntarily submit electronic data regarding their expenditures for conservation of species listed under section 4(c); and
(2) provide information regarding the expenditures referred to in section 16(b)(2)."

SEC. 16. REIMBURSEMENT FOR DEPREDATION OF LIVESTOCK BY REINTRODUCED SPECIES.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 is further amended—
(1) by striking sections 15 and 16.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DEPREDATION OF LIVESTOCK BY REINTRODUCED SPECIES

"Sec. 17. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, may reimburse the owner of livestock for any loss of livestock resulting from depredation by any population of a species if the population is listed under section 4 and includes or derives from members of the species that were reintroduced into the wild."

"(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR AND AMOUNT.—Eligibility for reimbursement under this section shall not be conditioned on the presentation of the body of the animal for which reimbursement is sought."

"(c) LIMITATION ON REQUIREMENT TO PRESENT BODY.—The Secretary may not require the owner of livestock to present the body of individual livestock as a condition of payment of reimbursement under this section."

"(d) USE OF DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept and use donations of funds to pay reimbursement under this section."

"(e) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The requirement to pay reimbursement under this section is subject to the availability of funds in any fiscal year."

SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Endangered Species Act of 1973 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 9 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is amended to—
(1) in subsection (a), by striking “endangered species” and inserting “endangered species or a threatened species”; and
(2) in subsection (c), by striking “endangered species” and inserting “endangered species or a threatened species”."

"(g) BURDEN OF PROOF IN SEEKING EXEMPTION OR PERMIT.—Section 10(g) (16 U.S.C. 1539(g)) is amended to—
(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “endangered species” and inserting “endangered species or a threatened species”; and
(2) by adding the following:

"(h) ANTIQUE ARTICLES.—Section 10(h)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1539(h)(1)(B)) is amended to strike “endangered species or a threatened species”."

"(i) BURDEN OF PROOF IN SEEKING EXEMPTION OR PERMIT.—Section 10(h)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1539(h)(1)(B)) is amended to strike “endangered species or a threatened species”.

Corrections and additions made to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 include various modifications to the reimbursement and permit provisions, as well as changes to the definition of certain terms like "endangered species" and "threatened species." The legislation aims to align reimbursement eligibility with the updated status of species under the Endangered Species Act, ensuring that appropriate funds are available to assist affected livestock owners. The changes also reflect the contemporary understanding and reclassification of species status as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.
(2) "PRESIDENT" for "HE".—Section 8(a) (16 U.S.C. 1537(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking "he" and inserting "the President".

(3) "SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR" for "HE".—Section 8(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1537(b)(3)) is amended by striking "he" and inserting "the Secretary of the Interior".

(4) "HE" by striking "himself" and inserting "the person".—The following provisions are amended by striking "he" each place it appears and inserting "the person":

(A) Section 10(c)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)(3)),

(B) Section 11(e)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1540(e)(3)),

(C) paragraph (c) for "him".—The following provisions are amended by striking "he" each place it appears and inserting "the defendant":

(A) Section 11(a)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1540(a)(3)),

(B) Section 11(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1540(b)(3)),

(B) Section 11(c)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1540(c)(3)).

(6) REFERENCES TO "HE".—

(A) Section 4(c)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (C) by striking "his" and inserting "the Secretary".

(B) Paragraph (6) of section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended by striking "and inserting "the Secretary".

(C) Paragraph (c) as redesignated by section 9(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by striking "him" and inserting "the Secretary".

(D) Section 3(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "him" and inserting "the Secretary".

(E) Section 8A(c)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1537a(c)(2)) is amended by striking "him" and inserting "the Secretary".

(F) Section 9(d)(2)(A) (16 U.S.C. 1538(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "him" each place it appears and inserting "such person".

(G) Section 10(b)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)(1)) is amended by striking "him" and inserting "the Secretary".

(H) Paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 7(d) (16 U.S.C. 1536(d)) are redesignated as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively.

(7) REFERENCES TO "HIMSELF OR HERSELF".—Section 11 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amend-
ed in subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) by striking "himself or herself" each place it appears and inserting "the applicant".

(A) Section 4(g)(1), as redesignated by section 8(1) of this Act, is amended by striking "his" and inserting "the officer".

(B) Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1535) is amended—

(i) in subsection (d)(2) in the matter following clause (ii) by striking "his" and inserting "the Secretary";

(ii) in subsection (e)(1), as designated by section 10(b)(A) of this Act, by striking "his periodic review" and inserting "periodic review by the Secretary";

(C) Section 7(a)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1536a(3)) is amended by striking "his" and inserting "the applicant's".

(D) Section 8(c)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1537(c)(1)) is amended by striking "his" and inserting "the Secretary".

(E) Section 9 (16 U.S.C. 1538) is amended in subsection (d)(2)(B) and subsection (f) by striking "his" each place it appears and inserting "such person's".

(F) Section 10(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)(3)) is amended by striking "his" and inserting "the Secretary's".

(G) Section 10(d) (16 U.S.C. 1539(d)) is amended by striking "his" and inserting "the latter".

(H) Section 11 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1) by striking "his" and inserting "the Secretary's";

(ii) in subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) by striking "his or her" each place it appears and inserting "the defendant's";

(iii) in subsection (d) by striking "his" and inserting "the officer's or employee's";

(iv) in subsection (e)(3) in the second sentence by striking "his" and inserting "the person's"; and

(v) in subsection (g)(1) by striking "his" and inserting "his".

SEC. 19. CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 5 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 5. Recovery plans and land acquisition."

(2) by striking the items relating to sections 13 through 17 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 13. Private property conservation.


"Sec. 16. Annual cost analysis by United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

"Sec. 17. Reimbursement for predation of livestock by reintroduced species.

"Sec. 18. Authorization of appropriations.

(3) by striking the item relating to section 16 contain and inserting the following:

"Sec. 16. Annual cost analysis by United States Fish and Wildlife Service."

(4) by striking the item relating to section 17 contain and inserting the following:

"Sec. 17. Reimbursement for predation of livestock by reintroduced species."

(5) by striking the item relating to section 18 contain and inserting the following:

"Sec. 18. Authorization of appropriations."
Page 43, line 19, strike the close quotation mark and the following period, and after line 19, insert the following:

“(6) This subsection shall not apply to any agency that may affect any species for which a permit is issued under section 10 for other than scientific purposes, if the action implements or is consistent with any consultation and any incorporated by reference in the permit.

Page 49, beginning at line 15, strike “offered by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3)” and insert “or otherwise comply with the requirements of paragraph (2)(B)”. Page 56, line 11, after “proposed” insert “in extent”.

Page 53, line 22, strike “requester” and insert “requestor”.

Page 56, line 14, strike “10” and insert “5”.

Page 56, beginning at line 15, strike “date the Secretary provides notice of the withdrawal to the requestor” and insert “date the requestor receives from the Secretary, by certified mail, notice of the withdrawal”.

Page 56, line 19, insert “or biological” before “considerations”.

Page 57, line 22, strike “immediate” and insert “imminent”.

Page 57, after line 23, insert the following:

“(g) EXEMPTION FROM LIABILITY FOR TAKE OF AQUATIC SPECIES.—The operation of a water storage reservoir, water diversion structure, canal, or other artificial water delivery facility shall not be in violation of section 9(a) by reason of any take of any aquatic species listed under section 4(c) that would benefit the species for other than scientific purposes, if the action implements or is consistent with any consultation and any incorporated by reference in the permit.”

Page 60, line 19, strike “180” and insert “270”.

Page 60, beginning at line 20, strike “unsolved questions regarding the documentation of the foregone proposed use or”.

Page 60, beginning at line 25, strike “the documentation of the foregone use established under subsection (f)” and insert “that would benefit the species”.

Page 61, line 10, after “mechanisms” insert “to be the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 61, line 15, after “documented” insert “to be the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 61, line 17, after “use” insert “which shall not include transfer of title”.

Page 62, beginning at line 7, strike “binding on the Secretary and the private property owner and insert “the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 62, line 15, after “for” insert “essentially”.

Page 66, strike lines 21 through 26 and insert the following:

“(d) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—(1) Amendment.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is further amended in paragraph (15) (relating to the definition of “Secretary”) by striking “or the Secretary of Commerce as program responsibilities are vested pursuant to the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 4 of 1970” and insert “to the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 4 of 1970 and for addition to the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

Page 49, beginning at line 15, strike “offered by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3)” and insert “or otherwise comply with the requirements of paragraph (2)(B)”.

Page 56, line 11, after “proposed” insert “in extent”.

Page 53, line 22, strike “requester” and insert “requestor”.

Page 56, line 14, strike “10” and insert “5”.

Page 56, beginning at line 15, strike “date the Secretary provides notice of the withdrawal to the requestor” and insert “date the requestor receives from the Secretary, by certified mail, notice of the withdrawal”.

Page 56, line 19, insert “or biological” before “considerations”.

Page 57, line 22, strike “immediate” and insert “imminent”.

Page 57, after line 23, insert the following:

“(g) EXEMPTION FROM LIABILITY FOR TAKE OF AQUATIC SPECIES.—The operation of a water storage reservoir, water diversion structure, canal, or other artificial water delivery facility shall not be in violation of section 9(a) by reason of any take of any aquatic species listed under section 4(c) that would benefit the species for other than scientific purposes, if the action implements or is consistent with any consultation and any incorporated by reference in the permit.”

Page 60, line 19, strike “180” and insert “270”.

Page 60, beginning at line 20, strike “unsolved questions regarding the documentation of the foregone proposed use or”.

Page 60, beginning at line 25, strike “the documentation of the foregone use established under subsection (f)” and insert “that would benefit the species”.

Page 61, line 10, after “mechanisms” insert “to be the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 61, line 15, after “documented” insert “to be the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 61, line 17, after “use” insert “which shall not include transfer of title”.

Page 62, beginning at line 7, strike “binding on the Secretary and the private property owner and insert “the best and final offer by the Secretary”.

Page 62, line 15, after “for” insert “essentially”.

Page 66, strike lines 21 through 26 and insert the following:

“(d) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—Payments under this section are subject to appropriations.”

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. 22. REVIEW OF PROTECTIVE REGULATIONS.

(a) The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) review regulations issued before the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in order to determine whether reformation of such regulations would be desirable in order to facilitate and improve cooperation with the States pursuant to section 6 of such Act, and

(2) report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate regarding the findings of such review.

SEC. 23. PROVISION OF INFORMATION REGARDING COMPLIANCE COSTS OF FEDERAL POWER ADMINISTRATIONS.

(a) CUSTOMER BILLINGS.—The Administrator of the Bonnevile Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration shall each include in monthly firm power customer billing statements to each customer information reporting such customer’s share of the Federal power marketing and generating agencies’ direct and indirect costs incurred by such administration, related to compliance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and activities related to such Act.

(b) DIRECT COSTS.—In identifying and reporting direct costs, each Administrator shall include Federal agency obligations related to study-related costs, capital, operation, maintenance, and replacement costs, and staffing costs.

(c) INDIRECT COSTS.—In identifying and reporting indirect costs, each Administrator shall include foregone generation and replacement power costs.

(d) COORDINATION.—Each Administrator shall coordinate identification of costs under this subsection with the appropriate Federal power generating agencies.

SEC. 24. SURVEY OF BLM LANDS AND FOREST SERVICE LANDS FOR MANAGEMENT FOR RECOVERY OF LISTED SPECIES.

(a) In General.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) survey all lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Land Management and all lands under the administrative jurisdiction Forest Service immediately before the enactment of this Act, for the purpose of assessing the value of such lands for management for the recovery of any species included in a list published under section 4(c) on or before the date of enactment of this Act, except that such determinations and actions shall be appropriate as part of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

(b) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—The Secretary of the Interior may not transfer administrative jurisdiction pursuant to any recommendation under subsection (a)(2) except as authorized by a statute enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 25. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECTION 7 CONSULTATION AND INCIDENT TAKE AUTHORIZATION UNDER MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972.


The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Rahall) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo).

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

Mr. Chairman, the manager’s amendment makes a number of technical changes to clarify certain provisions and address issues concerning science, the definition of ‘‘justification of ESA-related programs, and review of protective regulations. It allows actions authorized under an approved section 10 permit to be carried out without duplicative consultation. It prevents water stakeholders from being held accountable for impacts due to State actions. It requires the four Power Marketing Administrations to include ESA costs in their monthly billing statements. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to survey Federal lands to assess their value for Federal actions. It clarifies conflicting statutes to make ESA the governing statutory authority when receiving a dock-building permit.

That is the short version of what is included in the manager’s amendment. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the manager’s amendment makes significant changes in the bill as it was reported from the Committee on Resources. These changes are likely to result in more species extinctions at greater loss of taxpayer dollars.

The pending legislation will increase direct spending in the discretionary funding law, which we will get into in general debate, and it could rise to more than $600 million a year, $235 million per year. We are spending today for species conservation, according to the Congressional Budget Office.
Let me make one point perfectly clear: the manager’s amendment is not something I agreed to in my discussions with the gentleman from California (Chairman Pombo). To say that I agree with 90 percent of this bill is not an accurate description, or is an unfair way of words.

One of the points that we had reached agreement on was that there was to be a recovery-based standard of determining when Federal agency actions jeopardize the continued existence of a species. The manager’s amendment drops this crucial provision. It cripples it.

While I was willing to eliminate critical habitat, it was only on the condition that we ensure that there were adequate provisions in place to encourage recovery. Without this definition, the bill will not promote recovery. We will likely see more endangered and threatened species. It is upon that ground that I oppose this manager’s amendment, as well as the loosened compensation standards put in order by the manager’s amendment.

It eliminates the bill’s requirement that appraisals determining the market value of foregone use of property are binding on both the Secretary and the property owner. Instead, the appraisal is binding only on the Secretary, and the property owner may then go to court to seek additional compensation. That makes the current pendulum worse, and it will increase the cost of this entitlement program to property owners and it will increase that cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Allen).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to deal with the section of the manager’s amendment that covers the manatees. Buried in this manager’s amendment in dry language is a contest between Florida developers on the one hand and Florida manatees on the other. In this Republican Congress, guess who wins, the developers or the manatees? It is not only bad policy, bad politics.

Finally, the minority and majority have already reached agreements and passed a version of the Marine Mammal Protection Act out of the Committee on Resources, and this amendment flies directly in the face of that process.

So here is the situation: Florida developers are not pleased by a court case in July. They rush in here, they get a provision in this bill to make sure that they win and the Florida manatees lose. Bad politics.

Mr. Rahall. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hinchey).

Mr. Hinchey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The interesting thing about the manager’s amendment is that it takes a very bad bill and makes it even worse.

I just want to focus on one aspect of this legislation which I think would be amusing in some sense if it were not for the fact that it is an example of a kind of cynical hypocrisy in those people who call themselves fiscally conservative. The bill guts the Endangered Species Act, there is no question about that, and all the protections that are involved there; but then it creates a whole new government giveaway program for some of the Nation’s richest landowners and property owners. What this bill does is add insult to injury.

If we build a highway across somebody’s property, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we compensate them for that and we pay them for it. If we build a highway across somebody’s property, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we pay them for it. If we take part of their property for a wildlife refuge area, we compensate them for that and we pay them for it. But if we take their property for endangered species habitat, we tell them, you are out of luck.

Now I have guys coming down here saying, this is a big giveaway system, that we are going to give away things to people. No. This is a big takeaway. You are taking away from them. You have been doing it for 30 years. Now it is time to pay for it. You are taking land away from people.

Every little and big giveaway program that crosses the country, every homeowner across the country who has had their property taken away from them should adamantly opposed to this legislation. You might want to even cast aside the environmental aspects of it, because if you look at the monetary implications of this and the budgetary implications of this bill, it is going to create an even bigger budget deficit in the context of this entire giveaway system.

People are using here more and more frequently the devastating impact of the two hurricanes. They want to sell off the national parks, they want to remove the safety net for millions of Americans who rely on government services, and now they are going to make it even more difficult for this Congress to provide the kind of programs and assistance that are needed in terms of health care, education, a variety of things by passing a piece of legislation that builds an even bigger budget deficit by creating a whole new giveaway program, a new entitlement program for some of the wealthiest people in the country, some of the biggest landowners in the country.

By way of background, this section would allow those applying for dock permits to simply prove that their activities would not, quote-unquote, jeopardize, would not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered and threatened marine mammal species as mandated by the Endangered Species Act, section 7. Today, under existing law they must prove that their activities would have only a negligible impact on these species as mandated by the Marine Mammal Protection Act, section 101. This simple change in wording will allow those applying for dock permits to simply prove that their activities would not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered and threatened marine mammals.

Now, it did not take long for the developers to get here. They lost a lawsuit on July 13, 2005, against the Fish and Wildlife Service in which the court found that the Marine Mammal Protection Act does in fact apply to dock-building activities that would lead to injury to marine mammals, and specifically manatees in Florida’s inland waters. This amendment, therefore, is rushed into this particular bill, just part of the manager’s amendment; it would undermine the process that has gone for several years that the State of Florida and the Fish and Wildlife Service have engaged in to recover manatees in Florida. It would completely short-circuit the progress made by the State and those Federal agencies.

Finally, the minority and majority have already reached agreements and passed a version of the Marine Mammal Protection Act out of the Committee on Resources, and this amendment flies directly in the face of that process.

So here is the situation: Florida developers are not pleased by a court case in July. They rush in here, they get a provision in this bill to make sure that they win and the Florida manatees lose. Bad politics.

Now I have guys coming down here saying, this is a big giveaway system, that we are going to give away things to people. No. This is a big takeaway. You are taking away from them. You have been doing it for 30 years. Now it is time to pay for it. You are taking land away from people.

Every little and big giveaway program that crosses the country, every homeowner across the country who has had their property taken away from them should adamantly opposed to this legislation. You might want to even cast aside the environmental aspects of it, because if you look at the monetary implications of this and the budgetary implications of this bill, it is going to create an even bigger budget deficit in the context of this entire giveaway system.

People are using here more and more frequently the devastating impact of the two hurricanes. They want to sell off the national parks, they want to remove the safety net for millions of Americans who rely on government services, and now they are going to make it even more difficult for this Congress to provide the kind of programs and assistance that are needed in terms of health care, education, a variety of things by passing a piece of legislation that builds an even bigger budget deficit by creating a whole new giveaway program, a new entitlement program for some of the wealthiest people in the country, some of the biggest landowners in the country.

All they have to do is come here under this legislation, just to ask for it, and it will be given to them. If you really want to conserve the fiscal integrity of this process, please vote against this bill.

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

I look forward to the gentleman’s opposition to the highway bill and any new purchases of land, to the wildlife refuge system, to the park system, or anything else that this kind of giveaway money on, because he sees it as a big giveaway, a big government giveaway system.

Again, what the underlying bill does is if you step in and take habitat from a private property owner and you tell them that you restrict them and you tell them they cannot use part of their property, then we set up a system of incentives and grants.

But, if in the end, the Secretary says your property is necessary for the recovery of an endangered species, therefore you cannot use it, we compensate them for that and we pay them for it. If we build a highway across somebody’s property, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we pay them for it. If we take part of their property for a wildlife refuge, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we pay them for it. But, if we take their property for endangered species habitat, we tell them, you are out of luck.

Now I have guys coming down here saying, this is a big giveaway system, that we are going to give away things to people. No. This is a big takeaway. You are taking away from them. You have been doing it for 30 years. Now it is time to pay for it. You are taking land away from people.

Every little and big giveaway program that crosses the country, every homeowner across the country who has had their property taken away from them should adamantly opposed to this legislation. You might want to even cast aside the environmental aspects of it, because if you look at the monetary implications of this and the budgetary implications of this bill, it is going to create an even bigger budget deficit in the context of this entire giveaway system.

People are using here more and more frequently the devastating impact of the two hurricanes. They want to sell off the national parks, they want to remove the safety net for millions of Americans who rely on government services, and now they are going to make it even more difficult for this Congress to provide the kind of programs and assistance that are needed in terms of health care, education, a variety of things by passing a piece of legislation that builds an even bigger budget deficit by creating a whole new giveaway program, a new entitlement program for some of the wealthiest people in the country, some of the biggest landowners in the country.

All they have to do is come here under this legislation, just to ask for it, and it will be given to them. If you really want to conserve the fiscal integrity of this process, please vote against this bill.

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

I look forward to the gentleman’s opposition to the highway bill and any new purchases of land, to the wildlife refuge system, to the park system, or anything else that this kind of giveaway money on, because he sees it as a big giveaway, a big government giveaway system.

Again, what the underlying bill does is if you step in and take habitat from a private property owner and you tell them that you restrict them and you tell them they cannot use part of their property, then we set up a system of incentives and grants.

But, if in the end, the Secretary says your property is necessary for the recovery of an endangered species, therefore you cannot use it, we compensate them for that and we pay them for it. If we build a highway across somebody’s property, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we pay them for it. If we take part of their property for a wildlife refuge, even though that may increase the value of the rest of their property, we pay them for it. But, if we take their property for endangered species habitat, we tell them, you are out of luck.

Now I have guys coming down here saying, this is a big giveaway system, that we are going to give away things to people. No. This is a big takeaway. You are taking away from them. You have been doing it for 30 years. Now it is time to pay for it. You are taking land away from people.

Every little and big giveaway program that crosses the country, every homeowner across the country who has had their property taken away from them should adamantly opposed to this legislation. You might want to even cast aside the environmental aspects of it, because if you look at the monetary implications of this and the budgetary implications of this bill, it is going to create an even bigger budget deficit in the context of this entire giveaway system.
be compensated for it. You are taking away their land. There is nothing wrong with that.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, when the Contract With America was written, this provision was scored by CBO at $3.2 billion; $3.2 billion.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this provision was not in the Contract With America. Nobody seems to be constrained by the truth here. This is a brand-new way of dealing with compensating property owners whose land is taken. CBO scored this at $10 million. This is a brand-new way of dealing with a very real problem and assuring some kind of protection to my property owners and your property owners.

Mr. Chairman, it was just a couple of weeks ago that the Supreme Court came out with a decision where this Congress stood up and said, you cannot use eminent domain to take away somebody’s property, to take someone’s house away from them and give it to another individual. And all of you ran down on the floor and said you were all in support of that.

We are going to stop the government from being able to use eminent to take away somebody’s house and give it to somebody else. But, under that provision, you can pay them for their house. Under current law, you do not have to pay when you steal somebody’s property for declared habitat at this time. You guys are all fine with that. Is that because we are talking about farmers and ranchers? Is that why you do not want to pay them? But when we are talking about somebody’s house, all of a sudden you want to pay them? I mean, you guys have no consistency in this whatsoever.

I believe if you take away somebody’s private property, you should have to pay them for it, and that is what we are trying to do in this underlying bill. I know that some of my colleagues are just philosophically opposed to that, and God love you. But the fact of the matter is, if you take away somebody’s private property, you ought to have to pay for it.

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, when you do take, meaning you have no value left, then you have just compensation, was the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is not what the Constitution says. The Constitution says, nor shall private property be taken for a public use without just compensation. That is what it says. It does not say the government can step in and take away your value and then tell the gentleman, as we continue to work forward, I will continue to work with the gentleman as this bill moves through the process, continue to work with the gentleman and try to work out whatever differences that still exist under the bill.

The gentleman from West Virginia operated under good faith with me, I believe I did the same thing with the gentleman through this entire process, and I pledge to the gentleman that we will continue to work together to produce the best possible bipartisan bill we can to deliver to the President’s desk.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Boehlert).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct a couple of things. First of all, this is mandatory spending we are talking about. Secondly, we do not allow the taxpayer permission in this bill, I allowed in highway cases. That is important to distinguish between the two.

Mr. Chairman, we are all in agreement. There is broad and justifiable consensus that the act is overdue for reform, but reforming the law should not be a euphemism for gutting the law, and that is exactly what the bill would do.

The list of areas of disagreement are very strong, but I would also point out that we do not, in the substitute bill, have many of the provisions in the base bill because they need to be addressed in a responsible way and, in many cases, we take the exact language. But section 13 is totally unacceptable. That is the big controversy; opening up an open-ended entitlement, putting the taxpayers at great risk.

I urge opposition to the base bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I have no quarrel with the stated purpose of this bill to reform the Endangered Species Act. Chairman Pombo is correct, there is broad and justifiable consensus that the Act is overdue for reform.

Is the gentleman going to oppose the highway bill because we compensate people when we take their land away for a highway, even though we do not take 100 percent of the use? Why is it okay in that instance, but it is not okay when it comes to protecting habitat?

You guys talk big about wanting to protect habitat and protect species, but 90 percent of the habitat for endangered species is on private property. The recovery of endangered species is if you bring in the property owners and have them be part of the solution. You are stopping that from happening right now under current law and in the substitute. You are wrong on this.

We have to pay when you take away somebody’s private property. That is what we have to do. That is what is in the underlying bill. I am sorry if you have a philosophical problem with paying for what you are taking.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the part that I have trouble with is that we did not authorize any new money to fund this. You just said, take it out of the Interior Appropriations bill. Well, I want to tell you, we have not funded the Endangered Species Act properly under this administration, and if there is not any money, it is going to have to come out of somebody else’s hide. It is going to be the Fish and Wildlife Service, it is going to be the Park Service; somebody is going to have to fund this, and it is going to cost a lot more than $10 million a year. That is laughable.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) has 3½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Rahall) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, this is another area where you guys are just not consistent. One of you comes down and beats us up because we are spending too much money on this massive increase in spending under this bill. Somebody else comes down and says, you do not fully fund endangered species under this bill. Either we spend too much or we do not spend enough. You cannot have it both ways. Either we spend too little or we do not spend enough, but you cannot keep coming down here and trying to make both arguments.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Rahall) has the right to close.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend from West Virginia, I appreciate all the work that he and his staff put into this bill. This was an important thing for us to go through, and I think that we produced a good bill at the end of that.

I know that there are issues in the underlying bill that we disagree on, and I probably will tell the gentleman, as we continue to work forward, I will continue to work with the gentleman as this bill moves through the process, continue to work with the gentleman and try to work out whatever differences that still exist under the bill.

The gentleman from West Virginia operated under good faith with me, I believe I did the same thing with the gentleman through this entire process, and I pledge to the gentleman that we will continue to work together to produce the best possible bipartisan bill we can to deliver to the President’s desk.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I say to my chairman, I appreciate his concluding comments and, as I have said, all of us have negotiated in good faith, and I do want to continue that relationship that we have. Maybe we can still work on this bill together; I hope we can. But we will see as the process goes forward.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Boehlert).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct a couple of things. First of all, this is mandatory spending we are talking about. Secondly, we do not allow the taxpayer permission in this bill, I allowed in highway cases. That is important to distinguish between the two.

Mr. Chairman, we are all in agreement. There is broad and justifiable consensus that the act is overdue for reform, but reforming the law should not be a euphemism for gutting the law, and that is exactly what the bill would do.

The list of areas of disagreement are very strong, but I would also point out that we do not, in the substitute bill, have many of the provisions in the base bill because they need to be addressed in a responsible way and, in many cases, we take the exact language. But section 13 is totally unacceptable. That is the big controversy; opening up an open-ended entitlement, putting the taxpayers at great risk.

I urge opposition to the base bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I have no quarrel with the stated purpose of this bill to reform the Endangered Species Act. Chairman Pombo is correct, there is broad and justifiable consensus that the Act is overdue for reform.
But "reforming" the law should not be a euphemism for "gutting" the law, and that's what this bill would do. I urge my colleagues to look beyond the descriptions of the bill and to examine the bill itself.

The most advertised feature of the bill is that it gets rid of the current "critical habitat" provisions of the law and replaces the habitat requirements with flexible, comprehensive, science-based "recovery plans." Sounds pretty good. And it would be pretty good if that were a full description of what the bill did. But what has actually been obscured is that, under the bill, the recovery plans are utterly unenforceable. No one ever has to abide by them. Not only that, the plans will be written through a process that guarantees delay, but does not guarantee that the best science will be used.

So is there a way to get rid of the current "critical habitat" burdens and to use recovery plans without weakening the law? Of course there is. And our Bipartisan Substitute shows how. We eliminate all the provisions of current law that designate habitat designations just as in H.R. 3824, but we make recovery plans enforceable and we ensure that they have strong scientific basis. That's how you get real reform while still protecting real species.

It's not impossible to balance the need for reform with the need to protect species. But instead, we have a bill before us that is balanced in its rhetoric, but not in its effect. The bill weakens just about every feature of law designed to protect species—for example, the review of federal actions to make sure they do not unduly harm species.

Now I am not trying to suggest that H.R. 3824 is all bad news. In fact, many of its provisions, often in language identical to that in H.R. 3824, So we commend the Resources Committee for so many of the bill's provisions and we embrace them. But there is one provision of H.R. 3824 that our Substitute does not include at all. And that's Section 13, which creates an opening-ended entitlement that will open the federal treasury to provide mandatory payments to developers. This is a bad idea on philosophical and legal grounds, but this is an especially bad time to expose taxpayers to such burdens.

We don't have to endanger taxpayers in order to reform the Endangered Species Act. We don't have to make it easier for species to become extinct to reform the Endangered Species Act. All we need to do to reform the Act is to make sure that common sense isn't trumped by ideology.

I urge my colleagues of defeat H.R. 3824, which just waves the banner of reform to distract attention from its actual content. Vote instead for real reform. Vote for the Bipartisan Substitute.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

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

I just want to say that when the gentleman talks about a taking, that is not what his legislation does. All that has to happen is that a landowner proposes a use for his property, and if that use is ruled as a taking, the landowner gets compensated. The landowner does not show that they could do that, that they could go through the city zoning, or they could go through the county zoning, that they would get those permits to build those houses or whatever else he wants to do, or he could build that commercial establishment, no showing of that. Yet, under this legislation, he is entitled to compensation. Nothing has been taken, only the suggestion in the proposal on a plan.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-240.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Act chairmain. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Acting CHAIRMAN.

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Amendment references.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Determinations of endangered species and threatened species.

Sec. 5. Repeal of critical habitat requirements.

Sec. 6. Petitions and procedures for determinations and revisions.

Sec. 7. Reviews of listings and determinations.

Sec. 8. Protective regulations.

Sec. 9. Secretarial guidelines; State cooperative agreements.

Sec. 10. Recovery plans and land acquisitions.

Sec. 11. Cooperation with States and Indian tribes.

Sec. 12. Interagency cooperation and consultation.

Sec. 13. Exceptions to prohibitions.


Sec. 15. Public accessibility and accountability.

Sec. 16. Analytical analyses.

Sec. 17. Reimbursement for depredation of livestock by reintroduced species.

Sec. 18. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 19. Miscellaneous technical corrections.

Sec. 20. Establishment of Science Advisory Board.

Sec. 21. Clerical amendment to table of contents.

(b) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to such section or other provision of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) BEST AVAILABLE SCIENTIFIC DATA.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (21) in order as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), respectively, and by inserting before paragraph (5), as so redesignated, the following:

"(2) The term 'best available scientific data' means data and analyses, regardless of source, produced by scientifically accepted methods and procedures that are available to the Secretary at the time of a decision or action for which such data are required by this Act, and that meet scientifically accepted standards of objectivity, accuracy, reliability, and relevance.

(b) PERMIT OR LICENSE APPLICANT.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is further amended by amending paragraph (13), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

"(13) The term 'permit or license applicant' means, when used with respect to an action of a Federal agency that is subject to section (a) or (b), any person that has applied to such agency for a permit or license or for formal legal approval to perform an action.

(c) JEOPARDIZE THE CONTINUED EXISTENCE.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

"(12) The term 'jeopardize the continued existence' means to engage in an action that, directly or indirectly, makes it less likely that a threatened species or an endangered species will be brought to the point at which measures provided pursuant to this Act are no longer necessary, is likely to significantly delay doing so, or is likely to significantly increase the cost of doing so.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(n) (16 U.S.C. 1536(n)) is amended by striking "section 3(13)" and inserting "section 3(14)."

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES AND THREATENED SPECIES.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE DETERMINATIONS.—Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 1533) is amended by striking so much of subsection (a)(2) and inserting the following:

"(2) Determination of endangered species and threatened species.

SEC. 4. (a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations in accordance with subsection (b) to determine whether any species is an endangered species or a threatened species because of any of the following factors:

"(A) The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range, including by human activities, of other species, competition from other species, drought, fire, or other catastrophic natural causes.

"(B) Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes.

"(C) Disease or predation.

"(D) The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms, including any efforts identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

"(E) Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

(b) BASIS FOR DETERMINATION.—Sec.
(1) by striking “best scientific and commercial data available to him” and inserting “best available scientific data”; and
(2) by inserting “Federal agency, any other agency of the Department of Interior, or by a State agency in the States unless otherwise required by law.”
(c) Section 5(b)(1) of this Act, as amended by section 5(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:
(5) The Secretary shall:
(A) determine, on the basis of such review and any other information the Secretary considers relevant whether any such species should be proposed for—
(i) removal from such list;
(ii) change in status from an endangered species to a threatened species; or
(iii) change in status from a threatened species to an endangered species;
(B) Each determination under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be made in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF CRITICAL HABITAT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 4(a) (16 U.S.C. 1533(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).
(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—
(1) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)), as otherwise amended by this Act, is further amended by striking paragraph (2), and by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) in order as paragraphs (2) through (7), respectively.
(2) Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is further amended in paragraph (2), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking “adverse modification of any habitat of such species” and inserting “adverse modification of any critical habitat of such species”.

SEC. 6. PETITIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATION OF THREATENED SPECIES.

(a) TREATMENT OF PETITIONS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended in paragraph (2), as redesignated by section 5(b)(1) of this Act, by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:
(II) change in status from an endangered species to a threatened species;
(III) change in status from a threatened species to an endangered species;
(B) Each determination under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be made in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 7. REVIEWS OF LISTINGS AND DETERMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(c) (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)) is amended by inserting at the end the following:
(5) Each determination under paragraph (2) shall consider the following as applicable:
(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the criteria in the recovery plan for the species required by section 5(c)(1)(A) or (B).
(B) If the recovery plan is issued before the criteria required under section 5(c)(1)(A) or (B) are established or the State agency in the States fails to establish a recovery plan for the species, the factors for determination that a species is an endangered species or a threatened species set forth in subsections (a)(4)(A) and (B) shall apply.
(C) A finding of fundamental error in the determination that the species is an endangered species, a threatened species, or extinct.

(d) A determination that the species is no longer an endangered species or threatened species or in danger of extinction, based on an analysis of the factors that are the basis for listing under section 4(a)(1).

SEC. 8. PROTECTIVE REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(d) (16 U.S.C. 1533(d)) is amended by inserting the following:
(1) inserting “(i)” before “Whenever”;
(2) inserting “in consultation with the States” after “the Secretary shall”; and
(3) adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

(2) Each regulation published under this subsection after the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005 shall be accompanied with a statement by the Secretary of the reason or reasons for applying any particular prohibitions to the threatened species only if the specific threats to, and specific biological conditions and needs of, the species are identical, or sufficiently similar, to warrant the application of identical prohibitions.
(4) The Secretary may review regulations issued under this subsection prior to the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.
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Species Recovery Act of 2005 as they pertain to that species.”.

SEC. 9. SECRETARIAL GUIDELINES; STATE COMMENTS.

Section 4(f)(16 U.S.C. 1533) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection—

(A) in the heading by striking “AGENCY” and inserting “SECRETARY”;

(B) by inserting the following paragraph (1), by striking “the purposes of this section are achieved” and inserting “this section is implemented”;

(C) in redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

(D) in paragraph (3) by striking “and” and inserting “after the semicolon at the end, and” and inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the criteria for determining best available scientific data pursuant to section 3(2);”;

“(5) by striking paragraph (5);”;

“(6) and inserting

“(6) the criteria for determining best available scientific data pursuant to section 3(2);”;
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“(A) an assessment of any significant change in the well-being of each such species, including—

(i) changes in population, range, or threat status of any species, or the determination of a quantifiable parameter developed for such purposes.

(ii) the basis for that assessment; and

(B) for each species, a measurement of the degree of confidence in the reported status of such species or the determination of a quantifiable parameter developed for such purposes.

(f) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Secretary shall, prior to final approval of a new or revised recovery plan, provide public notice and an opportunity for public review and comment on such plan. The Secretary shall consider all information presented during the public comment period prior to approval of the plan.

(g) STATE COMMENT.—The Secretary shall, prior to final approval of a new or revised recovery plan, provide public notice and an opportunity to comment on such draft to the Governor of, and State agency in, any State and any Indian tribe to which such draft would apply. The Secretary shall include in the final recovery plan the Secretaries response to the comments of the Governor of, and State agency in, any State and any Indian tribe that submitted comments.

(h)GENCY ACTIVITIES DEFINED.—For purposes of this Act, the term "Indian tribe" means—

(1) with respect to the 48 contiguous States, any federally recognized Indian tribe, organized band, pueblo, or community; and

(2) with respect to Alaska, the Metlakatla Indian Community.

(1) USE OF PLANS.—(1) Each Federal agency shall provide such Federal, State, and any Indian tribe to which such lands or water rights in any program established pursuant to this Act for conservation of species determined to be endangered, threatened, or species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C)(iii) or recovered species pursuant to section 6.1972 is amended

(b) (A) by the Secretary under this subsection that provides for the enrollment of private lands or water rights in any program established pursuant to this Act for conservation of species determined to be endangered, threatened, or species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C)(iii) or recovered species pursuant to section 6.

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

(3) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding at the end the following:

(A) by adding at the end the following:

SEC. 11. COOPERATION WITH STATES AND INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1535) is further amended—

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

“(A) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under this subsection may also provide for development of a program for conservation of species determined to be endangered, threatened, or species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C)(iii) or any other species that the Secretary and the Governor agrees at risk of being determined to be an endangered species or threatened species under section 4(a)(1) in that State.

(B) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under this subsection shall provide for monitoring and assistance in monitoring the status of species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C)(iii) or recovered species pursuant to section 5.

(C) The Secretary shall periodically review each cooperative agreement under this subsection and seek to make changes in the cooperative agreement necessary for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species to which the agreement applies.

(4) Any cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under this subsection that provides for the enrollment of private lands or water rights in any program established pursuant to this Act for conservation of species determined to be endangered, threatened, or species pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(C)(iii) or recovered species pursuant to section 6.1972 is amended

(D) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

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

(2) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding at the end the following:

(A) by adding at the end the following:

(A) by adding at the end the following:

(E) in subsection (c), after consultation with the Governor of the affected State and the Secretary agrees is at risk of being determined to be an endangered species or threatened species under section 7(a)(2) through (d) undertaken pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with a State.

(F) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term "Indian tribe" means—

(1) with respect to the 48 contiguous States, any federally recognized Indian tribe, organized band, pueblo, or community; and

(2) with respect to Alaska, the Metlakatla Indian Community.

(1) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding at the end the following:

(2) in paragraph (4)(B), by adding at the end the following:

(A) by adding at the end the following:

(B) by adding at the end the following:

(C) by adding at the end the following:

SEC. 12. INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION.

(a) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 7(a)(16 U.S.C. 1536(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) in the second sentence, by striking "endangered species" and all that follows through "the Secretary and inserting "species determined to be endangered species and threatened species under section 4.3; or

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the first sentence by striking "action" the first place it appears and all that follows through "is not" and inserting "best scientific and commercial data available", and in inserting "best available scientific data"; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "and inserting "best scientific and commercial data available", and in inserting "best available scientific data"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: "In making the determinations required by this paragraph, the Secretary shall, prior to making any determination, consider whether the adverse impacts to individuals of a species are outweighed by any conservation benefits to the species as a whole."

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by striking "listed under section 4" and inserting "an endangered species or a threatened species"; and

(B) by inserting "under section 4 after "such species".

(b) OPINION OF SECRETARY.—Section 7(b)(16 U.S.C. 1536(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting "permit or license" before "before applicant"

(2) paragraph (2) by inserting "permit or license" before "applicant"

(3) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "Promptly after" and inserting "Before"; and

(B) by inserting "permit or license" before "applicant" and (iii) by inserting "proposed" before "written statement"; and

(B) by striking all after the first sentence and inserting the following: "The Secretary shall consider any comment from the Federal agency and the permit or license applicant, if any, prior to issuance of the final written statement of the Secretary. The Secretary shall issue the final written statement of the Secretary's opinion. The Secretary shall issue the final written statement of the Secretary's opinion by providing the written statement to the Federal agency and the permit or license applicant, if any, and, publishing notice of the written statement in the Federal Register. If jeopardy is found, the Secretary shall suggest the final written statement those reasonable and prudent alternatives, if any, that the Secretary believes would not violate subsection (a)(2) and can be taken by the Federal agency or any agency in implementing the agency action. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Federal agency and any permit or license applicant in the preparation of any suggested reasonable and prudent alternatives."; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: "in the final written statement those reasonable and prudent alternatives, if any, that the Secretary believes would not violate subsection (a)(2) and can be taken by the Federal agency or any agency in implementing the agency action. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Federal agency and any permit or license applicant in the preparation of any suggested reasonable and prudent alternatives."; and

(D) in paragraph (4)
(A) by redesigning subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(B) by inserting "and" after "(4)";

and

(C) "the Secretary shall provide" and all that follows through "with a written statement that"—and inserting the following: "the Secretary shall include in the written statement provided under paragraph (3), a statement described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph."

(B) A statement described in this subparagraph;

and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) Any terms and conditions set forth pursuant to paragraph (4)(B)(iv) shall be no more severe than needed to ensure the likelihood of the incidental taking identified pursuant to paragraph (4) in the written statement prepared under paragraph (3).

(B) If various terms and conditions are available to comply with paragraph (4)(B)(iv), the terms and conditions set forth pursuant to that paragraph—

(1) must be capable of successful implementation; and

(2) (ii) must be consistent with the objectives of the Federal agency and the permit or license applicant, if any, to the greatest extent possible.

(c) BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS.—Section 7(c)(16 U.S.C. 1383(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "which is listed" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting "that is determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species, or for which such a determination is proposed pursuant to section 4, may be present in the area of such proposed action;"

and

(2) the second sentence, by striking "best scientific and commercial data available" and inserting "best available scientific data available;"

(d) MODIFICATION OF AN ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMITTEE PROCESS.—Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is amended—

(1) by repealing subsection (j);

(2) by redesigning the remaining subsections accordingly; and

(3) in subsection (o), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking the first sentence, by striking "is authorized" and all that follows through "of this section" and inserting "may exempt an agency action from compliance with the requirements of subsections (a) through (d) of this section before the initiation of such agency action;" and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 13. EXCEPTIONS TO PROHIBITIONS.

(a) INCIDENTAL TAKE PERMITS.—Section 10(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1539(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and," after the semicolon at the end of clause (3), by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v), and by inserting at the end of clause (3), by striking paragraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) Any terms and conditions offered by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) to reduce or offset the impacts of incidental taking shall be no more severe than necessary to ensure the likelihood of the incidental taking identified pursuant to paragraph (4) in the written statement prepared under paragraph (3)."

(2) by redesigning subparagraph (A) of this paragraph on or after March 25, 1998, and before the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, other than permits for scientific purposes, shall contain the assurances contained in subparagraphs (B) through (D) of this paragraph and paragraph (5)(A) and (B).

(3) All permits issued under this subsection on or after March 25, 1998, and before the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, other than permits for scientific purposes, shall be governed by the applicable sections of parts 17.22(b), (c), and (d), and 17.32(b), (c), and (d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, as the same exist on the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Act of 2005.

(4) If the Secretary determines that a conservation plan under this subsection reasonably can be expected to achieve the goals specified under paragraph (2)(A)(iv), the Secretary shall, at the Secretary's expense, implement remedial conservation measures. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to allow the Secretary to require the holder of a permit to undertake any additional measures without the consent of the holder.

(b) The Secretary may, in the absence of consent of the holder, require any such additional minimization, mitigation, or other measure with respect to any species adequately covered by the permit during the term of the permit, except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C) to the extent such minimization, mitigation, or other measure is consistent with the requirements of section 10 of this title and the best available scientific data available for such changed circumstance.

(5)(A) The Secretary shall revoke a permit, or any portion of a permit, at the request of the permittee, if the Secretary determines that revocation to the permittee; and

(B) any permit subject to paragraph (4)(A) may be revoked due to changed circumstances only if—

(1) the Secretary determines that continuation of the activities to which the permit applies would be inconsistent with the criteria in paragraph (2)(B)(iv);

(2) the Secretary provides 60 days notice of revocation to the permittee; and

(iii) the Secretary is unable to, and the permittee chooses not to, remedy the condition causing such inconsistency.

(c) EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT ON APPLICATIONS.—Section 10(c) (16 U.S.C. 1539(c)) is amended in the section heading by striking "as if each place it appears and inserting "45". "

(d) EXPERIMENTAL POPULATIONS.—Section 10(j) (16 U.S.C. 1539(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "For purposes" and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: "For purposes of this subsection, the term 'experimental population' means a population (including any offspring arising therefrom) authorized by the Secretary for release under paragraph (2), but only when such population is in the area designated for it by the Secretary, and such area is, at the time of release, wholly separate geographically from areas occupied by nonexperimental populations of the same species. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to make a written determination as to whether a proposed use of the owner's property that is lawful under State and local law will require a permit under section 10(a), by submitting a written description of the proposed action to the Secretary by certified mail.

(2) A written description of a proposed use is deemed to be sufficiently described by the Secretary under paragraph (1) if the description includes—

(A) the nature, the specific location, the lawfulness under State and local law, and the anticipated schedule and duration of the proposed use, and a demonstration that the property owner has the means to undertake the proposed use;

(b) any anticipated adverse impact to a species that is included on a list published under 4(c)(1) that the requester reasonably believes will occur as a result of the proposed use.

(3) The Secretary may request and the requester may supply any other information that the Secretary determines necessary to make a determination under paragraph (1).
“(4) If the Secretary does not make a determination pursuant to a request under this subsection because of the omission from the request of any information described in paragraph (3), the requestor may submit a subsequent request under this subsection for the same proposed use.

(5)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary with respect to the appropriate Federal agency listings the requests to which the Secretary did not provide a requestor a timely response under paragraph (3) of this section or (B), the statute shall a model form of agreement that a person may provide to the Secretary in order to implement the goals of the program.

(6) At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the Congress containing the percentage and making available certified fisheries and wildlife biologists with expertise in the conservation of species.

(7) This subsection shall not apply with respect to agency actions that are subject to consultation under section 7.

(e) NATIONAL SECURITY EXEMPTION.—Section 10 (16 U.S.C. 1539) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) NATIONAL SECURITY.—The President, after consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, may exempt any act or omission from the provisions of this Act if the President finds that such exemption is necessary for national security.

SEC. 14. PRIVATE PROPERTY CONSERVATION.

Section 13 (consisting of amendments to other laws, which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

“PRIVATE PROPERTY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

‘‘SEC. 13. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program to improve the habitat and promote the conservation, on private lands, of endangered species, threatened species, and species that are candidates for being determined to be endangered species or threatened species.

(2) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with a private property owner that the Secretary shall, subject to appropriations, make annual or other payments to the person to implement the agreement.

(b) CONTENTS.—Any agreement the Secretary enters into under this section shall—

(A) specify a management plan that the private property owner shall commit to implement on the property of the private property owner, including—

(i) an identification of the species and habitat covered by the plan;

(ii) a description of the activities that the land to which the agreement applies is appropriate for the species and habitat covered by the agreement;

(iii) a description of the activities that the private property owner shall undertake to conserve the species and to create, restore, enhance, or protect habitat; and

(iv) a description of the existing or future economic activities on the land to which the agreement applies that are compatible with the goals of the program.

(B) specify the terms of the agreement, including—

(i) the terms of payment to be provided by the Secretary to the private property owner;

(ii) a description of any technical assistance the Secretary will provide to the private property owner to implement the management plan;

(iii) the terms and conditions under which the Secretary and the private property owner mutually agree that the agreement may be modified or terminated;

(iv) acts or omissions by the Secretary or the private property owner that shall be considered violations of the agreement and procedures under which notice and an opportunity to remedy any violation by the private property owner shall be given;

(v) other such duties of the Secretary and of the private property owner as are appropriate.

(4) COST SHARE.—The Secretary may provide—

up to 70 percent of the cost to implement the management plan under the terms of the agreement.

(5) PRIORITY.—In entering into agreements under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to those agreements—

(A) that apply to areas identified under section 6(a)(1)(A); and

(B) that reasonably can be expected to achieve the greatest benefit for the conservation of the species covered by the agreement relative to the total amount of funds to be expended to implement the agreement.

(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Any State agency, local government, nonprofit organization, or federal agency that may provide technical assistance to a private property owner in the preparation of a management plan, or participate in the implementation of a management plan, including identifying and making available certified fisheries and wildlife biologists with expertise in the conservation of species.

(7) TRANSFERS.—Upon any conveyance or other transfer of interest in land that is subject to an agreement under this section—

(A) the agreement shall continue in effect with respect to such land, with the same terms and conditions, if the person to whom the land or interest is conveyed or otherwise transferred notifies the Secretary of the person’s election to continue the agreement by not later than 30 days after the date of the conveyance or other transfer;

(B) the agreement shall terminate if the agreement does not continue in effect under subparagraph (A); and

(C) the person to whom the land or interest is conveyed or otherwise transferred may seek a new agreement under this section.

(8) MODEL FORM OF AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary shall establish a model form of agreement that a person may enter into with the Secretary under this section.

(9) VOLUNTARY PROGRAM.—

(A) AGREEMENTS MAY NOT BE REQUIRED.—The Secretary, or any other Federal official, may require a person to enter into an agreement under this section as a term or condition of any right, privilege, or benefit; or any action or refraction from any action, under any other law.

(B) REQUIREMENTS UNDER LAWS AND PERMITS.—None of the activities otherwise required by law or by the terms of any permit may be included in any agreement under this section.

(10) RELATIONSHIP TO HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANS.—The Secretary may consider an agreement that applies to an endangered species or threatened species in determining the adequacy of a conservation plan for the purpose of section 10(a)(2).

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SMALL LANDOWNERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to offer technical assistance to owners of private property seeking guidance on the conservation of endangered species or threatened species.

(2) ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.—Upon request, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to an owner of private property for the purpose of—

(A) helping to prepare and implement a conservation agreement under subsection (a); and

(B) training the managers of private property in best practices to conserve species and create, restore, enhance, and protect habitat for species.

(C) helping to prepare an application for a permit and a conservation plan under section 10(a); and

(D) any other purpose the Secretary determines is appropriate to meet the goals of the program under subsection (a).

(3) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in offers of technical assistance to owners of private property that the Secretary determines cannot reasonably be expected to afford adequate technical assistance.

(4) FUNDING FOR PROGRAM.—For any year for which funds are appropriated to carry out this Act, 10 percent shall be for carrying out this subsection, unless the Secretary determines that any fiscal year that a smaller percentage is sufficient and submits a report to the Congress containing the percentage and an explanation of the basis for the determination.

SEC. 15. PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 14 (relating to repeal of other laws, which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

“PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

‘‘SEC. 14. The Secretary shall make available on a publicly accessible website on the Internet—

(a) each list published under section 4(c)(1);

(b) all final and proposed regulations and determinations under sections 4; and

(c) the results of all 5-year reviews conducted under section 4(c)(2)(A).

(4) all draft and final recovery plans issued under section 5(a), and all final recovery plans issued under section 4(f) of this Act as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005;

(5) all reports required under sections 5(e) and 16, and all reports required under sections 4(f)(3) and 18 of this Act as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005;

(6) to the extent practicable, data contained in the reports referred to in paragraph (5) of this section, and that were produced after the date of enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, in the form of databases that may be searched by the variables included in the reports.

SEC. 16. ANNUAL COST ANALYSES.

Annual Cost Analyses.—Section 18 (16 U.S.C. 1554) is amended to read as follows:

“ANNUAL COST ANALYSES BY UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

‘‘SEC. 18. (a) IN GENERAL.—On or before January 15 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress an annual report covering the preceding fiscal year that contains
an accounting of all reasonably identifiable expenditures made primarily for the conservation of species included on lists published and in effect under section 4(c).

(b) SPECIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES.—Each report under this section shall specify—

(1) expenditures of Federal funds on a species-by-species basis, and expenditures by States that are not attributable to a specific species;

(2) expenditures by States for the fiscal year covered by the report on a species-by-species basis, and such expenditures that are not attributable to a specific species;

(3) based on data submitted pursuant to subsection (c), expenditures voluntarily reported by local governmental entities on a species-by-species basis, and such expenditures that are not attributable to a specific species;

(4) in subsection (c)(2), expenditures voluntarily reported by local governmental entities on a species-by-species basis, and such expenditures that are not attributable to a specific species;

Encouragement of Voluntary Submission of Data by Local Governments.

(c) ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION OF DATA BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide a means by which local governmental entities may—

(1) voluntarily submit electronic data regarding their expenditures for conservation of species pursuant to section 4(c); and

(2) attest to the accuracy of such data.

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF STATES FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 6(d) (16 U.S.C. 1536(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) in subsection (c)(2)(A), by striking ‘Secretary’ and inserting ‘Secretary as endangered’ and all that follows through ‘section 4’; and

(2) in subsection (b) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘fish or wildlife listed by the Secretary as endangered’ and inserting ‘fish or wildlife determined to be an endangered species or threatened species by the Secretary’; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ‘or a threatened species’ after ‘threatened species’ each place it appears; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘listed species’ and inserting ‘endangered species or threatened species’.

(e) PERMIT AND EXEMPTION POLICY.—Section 10(d) (16 U.S.C. 1539(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ‘or threatened species’ after ‘endangered species’; and

(2) by striking ‘of an endangered species and’.

(f) PRE-ACT PARTS AND SCRIBSHAW.—Section 10(f) (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ‘(f)’ the following:

“(g) BURDEN OF PROOF IN SEEKING EXEMPTION OR PERMIT.—Section 10(g) (16 U.S.C. 1539(g)) is amended by adding after ‘(g)’ the following: ‘BURDEN OF PROOF IN SEEKING EXEMPTION OR PERMIT.”;

(h) ANTIQUE ARTICLES.—Section 16(b)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “endangered species or threatened species listed and inserting ‘species determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species’.

I. PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 11 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amended in subsection (e)(3), in the second sentence, by striking ‘Such persons and inserting ‘Such a person.’

(j) SUBSTITUTION OF GENDER-NEUTRAL REFERENCES.—

(1) “SECRETARY FOR “HE”.—The following provisions are amended by striking “he” each place it appears and inserting “the Secretary”:

(A) Paragraph (4)(C) of section 4(b), as redesignated by section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

(B) Paragraph (5)(B)(1) of section 4(b), as redesignated by section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

(C) Section 4(b)(7) (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(7)), in the first sentence following subparagraph (B).

(D) Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1535).

(E) Section 8(d) (16 U.S.C. 1537(d)).

(F) Section 9(d) (16 U.S.C. 1539(d)).

(G) Section 10(b) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)).

(H) Section 10(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)(3)).

(I) Section 10(d) (16 U.S.C. 1539(d)).

(J) Section 16(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 1539(e)(4)).

(K) Sections 16(b)(5), and (8)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)(5), (8)(B)).

(L) Section 17(e)(5) (16 U.S.C. 1540(e)(5)).
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(2) “PRESIDENT” for “HE”.—Section 8(a) (16 U.S.C. 1537(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking “he” and inserting “the President.”

(3) “SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR” for “HE”.—Section 8(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1537(b)(3)) is amended by striking “he” and inserting “the Secretary of the Interior.”

(4) “PRESIDENT” for “HE”.—The following provisions are amended by striking “he” each place it appears and inserting “the person”:

(A) Section 10(3)(c) (16 U.S.C. 1539(f)(3)).

(B) Section 11(e)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1540(e)(3)).

(C) Section 5(k)(2), as redesignated by section 5(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended in the matter following subparagraph (B) by striking “him” and inserting “the Secretary”.

(D) Section 7(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(1)) is amended by striking “him” and inserting “the Secretary”.

(E) Section 8A(c)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1537a(c)(2)) is amended by striking “him” and inserting “the Secretary”.

(F) Section 9(d)(2)(A) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “him” each place it appears and inserting “such person”.

(G) Section 10(b)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1539(b)(1)) is amended by striking “him” and inserting “the Secretary”.

(5) References to “HIMSELF OR HERSELF”.—Section 11 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amended in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(3) by striking “himself or herself” each place it appears and inserting “the defendant”.

(B) Paragraph (6) of section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 1539) is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 4(b)(1) as section 4(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended in the matter following subparagraph (B) by striking “him” and inserting “the person”:

(ii) in section 4(b)(1) of this Act, amended by striking ‘‘him’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘the person’’; and

(iv) in subsection (e)(3) in the second sentence by striking ‘‘his’’ and inserting ‘‘the person’s’’; and

(v) in subsection (g)(1) by striking ‘‘his’’ and inserting ‘‘the person’s’’.

20. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 19.

(a) In GENERAL.—Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005, the Secretary of Interior, through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall establish a Science Advisory Board (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Board’’) to provide such scientific advice as may be requested by the Secretary to assist in the evaluation of the use of science in implementing this Act, including in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to the use of scientific information.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall each consist of 9 members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from a list of nominees recommended by the National Academy of Sciences, and shall ensure that the Board has a system of staggered 3-year terms of appointment. One member shall be elected by the members of the Board as its Chairman. Members of the Board shall meet separately with representatives of professional organizations of scientists to suggest qualifications in the areas of ecology, fish and wildlife management, plant ecology, or natural resource conservation. Members of the Board shall not be Federal employees or participation in the Federal Government. If a vacancy occurs on the Board due to expiration of a term, resignation, or any other reason, such member shall be replaced by the Secretary from a group of at least 4 nominees recommended by the National Academy of Sciences. The Secretary may extend the term of a Board member until the new member is appointed to fill the vacancy. If a vacancy occurs due to resignation, or reason other than expiration of a term, the Secretary shall appoint a member to serve during the unexpired term utilizing the nomination process set forth in this subsection. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the names, qualifications, and professional affiliations of each appointee.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Board shall receive per diem compensation at a rate not in excess of that fixed for GS-15 of the General Schedule as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) STAFF.—Upon the recommendation of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior shall make available employees as necessary to exercise and fulfill the Board’s responsibilities.

SEC. 21. CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 5 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 5. Recovery plans and land acquisition.”;

and

(2) by striking the items relating to sections 13 through 17 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 13. Private property conservation program.”;

“Sec. 14. Public accessibility and accountability.”;

“Sec. 15. Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.”; and

“Sec. 16. Alternative cost analysis by United States Fish and Wildlife Service.”.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California. (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the substitute being offered for a number of reasons.

The substitute basically takes the Pombo bill and cuts out everything that is important to my constituents, the small farmers and ranchers of the Central Valley who are being driven out of our valley through arbitrary and capricious regulatory burdens. It is my consistent view that the best way to help me and my constituents is to provide them with conservation mitigation measures that will provide species and producers while eliminating basic taxpayer protections that would open the federal purse to developers while eliminating basic taxpayer protections.

The substitute provisions would do exactly the same thing and bring us back to square one.

What I cannot support is the removal of 2 provisions that I find absolutely critical to any reforms to the ESA: mandatory landowner notification, and the conservation compensation plans for effective landowners.

The first issue, the landowner notification is just a no-brainer issue. Landowners deserve to know what they can and cannot do with their property and the service should be responsible for telling them.

Many of the opponents of this provision claim that landowners can simply go to court and get a decision but in reality, they cannot because the court has many unfounded cases that the service tells them no directly they have no standing in court. This provision is crucial, especially to the little guy who does not have millions and millions of dollars to higher lawyers, biologists and surveyors needed to take on the service.

Mr. Chairman, these little guys deserve an answer just like the big guys do. I understand that there is a provision in the substitute that attempts to address this issue with a similar 180 day timeline. Unfortunately, there is no enforcement behind the language other than a report to Congress, and we all know what we do with reports to Congress.

The service is under a number of other time lines under ESA such as a as a time line for completing political opinions which they also choose to ignore. The substitute provisions would do exactly the same thing and bring us back to square one. The second is the strong private property rights section that are good in H.R. 3824. They did not seem to make the cut in the substitute. It is not a sweeping entitlement program as the one under the old service bill, but it is a program that will fairly compensate landowners and will provide species with conservation mitigation measures that would otherwise go unprotected.

I do have to say that I am pleased that my colleagues chose to include the provisions from the underlying bill in the substitute. The fact that we included 2 provisions that would not accept was the new mandatory landowner notification, and the substitute provisions would do exactly the same thing and bring us back to square one.

Mr. Chairman, I have one final comment. I must correct the record. I would ask that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) place back up the slide that he had from the bill which outlines that under the Pombo bill, actually, it is here, under the Pombo bill you can only become compensated for what is an allowable use for what is the current State or local regulation, under the current zoning use.

So a farmer who is plowing his field and trying to grow a crop every day, if he is denied the use of that property, he can only be compensated for the loss of his farming income and he can not claim that it could be a high rise hotel in its place. He only gets compensated for what is allowable under the property, and that is simply an erroneous statement to say anything else.

Mr. Chairman, we need to defeat this substitute. We need to pass the underlying measure.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute. I want to thank all of our co-sponsors for their support, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DIXES), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

That is a pretty good sampling of Congressional centrists because there is a moderate, targeted solution. Our substitute truly reforms the Endangered Species Act without endangering any species or American taxpayer. And that is where it differs from H.R. 3824.

But before I describe the differences, I want to emphasize the similarities. Both the bill and the substitute eliminate the current requirements for setting aside critical habitat and rely instead on recovery plans to save endangered and threatened species. They are identical. Both the bill and the substitute offer new financial incentives and legal protections to landowners to save species. Both the bill and the substitute require greater involvement of States in decisionmaking involving species. Both the bill and the substitute ensure that the public will have greater information about and a greater role in the decisionmaking.

In fact, while it is hard to quantify, I would guess about 80 to 90 percent of the language in the substitute is identical to the base bill. That is because we developed the substitute by reading through the base bill, once we could seize a copy, and by incorporating into our substitute every word of H.R. 3824 that we possibly could.

What we could not accept was language weakening the Act by, for example, making recovery plans unenforceable, sit on a shelf, gather dust or making it too easy for the Federal Government to take actions that would harm species. And most of all what we could not accept was the new mandatory spending required by this bill which would open the federal purse to developers while eliminating basic taxpayer protections.

I laid out my specific concerns for that provision during the general debate. I urge support for the substitute and opposition to H.R. 3824 as presented.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute. It is bipartisan. It is supported by Members of Congress from every part of the country. It is not only a unique and valuable bipartisan piece of legislation, but it is one that will work.

Like the underlying bill, the substitute would repeal the current requirement that the Secretary designate critical habitat for endangered fish, wildlife and plants, before formulating a plan for species recovery. In order, however, to maintain a strong science based approach, the substitute would establish a strong definition of what is meant to jeopardize continued existence of the species.

Science is the core principle of ESA and we direct the Secretary to issue, and regularly revise, guidance on the acceptable scientific measures. The substitute also creates a Science Advisory Board to peer-review controversial decisions and offer other assistance when necessary.

The substitute is going to provide a helping hand to landowners; dedicated funding for technical assistance to private property owners; a conservation grants program for landowners who help conserve the species on or near scientific lead.
their property; assurances that private citizens can get timely answers from the Fish and Wildlife Service; and reporting requirements so that we know how many applications are really going unanswered, and most importantly, why.

The substitute directs the Federal Government to work with the States on a far broader and more cooperative manner than either current law or the Committee on Resources bill.

The substitute directs the Secretary to first determine whether public lands are sufficient to protect and save the species; if we could protect the species, and save the species in our public lands, in our national forests, our national BLM lands, and in our parks and wildlife refuges, we should do so without placing the burden on private landowners.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment represents a broad bipartisan and fiscally responsible effort to move this process forward in a manner that can not only get an overwhelming vote of support in the House, but which can move on to the President’s desk for signature in the same manner as the original Act.

I urge my colleagues to support the substitute, and I say that it will be not only a successful undertaking, but one which will be much more in the interests of the landowners and of the species that we are trying to protect and preserve.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT).

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman not only yielding me time but, more especially, I appreciate all the work that he has done in this. We heard over and over in the hearings that Democrats really appreciated the way in which the gentleman reached out and started from scratch and negotiated with them. Everything was honest, open, above board and that the gentleman’s example was one to be emulated by people that wanted bipartisanship.

Of course, we get to the floor and I am hearing some different things now. But nonetheless I also want to thank those Democrats who, with an open mind and with a regard for fairness, have assisted the chairman in trying to put together a good bill.

Now, it seems to me what this comes down to is a couple of differing philosophies here. On the one hand, you have what private property ownership rights are important and on the other says King George, before we had the revolution, did not have such a bad system. If you were a suck-up to the king, if you paid homage, kind of like a uncle, you were a better friend of the government, then the government was going to treat you good. Never mind your private property rights. We will tell you what you can be compensated for and how and when.

Now, under the substitute amendment, it is pretty clear you do not get an honest answer from the government. Do my private property rights violate or infringe upon some endangered species? Will it amount to an inappropriate use?

Well, maybe it will and maybe it will not. Will you tell me an answer, but you will have to buy a permit and then under the bill, the chairman has come up with you get a straight answer and you get it quickly. And if you do not get it within 180 days, then you have got your answer as a matter of law.

Under this substitute, all property owners can find out is if they need to have a habitat conservation plan and if they do, well, gee, the government will help you fill out the application in begging to see what you can do with your own property. We give you a straight answer yes or no under the original bill, and that is how it should be.

The substitute amendment is going to stick the private property owners with the fees. And, boy, I tell you what, when I hear this word “entitlement” as if it is going to somebody that is not entitled to something, I tell you, entitlement has a different connotation here. Here under the original bill it is not an entitlement the way most people see it. If you own property and it is taken away from you, you cannot use it the way you want to because some Federal entity says you cannot, under our system of law, the way our Constitution is written, you ought to be compensated for it. That is America.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), a valued member from the Committee on Resources.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I think we are here in some sense, past all the clutter of people articulating their most honest feelings, is a bill set aside some 30 years ago to have an understanding about how we as Members of Congress, the government, can restore the prodigious bounty of God’s creation. How do we understand nature’s design? How do we use our intelligence to understand the facts behind how nature sustains itself?

Well, in the real world, well, actually, in the real world which is nature, but in the reality of the human condition, we have to be a little things that we have to take into consideration. How do you afford an Endangered Species Act? What do you do about private property rights? Do you get enough science? Is the recovery plan appropriate? Do you deal with farmers that have a problem with reintroduced species on the property eating their sheep or their cows?

All these things have to be taken into consideration so that we create a policy that protects private property rights, that brings individuals on those farms and that landscape into the process and helps pay for their contribution to the process, that brings Federal agencies in so they can view the landscape, not from just one small little fly or tiger beetle or some other particular species, but upon which the landscape that supports that species, supports clean water, supports clean air, supports the whole ecosystem including human beings, including us as a species.

We are not separate from clean water. We are not separate from clean air. We are part of nature’s design. We are part of this bounty of God’s creation. So how do we clarify all these different perspectives and views based on different things that happen in our districts?

Well, we come up with the best available science. We come up with the best available recovery plan. We come up with the funds that are appropriate to deal with all these issues.

I would tell my colleagues that I feel strongly this is the best policy change, the best reauthorization plan that we can use to deal with the Endangered Species Act that will deal with nature’s design and man’s impact on nature’s design, which includes private property rights, which includes reburments for helping to preserve endangered species, and by the way, in this substitute is a provision to pay those private property individuals.

I urge an “aye” vote on the substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for yielding me the time, and I join him in offering this substitute, because the bill we are considering today, H.R. 3824, will make it less likely that threatened and endangered species will recover; but that we can support this bipartisan substitute which will update and improve the Endangered Species Act.

I reject the notion, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot preserve both our natural environment for future generations while supporting strong economic growth.

Our substitute gives private property owners the opportunity to protect species on our own land while ensuring that they do not face additional regulatory burden. Importantly, this substitute actually discourages the use of private land for public purposes. The substitute says if we can protect a species on public land, we should.

In some cases, private property owners will be asked to mitigate for the effects of preserving threatened and endangered species. However, we can and should provide incentives for private property owners who are complying with the law, and the substitute does just that.

The substitute strikes a careful balance between the rights of private
property owners and the preservation of our natural resources.

I encourage my colleagues to join me and a bipartisan group of Members in supporting this reasonable, better substitute and opposing H.R. 3824.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in the 32 years that the Endangered Species Act has been in effect, we have learned a lot of lessons over time and seen the areas where it needs some improvement.

I believe that the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) and other members of the House Committee on Resources have worked very hard to come up with a piece of legislation that protects property owners' rights and improves the way that we protect and rehabilitate endangered species, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important aspects of H.R. 3824 deals with private property owners' participation in species recovery. I believe in America it is a fundamental right to be able to own property and to be able to enjoy that property.

I visited a country back during the spring that no citizen in that country could own property or they could lease it for 25 years or 99 years; and, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe America wants to return to that fundamental time where we could not own property, we could just live on property owned by somebody else.

I believe taking property that allows somebody an option not to be able to use their property how they intended, property they used their hard-earned money to purchase is fundamentally wrong.

Specifically, H.R. 3824 will provide certain federal property owners by allowing landowners to request a written determination as to whether their land use activities will violate the take prohibitions of section 9.

It will also compensate private property owners for the fair market value for foregone use of their property where the Secretary has determined that the use of that property would constitute a take under section 9.

I believe we should protect our endangered species not at the expense of our private landowners.

Mr. Chairman, there is a better way to protect endangered species; and I believe it is H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Miller substitute amendment and "yes" on the final passage of H.R. 3824.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), an informed and valued member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the Endangered Species Act is one of our most far sighted and important conservation laws. For more than thirty-two years, the Endangered Species Act has sounded the alarm and saved wildlife that we humans have driven toward extinction. Today, we have wolves in Yellowstone, manatees in Florida, and sea otters in California, largely because of the act.

In the state of New Jersey, we have bald eagles, timber rattlesnakes, and barred owls because of the protections provided by the Endangered Species Act; and by protecting their habitat, we have protected our own habitat.

I am concerned that the provisions contained in H.R. 3824 would profoundly alter the act and the process. It contains costly, highly problematic, vague new procedures and ill-conceived tradeoffs that diminish our ability to conserve fish and wildlife for future generations.

Consequently, I join with my colleagues to offer the responsible, bipartisan Miller-Boehlert substitute that addresses concerns of landowners, States, and sportmen while improving the ability to achieve timely recovery of threatened and endangered fish, wildlife, and plants.

Our amendment provides a creative, workable solution that promises better results for recovering endangered species and reducing burdens on landowners.

The most important tool needed to halt the decline and recover threatened and endangered species is effective habitat protection. H.R. 3824 fails to protect habitat. The bipartisan amendment has strong provisions to do that.

By contrast, our substitute provides a better way of protecting habitat necessary for recovery, with a true focus on recovering species.

There is broad consensus in Congress to reform the Endangered Species Act, Mr. Chairman; but it is vital that in doing so we maintain the integrity of the act and our ability to conserve these species for future generations. The Miller-Boehlert amendment will do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support the substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the substitute would be a great improvement for the current Endangered Species Act. It would treat landowners much as we do under the Conservation Reserve Program; but the underlying bill would be a disaster for taxpayers, a new entitlement.

The Secretary shall pay no less than fair market value. I guess the Secretary, if they are feeling good that day, could make a fair market value with taxpayers' money, borrowed money; and it does not require the historic, usual, or custom use.

Take a piece of remote farm land, propose a huge development on it; it does not have to be proven to be economically viable. You proposed it; you were going to build 5,000 houses; you were going to make $1,000, $2,000, $5,000 on each house. You could not be compensated for that. You do not have to prove that this is economically viable, and sequential owners would get that right. You then sell it to your next door neighbor; they can make the same claim. They sell it to the guy down the street, they can make the same claim, on and on and on.

What an incredible new, speculative market, helping the housing bubble, I guess; but this is going to kill the taxpayers and the Federal Treasury. You should vote for the substitute. It will improve the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I very much wanted to support the substitute amendment that we are debating this afternoon.

I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). Both he and I have argued the opportunity to spend some time together in the wonderful Sierra Nevada mountains, and I know how much respect and pride he has for America's natural resources. I share it as well.

But there are three areas as it relates to the proposed substitute amendment that I find to be very problematic and important to the constituents that I represent that have had difficulty with this act over the years.

First of all, the definition as it relates to property rights I think is lacking and needs to be worked on in an important way.

Second, as it relates to the discussion of jeopardy to species, it is so vague. How would be applied to section 7 and other aspects of the measure, I do not believe it is clear and could indicate further need for litigation, which is the current problem and part that we are trying to solve. I just do not believe that the jeopardy definitions under the current proposed substitute amendment could work as they currently are drafted.

Finally, this is very important and I mentioned it in my comments in supporting the bill: there are no clear definitions as it relates to takings for farmers and ranchers, not just in California but throughout the country. Farmers and ranchers, I would maintain, are, in many cases, one of the last bastions of protection for habitat. I mean, think about it. They really want to farm, and they want to be able to maintain their ranches. When we have growth areas throughout the country, like in California, those farms and ranches are going to be the last hedges against urban sprawl and uncontrolled growth. Therefore, having no clear definitions for takings, I think, is critical.
Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. The time is insufficient, not only to explain my position, but also the time for consideration of this bill has been insufficient.

Thirty-two years ago, we passed a bill that a Republican President, Richard Nixon, signed to protect and conserve species in danger of extinction. Unfortunately, though, the underlying bill, which has been fast-tracked since its introduction, would substantially undermine the Endangered Species Act. That is what this is about.

For example, this bill would undermine the ability of the responsible Federal agencies to ably perform their oversight roles, and it fails to recognize the importance of sound science to species recovery and restoration.

The bill also creates a fiscally irresponsible, open-ended entitlement program that effectively pays landowners to comply with the law.

In contrast, the bipartisan substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has a far more reasoned approach.

It ensures consultation between the Secretary and other Federal agencies with proposed actions that may jeopardize species. It strengthens the definition of what constitutes jeopardy and requires the Secretary to ensure that proposed recovery plans identify and include areas necessary for species survival.

The substitute also creates conservation programs that provide technical and financial assistance to landowners committed to efforts that protect species. Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to protect our environment—as well as the diverse forms of life that share it.

The bipartisan substitute will help us achieve the goal. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the substitute and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I might also note, as a representative of one of the districts that has vast listings for threatened and endangered species. California has more than twice the species listed as any other State.

Today, there are 1,268 species listed as endangered or threatened in the United States, including 26 in the State of Maryland.

This law is not perfect, but it has been very successful. Roughly 40 percent of listed species have witnessed the stabilization or growth of their populations. And, as the next percent have been declared extinct since the law’s enactment.

The fact is, this law has enabled the very survival of some of our most vulnerable species—including the bald eagle, the gray wolf, the California condor, and the whooping crane.

Unfortunately, though, the underlying bill—which has been fast-tracked since its introduction last week—would substantially undermine the Endangered Species Act.

For example, this bill would undermine the ability of the responsible Federal agencies—the Departments of Commerce and Interior—to ably perform their oversight roles, and it fails to recognize the importance of sound science to species recovery and restoration.

The bill also creates a fiscally irresponsible, open-ended entitlement program that effectively pays landowners to comply with the law. In contrast, the bipartisan substitute offers a far more reasoned approach.

It ensures consultation between the Secretary and other Federal agencies with proposed actions that may jeopardize species. It strengthens the definition of what constitutes jeopardy and requires the Secretary to ensure that proposed recovery plans identify and include areas necessary for species survival.

The substitute also creates conservation programs that provide technical and financial assistance to landowners committed to efforts that protect species. Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to protect our environment—as well as the diverse forms of life that share it.

The bipartisan substitute will help us achieve the goal. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the substitute and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his tremendous work on this legislation.

I applaud my colleagues here today for offering this amendment in the nature of a substitute. It goes a long way in making meaningful reforms to the Endangered Species Act without hollowing the fundamental goals of America’s flagship wildlife conservation efforts. While there have been successes in species recovery since enactment of the 32-year-old Endangered Species Act, most would agree that it is in need of real reform to make it more effective in species recovery, less demanding on some landowners, and less prone to lawsuits and bureaucracy.

However, pushing the problematic and prohibitively expensive H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act through the legislative process has left a sour taste in many of our mouths because it removes the enforceable protections for species recovery and creates the entitlement program for private landowners.

At a time when our country is still coping with the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and most recently with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, one has to wonder why a rewrite of the Endangered Species Act that includes an entitlement program is even a consideration. This substitute will improve the recovery of more species, put back into place needed enforcement of species recovery plans, and it will do all of this and much more without creating an entitlement program.

This bipartisan substitute is a more pragmatic solution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). (Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the underlying amendment, because in the middle of the night, the manager’s amendment removed the NOAA fisheries provision in the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3824, the Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act, as it is currently drafted.

Mr. Chairman, once again California leads the Nation: This time it is for the number of listings for threatened and endangered species. California has more than twice the species listed as any other State.

My home on the Central Coast in the 17th district has more habitat where both endangered plants and animals have lived with commercial farming and ranching. The same climate that produces over three billion dollars annually in agriculture farm gate also is home to the tar plant in Santa Cruz and the California condor in Big Sur.

Another example is the Big Sur area of California where you can find redwoods from the Northern Cascades to the central Sierras to the coastal ranges. The bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) recognizes that California is home to one of the last remaining wild redwood forests on the West Coast.

Today, I want to take a moment to stand in support of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) who is an avid supporter of our environment and, I believe, the environment of this country.
northern California growing next to the yucca of southern California.

I recognize the need for some “tune-ups” in the ESA, unfortunately. H.R. 3824 takes a meat axle approach when what we need is a scalpel.

The Endangered Species Act is one of America’s most important and successful environmental laws. As one of the pillars of environmental law, it has brought public attention to the impact of human activities on our Nation’s wildlife that contributes so much beauty and delight to life as well as growing economic development in environmental tourism.

But it also goes beyond that to declare the preservation of such species as the American bald eagle and the California condor, that glide on the thermals along the Big Sur coastline, a national priority.

While opponents of the law complain that it has restored healthy populations of only 16 of the more than 1,800 species on its endangered list, dozens of other species have dramatically increased their populations because of the law’s protection.

With the ESA these species could easily have succumbed to extinction as corporations and developers decided the fate of their habitats.

That’s no small accomplishment. What’s more, only nine endangered plants and animals have been lost. We cannot forget that robust biodiversity is absolutely necessary to a healthy environment.

Ninety-eight percent of the species protected under the Endangered Species Act are still alive today, and many are showing improvements in populations, especially with the Endangered Species Act, wildlife such as the bald eagle, American alligator, California condor, Florida panther and many other animals that are part of America’s natural heritage could have disappeared from the planet years ago. The Endangered Species Act works because it safeguards the places where endangered animals and plants live.

With the recent discovery of the once thought to be extinct ivory-billed woodpecker in Arkansas and the Mount Diablo Buckwheat in California, this is an opportune moment to highlight the success of many of our conservation efforts. For example, in my home State of California, I am especially proud of the conservation and management efforts that have helped significantly restore populations of California condor, the Southern sea otter, the winter run Chinook salmon, the Least Bell’s Vireo songbird, the California Brown Pelican, and the California gray whale.

Mr. Chairman, it is fitting that Congress is more interested in private property development than in the common good of America the beautiful, from sea to shining sea.

The action this House takes today is a step in the long process to reauthorizing the Endangered Species Act. I urge my colleagues not to take the meat axe approach but to support the bipartisan Miller/Boehlert substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).
The current estimated cost of construction for the completed project is $738 million with the federal share being $528 million and the local share $210 million. Federal allocations for the project amounting to $129.6 million were issued by the Corps on May 2005 to complete the project. Over the last 10 federal years (1996-2005), federal appropriations have totaled about $129.6 million and Corps re-programming actions resulted in another $13 million being made available to the project. During that time, appropriations have generally declined from about $15-20 million annually in the earlier years to about $5 million in the last three fiscal years. While this may not be unusual given the state of completion of the project, the Corps’ project fact sheet from May 2005 noted that the President’s budget request for fiscal years 2005 and 2006, and the appropriated amount for fiscal year 2005 were insufficient to fund new programming actions resulted in another $13 million being made available to the project. Given the budget constraints, the Corps also had settled and needed to be raised to fiscal year 2006 on the project if the funds were stated that it could spend $20 million in fiscal year 2005 were insufficient to fund new programming actions resulted in another $13 million being made available to the project.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to stand here and speak about this particular substitute. As it was brought to the Committee on Rules last night, I noticed that it has been consistently called the bipartisan substitute. It does have eight cosponsors that are bipartisan. But I would note that the actual bill itself has 95 co-sponsors and it has four times as many Democrats on the bill itself as the so-called "bipartisan substitute." So I would like to speak a bit about the bipartisan bill that is actually before us as well.

I have one of my good constituents, Mr. Child, who bought 500 acres of land and found an endangered species on it. The problem is that the snail was on it. The problem is he also had 11 geese, and the Federal Government threatened to sue him at the rate of $50,000 for every snail the geese happened to consume. This meant that the Federal Government went in there and captured all 11 geese, forced them to vomit to find out how many snails were actually consumed by the geese.

This gives us some idea why a small private property owner, as soon as he finds an endangered species, the goal is to get rid of the endangered species. And the problem is not the big guys. The problem is that 90 percent of the habitat for endangered species is on private property. Our goal, if we are really serious about trying to preserve endangered species of all kinds, is to get control and cooperation with small private property owners.

The main bill does that by providing a grant program for the cooperation, whereas the substitute eliminates that provision. The idea is to back up the old process of trying to threaten and intimidate, which does not work. That is why the recovery rate is so abysmally low with the Endangered Species Act. In fact, it moves us somewhat backwards by weakening scientific standards and creating potential for more litigation. We have agencies like the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which by the way is bankrupt by rampant litigation. This means they have little money and little funds left for actual recovery of species. What we need to do is to make sure that we are engaging in the process so that they assist and work in cooperation with the Federal Government. You cannot do that by supporting both the substitute and the main bill.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), a member of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to stand in opposition to the substitute and in strong support of the underlying bipartisan substitute. We are not able to stay for the vote because there are fires in my district and my neighborhood is being evacuated.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership as well. He has been a champion as well in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation which critically undermines protections for our Nation’s endangered species. I support the bipartisan substitute that the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is putting forth with the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), and commend them for this good proposal because it provides common sense proposals to strengthen the Endangered Species Act, and yet give a common sense enforcement to it.

I rise as House Democratic leader, of course, in support of the substitute, but also I rise as a mother and as a grandmother; mother of five and grandmother of five. My husband always says I just like to know how long into the future our children and grandchildren will be able to speak about your grandchildren. But we teach our grandchildren, and I did teach my children when they were little, that everything in nature is connected and that there is a reason, a balance to it all. This beautiful web of life that is nature. Today’s bill of course in this debate points out what value we place on that.

With the passage of the first Endangered Species law in 1966 and the modern Endangered Species Act in 1973, Congress made a commitment to future generations of Americans, at that time that would be our children, my grandchildren. We made a commitment to maintain the web of life and preserve the myriad species that form an essential part of our natural heritage. We must keep that commitment for the sake of our children and our grandchildren.

The Endangered Species Act is a safety net for wildlife, fish and plants that are on the brink of extinction. When other environmental laws have not provided enough protection, the Endangered Species Act is there to give endangered species one last chance to survive. Of the 1,800 species protected by the law, only nine species have been declared extinct. An impressive achievement.

Earlier in the debate, I heard the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) speaking, and I see he is still in the Chamber, and I thank him for his very enlightening presentation about the Endangered Species Act. In fact, it moves us some-
locking in a static definition of specific acceptable scientific data. It repeals all protections from pesticides, it drops the requirement for other Federal agencies to consult with wildlife experts at the Fish and Wildlife Service or the fishery experts at the National Marine Fisheries Service. It establishes an extraordinarily new entitlement program for developers and speculators that requires taxpayers to pay them unlimited amounts of money, and the list goes on and on.

Reasonable people agree that there are ways to improve the Endangered Species Act. Many people who care very, very much about the environment, about the balance of nature, about the web of life have concerns about the enforcement. I think that is why it is important for Congress to be very clear what our intent is, so that intention of Congress and that clarity of our voices here will give guidance to those who enforce the law so that is the law and the execution of it is not in a way that is so risk aversive as to be counterproductive.

We can do better than the current law, but it is hard to do worse than the legislation being proposed by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO). That is why my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), joined by a group of Members and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), taking the lead on the Republican side, have developed a substitute that gives landowners assistance and incentives to protect endangered species, strengthens the science behind the Endangered Species Act, and requires improved coordination with the States.

I urge my colleagues to strengthen the Endangered Species Act by voting for a bipartisan substitute and opposing the underlying bill, and in doing so, to truly, as Members of Congress, show our children that we mean it when we say that we all know that everything in nature is connected and it is important to maintain the balance, the web of life.

In Isaiah in the Old Testament, we are told that to minister to the needs of God’s creation, and that includes our beautiful environment, is an act of worship. To ignore those needs is to dishonor the God who made us. Let us minister to the needs of God’s creation. Let us support the substitute and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller-Boehlert substitute amendment because I believe we will not have a world to live in if we continue our neglectful ways.

The Endangered Species Act has been a guiding force for the preservation of species threatened with extinction for over 30 years. It is vitally important that we not alter it in any way that could result in the protection it provides from being compromised.

The Endangered Species Act is working. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 99 percent of the species ever listed under the ESA have been removed, and 76 percent of the species that are listed are stable or improving; but the recovery plans in place may need 50 years to restore these to relative abundance.

The amendment would prevent the creation of a mandatory entitlement program for private property owners which is likely to be hugely expensive. The substitute also restores the role of science in the Endangered Species Act. The underlying bill appears to give the opinions of individuals without any scientific expertise equal standing with those of scientists and repeals protections against hazardous pesticides.

I oppose H.R. 3924 and any efforts to weaken the Endangered Species Act. I support the Miller-Boehlert substitute. Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO). I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and in support of the underlying bill. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) on many, many years of hard work on this issue.

I have to say, I am astonished to be here. By my count, the number of Democrats who voted for the underlying bill in committee was greater than the number of Democrats who voted against it. The minority leader just told us that reasonable people can agree that the Endangered Species Act can be improved. I think that is the fundamental starting place, and it is nice to be debating the substitute, because we are talking about a fundamentally defective process.

On the other hand, the underlying bill is a good bill. The substitute has some great defects. In the first place, it raises the regulatory bar. It makes it more difficult. In the second place, the substitute does nothing to provide straightforward answers to property owners. In other words, the fundamental problems, which have caused such division in America, are not dealt with in the substitute bill. They do not provide compensation to a landowner.

If you are a landowner and the town or the State or country builds a highway, the land gets condemned and you get paid for the land. We need to have some kind of a compensatory process, and we do not have that in the substitute bill.

The substitute bill replaces the dysfunctional critical habitat concept with something far worse. They talk about lands necessary for recovery. What that is, I do not know that we can figure out, we have done a lot of litigation and have been through a great deal of pain in America.

The substitute removes the incentives and creates a voluntary program. And a landowner, after he volunteers, could get 70 percent of his costs back for participating in the program. It does not give him any grants or any contractual rights. It does not pay him for the cost. I urge support of the underlying bill and opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment. It will significantly improve the species recovery which is an important part of our negotiating process that led us up to this bill on the floor today.

It will assist landowners in their efforts to conserve species. The substitute will also include a statutory definition of jeopardy that will ensure that Federal agency actions do not diminish recovery. That is a very important part of giving up the critical habitat designation, that we have an improved consultation and an improved definition of what constitutes jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge strong support of this bipartisan substitute and, again, opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully disagree with the minority leader that this bill is not Republicans versus Democrats. This is largely east versus west with western Democrats supporting the underlying bill and eastern Republicans opposing.

For me, I would quote from the House Republican majority Committee on the Budget that warned that the underlying legislation “creates a new entitlement program.

This spring, moderates of the Republican Tuesday Group and conservatives of the Republican Study Committee worked together to put forward budget reforms to end deficits. The heart of our reform was a prohibition against new entitlement spending. Entitlement spending already makes up two-thirds of all Federal spending. Our deficit, because of Hurricane Katrina and related costs, will top a trillion this year; and I do not believe that we can afford a new entitlement program.

I would urge our chairman to reform the provisions in the bill to keep the spending within the budget, and make it subject to appropriations. The grant portion of this bill that compensates landowners is responsible. The mandated spending portion of the bill is not responsible.

CBO warns that in their score of this bill both costs and litigation will go up under the bill. Following CBO’s fiscal advice, I would urge adoption of the more fiscally responsible substitute.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).
Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute and in favor of the underlying bill.

An amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANO-VICH) in committee, which was accepted without objection, will allow local officials to perform vital work needed to prevent the potential threat of catastrophic flooding. I rise in opposition because this needed amendment is stripped out of the substitute.

We must recognize that the Federal bureaucracy can be, but in times of emergency nothing is more important than human health and safety. My disaster declaration and protection provision in this bill must be made quickly.

When critical levee repairs are needed to protect human life, time is of the essence. Appropriate action to repair levees must be done quickly and cannot be delayed by cumbersome paperwork. This amendment that we offered frees the Federal Government from the red tape that must be made flexible enough to allow timely repair and maintenance of levees before disaster strikes. Any efforts to improve ESA must include this provision which recognizes protecting the public from impending danger must take priority.

The amendment that I offered recognizes that when critical repair, reconstruction, or improvements to levee systems are needed, the Federal Government should not be an impediment to targeted, urgent public safety work that must happen.

The amendment that we offered frees local agencies from lengthy processes only for those projects where critical repairs are needed to avoid the loss of human life due to natural disaster. Current agency regulations only allow for an expedited consultation in a Presidentially declared disaster area for levees and dykes. The only way that levees and dykes can be strengthened is when the levee has been designated as posing a potential threat to human life. For that reason, I stand opposed to the substitute.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, reforming the Endangered Species Act is about to become a reality. This amendment offers an opportunity to enact significant improvements to ESA that restore balance and protections to species as well as landowners.

One of the most effective ways to protect species habitat is through development of habitat conservation plans. The bill improves and encourages habitat conservation plans by codifying the no-surprise policy and eliminating unnecessary red tape that required multiple consultations regarding already approved actions.

These important provisions will free up limited government and landowner resources and ultimately improve conservation efforts by encouraging more habitat conservation plans.

My district in California is home to a large comprehensive habitat conservation plan both in Riverside and Orange counties. In fact, the West Riverside County Multi-Species Conservation Plan is the largest in the Nation covering over 1 million acres of land. The plan cost tens of millions of dollars to develop, years to put into effect, and still has to pay for its own implementation. Once fully implemented, 500,000 acres in western Riverside County will be set aside for species habitat.

It is our responsibility to ensure landowners and local authorities undertake an extensive planning like that back in my district, the Federal Government lives up to its part of the agreement. This bill does just that and removes unnecessary regulatory burdens that do nothing to benefit the species.

I just discovered in the Miller-Boehlert substitute that the habitat conservation plans that we put a lot of time in to work out in Southern California may be put at risk. That would be very bad news for people who spent large amounts of money to put this into effect, not to mention time. I want to make sure that we defeat the substitute, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) for working with me to include this provision that improves habitat conservation plans.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for the purpose of an unanimous consent request.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boehlert-Miller substitute and against the underlying bill.

A major factor forcing threatened and endangered species towards extinction is the loss and deterioration of habitat necessary for survival. We cannot expect a species to recover without first ensuring that it has the habitat in which to do so.

The Majority has just presented us with this manager's amendment to the underlying bill that would delete not only the protections and enforceability afforded under the designation of critical habitat but also the broader habitat protection provided by the jeopardy definition.

We have arrived at a situation where the underlying bill will offer no enforceable protection for the habitat that endangered species need to survive, but will only create a blizzard of unenforceable bureaucratic paperwork which, in the words of Shakespeare, would be "full of sound and fury but signifying nothing."
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Our plan says 2 years. So if they want to recover species, we say get it done in 2 years with the recovery plan; they say 3.

If my colleagues want to talk about spending, they create a new science board for $20 million a year. CBO says we will compensate private property owners to the tune of maybe $6 million in the first 5 years. That is all they score out. This, $1 million a year for bureaucrats, and private property owners are left carrying their own costs. That is not fair and right in America.

So if the Members want bigger bureaucracy, pay GS15s here in Washington, a total of $1 million combined over the year, and they get just as much as we are talking about trying to help out the private property owners.

And if they ask the government for some sort of safe harbor for entering into a habitat conservation program, basically they get back a written determination under our provision that prevents them from being prosecuted, from the government’s coming back and double-timing them, saying, yes, go ahead and we will not prosecute if you do everything you said you were going to do. Under the alternative, as I read it, whatever they do, they would have to get an incidental take permit and then they still do not have any kind of protection from the government’s coming back again after them.

So what we are trying to do is create cooperative partnerships with private landowners through new conservation programs and give certainty over 10-, 20-, and 30-year periods to recover species and set up recovery programs that would come together in 2 years, not 3, and provide for compensation when somebody loses their farm or a portion thereof just as if a highway ran through it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), co-author of the underlying bill.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point to make a clarification and to, again, speak to my opposition to the substitute.

The first clarification is that when the Fish and Wildlife Service compensates an owner for a restriction on his property, it is done through a deed restriction or a fee title. So this claim that landowners can make the same claims against the Fish and Wildlife Service is simply inaccurate. When they buy an easement, they buy a perpetual easement unless the Secretary were to make a mistake, and, simply, that is just not the way we do it in law currently.

The second point, and the main objection that I have to the substitute goes to the fundamental fifth amendment protection under the Constitution that says that when we take someone’s property, we compensate them for it. And that is what the Pombo bill does, and that is what the substitute does not do.

I would ask my colleagues to cast an “aye” vote on the underlying bill and oppose the substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair advises Members that the gentleman from California (Mr. GOODE) is withdrawing, remaining, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) has 4 minutes remaining.

The Chair would further advise that the order of closing is the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

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

This all boils down to a principal difference. There are a number of differences, but a principal difference. The substitute does not have the controversial section 13 in it; the base bill does.

Here is something that could actually happen under section 13. A developer could buy a parcel of land knowing that part of it could not be used because of the presence of endangered species. The developer then could request permission to build, say, a hotel on the property without doing much more than outlining the proposal on the back of an envelope. The developer would not even have to try to get necessary State permits or local zoning variances before submitting a claim.

When the Federal Government says that the hotel could not be built, that developer could get a payment from the government based upon what his appraiser said it was worth without providing much evidence that the project was realistic or serious. Then the developer could propose to build a landfill on the same site and go through the same process again and get money from the government again. Then the developer could propose to build a store on the same site and get money from the government again because the store could not be built.

In the meantime, the developer could proceed with the same project on other portions of the property, make substantial profits on his property, and never have that affect the steady stream of payments coming from the government. It is always known to be a problematic site.

This is no exaggeration, and it shows how right the provision is for abuse. The bill puts the taxpayers at risk. That is why the same concerns that we have expressed to our colleagues on the floor today have been expressed by the administration in the Statement of Administration Policy, which is otherwise supportive of the bill, in part because of the provisions that we also have in our substitute. The Statement of Administration Policy says that the new conservation aid program for private property owners provides little discretion to Federal agencies and could result in a significant budgetary impact. . . . The bill would affect direct spending. To sustain the economy’s expansion, it is critical to exercise responsible restraint over Federal spending.” We want to help exercise responsible restraint by eliminating section 13.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it. The Endangered Species Act has to be revisited. That is the responsible thing to do. The Committee on Resources has put a lot of hard work into and has come up with a product that, in many respects, is just wonderful, necessary. That is why we embrace the product. But section 13 is absolutely, totally unacceptable for a whole lot of very good reasons, and it is unacceptable to the taxpayers of America because, boy, does this impose a burden on them.

I urge support for the substitute. It is responsible. It is bipartisan. It is thoughtful. It eliminates section 13. It provides more appropriate, good science. It emphasizes the need of small property owners, and we want to help them.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for the co-sponsorship of this legislation, and all the rest of the co-sponsors for their support of this amendment. I want to thank all of my colleagues who joined in this debate today, and I think that it is important that we adopt this amendment.

Earlier the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) got up on the floor, and he was upset that somebody had said that the underlying bill would eviscerate the Endangered Species Act. Yesterday, that statement would have been true. He had a right to be upset. But today when the manager’s amendment was offered and was accepted, the Endangered Species Act was eviscerated and let go yesterday. Because the bill, prior to that amendment, contained this language: The term to jeopardize the continued existence means, with respect to any agency action, that action reasonably that would be expected to significantly im-pede directly or indirectly the conservation long-term of the species in the wild. That language was struck in the manager’s amendment when you struck on page 4, strike lines 3 through 11, and redesignate.

The point is this, there is now no statutory protection in law if this bill is passed for the protection of this species because there is no standard of jeopardy. That was not true last night, but it is not true today. It is true this afternoon. You can shake your head until the cows come home. The fact of the matter is, that is what took place in this amendment. So the evisceration is now complete because there is no standard in the bill for jeopardy.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is important that we accept this amendment,
this bipartisan substitute, because this is our last best chance to hold on to what this Nation holds dear, and that is the protection and the diversity of the species that inhabit this Nation, and the effort that we have made as a Nation to make sure that our actions and the actions of others, do not destroy and bring to extinction these species.

Those protections that we have provided since the inception of this act when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. OBEY) and others were here to support it, those protections have served this Nation well. We have a chance today to have a commonsense reform of that effort. Yes, this act should be changed; it is 30 years old, and we are about to do that with this substitute, because we provide the balance for the protection of these species and the protection of the landowners. What we do not do is what they do in the underlying bill; that, if a landowner has a proposal and a notion of how he might want to use his or her land, the Secretary then has to make a determination of whether or not a take might be possible.

No take is required. The Secretary makes no scientific study, makes no scientific investigation, just makes a determination. Does the landowner sue on that? Does the government sue to protect themselves? Then, if the Secretary says no, the landowner is compensated no longer by fair appraisals, because appraisals only bind the Secretary, they do not bind the landowner. Pretty soon, the U.S. Attorney is going to have to go in to protect the treasury of the United States because, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) pointed out, this is a new entitlement with direct spending. That is why the Bush administration says that it will generate new litigation, further divert agency resources, and have significant budgetary impact, because that is what they have done.

That is why the substitute provides you the means by which to reform, streamline, and make more efficient the Endangered Species Act at the same time, while protecting not only the landowners, but also protecting the taxpayers of this Nation from a raid on their Treasury when, in fact, no take has taken place.

We all share the gentleman from California's concerns and beliefs that, when your land is taken, you should be reimbursed; when your land is not taken, you should not be reimbursed.

I ask support of the Boehlert/Miller substitute. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Well, George, we have come a long ways. We have come a long ways, because, as you know, I have been working on this since I got here, and when I first heard this, there was nothing wrong with the act that a little bit more money would not solve. Here we are today, everybody saying that there is problems with the law and we have to fix it. So we have come a long ways, and I am being attacked for spending more money under the act on the reauthorization.

First of all, I wanted to respond to your comment about jeopardy. We stay with current law. The bill in the substitute, the current bill, is current law. We stay with current law. We had a different definition in the bill originally, and that caused the administration to say that it would result in new litigation, so we said we will stay with the current law, and that is why the substitute provides for the protection of these species, and we are about to do that with this substitute.

First of all, I wanted to respond to your comment about jeopardy. We stay with current law. The bill in the substitute, the current bill, is current law. We stay with current law. We had a different definition in the bill originally, and that caused the administration to say that it would result in new litigation, so we said we will stay with the current law, and that is why the substitute provides for the protection of these species, and we are about to do that with this substitute.

I have heard here today that the underlying bill guts, eviscerates, euthanizes, is unreasonable, and then I get a handout that talks about how much the substitute is like the base bill. When it comes to critical habitat, both bills use identical language. When it comes to providing certainty for landowners, both bills contain identical language. When it comes to providing incentives for landowners, both bills contain identical language, and on and on and on, about how much alike the bills are; and yet they gut, eviscerate, euthanize, and they are unreasonable.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) I think is right about this: The real difference between the two bills is how private property rights is protected.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and I spent months debating the meaning of a word, and we finally came pretty close to getting a bill put together. The substitute represents, I think, a step back in the negotiations in that everything that you wanted that you did not get, you put in the substitute; change the words a little bit so that they really do not mean anything. There is no protection for private property owners. I remember 10 years ago, I introduced a bill on endangered species, and one of the major provisions in that bill was to utilize public lands, and I got ripped over it because 90 percent of the species have their habitat on private land. You cannot just put the focus on public lands. You cannot. But if it is going to work, if we are truly going to put the focus on recovery, if we are truly going to try to bring these species back from the brink and do the responsible thing, private property owners have to be part of the solution.

We hear a lot of horror stories about things that have happened in my district and Mr. CARDOZA’s district and Mr. COSTA’s district and Mr. BACA’s district, in your district, Mr. MILLER.

If you do not do something to protect the property owners, those stories are never going to stop. The act has been a failure in recovering species. Now we can all agree.

When it comes to protecting private property owners, regardless of what all the hot rhetoric is, what the underlying law says is that if you meet State and local zoning laws, if you go through the process of getting that approval, then you have something. If you are a farmer farming your land and they tell you that you cannot farm your land anymore, you can get compensated for agriculture land.

If you are a developer who has gone through the process, gotten your land zoned and they tell you you cannot use it, then that is what you get compensated for. But once land has that restriction on it, whoever buys it cannot come back again and say they want something else, because they know it is restricted.

So this argument is totally out of line and out of base. We protect private property owners. That is what leads to recovery. The substitute just does not. Vote against the substitute, support the base bill, and let us move on with some decent legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise all Members that it is improper to walk in front of a Member in the well who has the floor.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Threatened Endangered Species Act, the so-called “reform” that will dismantle our Nation’s most fundamental wildlife protection law and in support of the bipartisan Miller, Boehlert, Dingell, Gilchrest, Dicks, Saxton, Tauscher, Kirk Substitute. I am disappointed at the missed opportunity for the House to strike a real balance in the protection of rare species facing extinction and landowners from future government constraints.

While I agree that the current Endangered Species Act, ESA, needs improvements and updating, the controversial bill before us today does little to improve the current ESA. Among other things, the Threatened Endangered Species Act would remove the federal protection of critical habitats that are necessary for the recovery of a species. I also find it extremely disturbing that my colleagues are so intent on establishing an entirely new entitlement program to pay landowners for compliance at the taxpayers’ expense at the same time they are working so hard to privatize entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

I believe there is more we can do to support the goals of the ESA. That is why I support the bipartisan substitute amendment offered by Representative George Miller, Representative Gilchrest, Representative Sherwood Boehlert. This compromise amendment would proactively conserve species using both real science standards and conservation incentives for landowners. This amendment maintains several provisions in the underlying bill, but would, among other things, take a more comprehensive approach to recovery plans and create an advisory board to provide scientific advice to the Interior Department about applying the best science when enforcing endangered species law.

It took decades for many of our Nation’s species to reach the point of extinction. It is unrealistic to propose that there will be a quick fix to the recovery of animals and plants facing
decline. For over 30 years, the ESA has been a work in progress. Now is not the time to turn back the clock on wildlife protection.

Environmental preservation is about self-preservation and about the land we are leaving our children. As Members of Congress, as responsible stewards of the American people’s place on the planet, we have a duty to preserve plant and animal species for future generations. That sentiment was reflected in President Richard Nixon’s words during his signing of the Act on December 28, 1973 when he said, “Nothing is more priceless and more worthy of preservation than the rich array of animal life with which our country has been blessed. It is a many-faceted treasure, of value to scholars, scientists, and nature lovers alike, and it forms a vital part of the heritage we all share as Americans.

I am also reminded of the wisdom of my recently passed friend and hero, Senator Gaylord Nelson, who said, “We must recognize that we’re all part of a web of life around the world. Anytime you extinguish a species, the consequences are serious.” Thankfully today, citizens can see firsthand in every State the progress being made in bringing wildlife back to the brink of extinction.

For example, In Wisconsin, for the first time since its 1991 listing as an endangered species, the winged mapleleaf mussel, a species found in a 15-mile area of the Rock River, have been found to be slowly rebuilding. In Wisconsin, for the first time since 1997, eagles are increasing in Wisconsin, where 645 pairs occupied territories in 1997, up from 358 pairs in 1990. In fact, since eagles are relatively numerous in Wisconsin, the State has donated 5 years or more have either stabilized or are improving.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the responsible, bipartisan Boehlert substitute that answers the concerns of landowners, States, and sportmen, while improving the ability to achieve timely recovery of endangered and threatened fish, wildlife, and plants. Let’s mend it in light of past experience and the demands of modern times, but let’s do it responsibly—support the substitute. Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of this amendment. I have serious concerns about the changes to the current Endangered Species Act being discussed today, both in the underlying bill and this amendment. I am especially frustrated that both bills have made the critical habitat provisions of the ESA, which are crucial to the recovery of species, too much of the burden. More than two-thirds of threatened and endangered species reside on private lands where the Endangered Species Act is least effective. It is imperative landowners be regarded as part of the solution and given the tools and incentives necessary to engage their help and support. I believe we should have at least considered expanding the Habitat Conservation Plan Land Acquisition Program in H.R. 3824 which has proven itself effective in reducing conflicts between the conservation of threatened and endangered species and land development and use. That, unfortunately, is not in the base bill. Instead, H.R. 3824 provides a new, uncapped entitlement program in Section 13 that will only plunge our Nation’s finances deeper in the red, and then prohibits common-sense steps that could at least provide some protection to the taxpayer. For example, under H.R. 3824 the government can be forced to pay out repeated claims for different proposals to use the exact same piece of property. These claims don’t even need to be backed up by proof of compliance with State or local land use laws. And instead of lessening the number of ESA related lawsuits, even CBO has stated this provision is likely to increase the amount of litigation.

In contrast, the Boehlert substitute would establish a land owner incentive program that would operate much like a Farm Bill conservation program, with 70 percent cost sharing. From ESA language that would require the Secretary to maximize the conservation benefit for every dollar expended, put Federal money where it will do the most good. A technical assistance program would be established, and the safe harbor regulations would be codified.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the responsible, bipartisan Boehlert substitute that answers the concerns of landowners, States, and sportmen, while improving the ability to achieve timely recovery of endangered and threatened fish, wildlife, and plants. Let’s mend it in light of past experience and the demands of modern times, but let’s do it responsibly—support the substitute.
amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was 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. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

AYES—229

Abercombie
Aderholt
Akin
Baca
Barrett (SC)
Barrett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Baumgartner
Berry
Bilirakis
Bilirakis (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boren
Boydstun
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown, Daniel
Brown-Watke
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Byrnes
Caraus
Cato
Castle
C.C. Care
C. C.M. Castle
Chaffer
Chenoweth
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
Chenoweth (OK)
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This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 348, nays 66, not voting 20, as follows:

| Roll No. 507 | YEAH—348 |


SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 178, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 178, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.
Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal reasons require my absence from today.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. 109-241)

The conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2360) “making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes,” having met, conferences having been had, and a free conference agreed to, do recommend and do report to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same, as amended, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and execution of the management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, $79,409,000: Provided, That not to exceed $40,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That, not more than 180 days from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an integrated immigration enforcement strategy to reduce the number of undocumented aliens by ten percent per year based on the most recent United States Census Bureau data.

OFFICE OF SCREENING COORDINATION AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Screening Coordination and Operations, $4,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701-705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341–345), $165,835,000: Provided, That not to exceed $3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That, of the total amount provided, $26,070,000 shall remain available until expended solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, and re-location costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations.

For expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, $297,229,000; of which $73,758,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $221,473,000 shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology systems, requirements, standards, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security, and for the costs of conversion to narrowband communications, including the cost for operation of the land mobile radio legacy systems, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated shall be used to support or supplement the appropriations provided for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology project or the Automated Commercial Environment: Provided further, That the Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not more than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, a plan for information technology investments, that: (1) meet the capital planning and investment control requirements of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security that an independent verification and validation agent is currently under contract for the project; (5) is reviewed and approved by the Department of Homeland Security Information Review Board, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (6) is reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

For expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, and agricultural inspections and regulations, $1,139,560,000; of which $159,658,000 may not be obligated for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology project until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive and approve a plan for expenditure prepared by the Secretary of Homeland Security that: (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including Circular A-11, part 7; (2) complies with the Department of Homeland Security information systems enterprise architecture; (3) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government; (4) includes a certification by the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security that an independent verification and validation agent is currently under contract for the project; (5) is reviewed and approved by the Department of Homeland Security Information Review Board, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (6) is reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operations and training, and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of humanitarian efforts, $400,231,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, reconstruct, acquire, or dispose of facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs and immigration, $270,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removal operations, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operations training and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics, and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of humanitarian efforts, $400,231,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

For expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operations and training, and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of humanitarian efforts, $400,231,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

For expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operations and training, and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of humanitarian efforts, $400,231,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

For expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operations and training, and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of humanitarian efforts, $400,231,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2006 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.
to exceed $7,500,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations pursuant to section 3313 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2661); of which not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be for official representation expenses; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the direction of the Director of the Office of Homeland Security; of which not less than $100,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline; of which not less than $200,000 shall be for Project Alert; of which not less than $5,000,000 may be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(q) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(f)(3)); of which not to exceed $117,000,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled illegal aliens: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $33,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: Provided further, That none of the amounts appropriated, $15,770,000 shall be available for official representation expenses; Provided, That the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $26,546,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Aviation Security

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing for security at the Transportation Security Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration, $487,000,000, shall be available until expended: Provided, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during the fiscal year 2007 for fiscal year 2006: Provided further, That any security service fees collected in excess of $5,000,000,000 under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2007: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 4923 of title 49, United States Code, which authorizes the usage of the cost of the Federal Government for a project under any letter of intent shall be 75 percent for any medium or large hub airport and 90 percent for any other airport, and all of the fund available under this heading which $73,500,000 shall be available for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline, of which not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be available for official representation expenses; Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be available for expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be available to replace explosive trace detection machines, at not to exceed $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, for the Integrated National Mission System; and of which not to exceed $2,617,386,000: Provided further, That none of the amounts appropriated, $15,103,569 are rescinded.

Surface Transportation Security

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing surface transportation security activities, $26,466,000, to remain available until expended.

Aviation Security

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing for security at the Transportation Security Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration, $487,000,000, shall be available until expended: Provided, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during the fiscal year 2007 for fiscal year 2006: Provided further, That any security service fees collected in excess of $5,000,000,000 under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2007: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 4923 of title 49, United States Code, which authorizes the usage of the cost of the Federal Government for a project under any letter of intent shall be 75 percent for any medium or large hub airport and 90 percent for any other airport, and all of the fund available under this heading which $73,500,000 shall be available for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline, of which not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be available for official representation expenses; Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be available for expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be available to replace explosive trace detection machines, at not to exceed $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, for the Integrated National Mission System; and of which not to exceed $2,617,386,000: Provided further, That none of the amounts appropriated, $15,103,569 are rescinded.

Environmental Compliance and Restoration

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the United States Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Reserve Training

For necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the reserve forces, to include personnel compensation and benefits and related costs; and equipment and services; $119,000,000.

Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the United States Coast Guard not otherwise provided for: purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note); and recreation and welfare; $3,492,331,000, of which $1,200,000,000 shall be for defense-related purposes; of which $24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 102(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2711(a)(5)); to exceed $3,000 shall be for official representation expenses: Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be available to replace explosive trace detection machines, at not to exceed $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

construction

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, $26,466,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of immigration, $26,466,000, to remain available until expended.
lease, and the proceeds shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available until September 30, 2008: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in conjunction with the President’s fiscal year 2007 budget, a review of the Revised Deepwater Implementation Plan that identifies any changes to the plan for the fiscal year; an annual performance comparison of Deepwater assets to pre-Deepwater legacy assets; a status report on critical milestones; a detailed explanation of how the costs of legacy assets are being accounted for within the Deepwater program; an explanation of why assets that elements of the Integrated Deepwater System are not accounted for within the Deepwater appropriation under this heading; a description of the competitiveness plan projected in all contracts and subcontracts exceeding $5,000,000 within the Deepwater program; a description of how the Coast Guard is planning for the human resource needs of the Deepwater Program and of the earned value management system gold card data for each Deepwater asset: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a comprehensive review of the Revised Deepwater Implementation Plan every five years, beginning in fiscal year 2011, that includes (1) identified and justified. 

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES
For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, as authorized by section 6 of the Truman-Hobbs Act (33 U.S.C. 516), $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; and authorized by law, $17,750,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 102(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): Provided, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public entities or private sources, and countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY
For retired pay, including the payment of obli-gations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appro-priations for this purpose, payments under the Retirement and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career sta-tus bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-re-lated special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their de-pendents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, $1,014,080,000.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE AS SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 614 vehicles for police-type use, which shall be available for maintenance and repair of these vehicles; purchase of 350 small to medium-sized passenger motor vehicles; purchase of American-made motorcycles; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees where a protective assignment during the actual day or days of the assignment requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; pro-duction of official reception and representation expense; government employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; re-search and development; grants to conduct beha-vioral research in support of protective re-search, operational analysis, or advance for commercial accommodations as may be neces-sary to perform protective functions; $1,288,310,000, of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be available until expended for assistance to organizations (as described under section 301(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such Code) determined by the Secretary to be at high-risk of international terrorist attack, and that these determinations shall not be delegated to any official: Provided, That the Secretary shall cer-tify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the threat to each designated tax exempt entity at least 60 days before the Secretary makes an allocation under this section of funds to such organizations.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS
For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, including grants to State and local governments for terrorism prevention activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $2,501,300,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(A) $65,000,000 shall be for use in high-threat, high-density urban areas (as determined by the Secretary).

(B) $25,000,000 shall be available until expended for assistance to organizations (as described under section 301(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such Code) determined by the Secretary to be at high-risk of international terrorist attack, and that these determinations shall not be delegated to any official: Provided, That the Secretary shall cer-tify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the threat to each designated tax exempt entity at least 60 days before the Secretary makes an allocation under this section of funds to such organizations.

(C) $175,000,000 shall be for port security grants pursuant to the purposes of 46 United States Code 70107(a) through (h), which shall be awarded based on risk and threat with-standing subsection (a), for eligible costs as de fined in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such Code.

(D) $30,000,000 shall be for intercity bus security grants.

(E) $150,000,000 shall be for intercity pas-senger rail transportation (as defined in section 24502 of title 49, United States Code), freight rail, and transit security grants; and

(F) $5,000,000 shall be for buffer zone protec-tion grants.

Title III—PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY
PREPAREDNESS
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Preparedness, the Office of the Chief Medical Officer, and the Office of Na-
grants under subparagraphs (B), (E), and (F) of paragraph (2) of this heading: Provided further, That grantsee shall provide additional reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Department of Homeland Security: Provided further, That funds appropriated for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants under paragraph (1) and discretionary grants under paragraph (2) of this heading shall be available for operational costs, to include personnel overtime and overtime associated with Office for Domestic Preparedness certified training, as needed.

Notwithstanding the Department’s implementation plan for Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, the Office for Domestic Preparedness shall issue the final National Preparedness Goal no later than December 31, 2005; and no funds provided under paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) shall be awarded to States for operations to the Office for Domestic Preparedness an updated State homeland strategy based on the interim National Preparedness Goal, dated March 31, 2005; Provided further, That the Government Accountability Office shall review the validity of the threat and risk factors used by the Secretary for the purposes of allocating discretionary grants funded under this heading, and the application of those factors in the allocation of funds, and report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the findings of its review by November 17, 2005; Provided further, That within seven days from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with the threat and risk methodology and factors that will be used to allocate discretionary grants funded under this heading.

Notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3), and subsection (f), of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

For federal disaster relief provided pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), to remain available until September 30, 2007, including up to $40,000,000 for financial assistance under section 1361A of such Act to States and communities for taking actions under such section with respect to severe repetitive loss properties, to remain available until expended; Provided, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3 percent of the total appropriation.

For necessary expenses under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), not to exceed $36,496,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; not to exceed $40,000,000 for financial assistance under section 1361A of such Act to States and communities for taking actions under such section with respect to severe repetitive loss properties, to remain available until expended; Provided, That grants made for predisaster mitigation shall be awarded on a competitive basis subject to the criteria in section 203(g) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(g)), and notwithstanding section 203(f) of such Act, shall be made without reference to State allocations, quotas, or other formula-based allocation of funds: Provided further, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3 percent of the total appropriation.

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), not to exceed $625,499,000, of which $542,157,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), $625,499,000, of which $542,157,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), $625,499,000, of which $542,157,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations, $221,240,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations, $221,240,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

Notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3), and subsection (f), of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

Notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3), and subsection (f), of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

Notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3), and subsection (f), of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations, $221,240,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations, $221,240,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations, $221,240,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014), and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: Provided, That in fiscal year 2006, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $669,148,000 for commissions and taxes of agents; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund.
Immigration Services shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on its information technology transformation efforts and how the efforts align with the enterprise architecture standards of the Department of Homeland Security within 90 days from the date of enactment of this Act.

**FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER**

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training, purchase of not more than 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in matches, tournaments, or other presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; $194,000,000, of which up to $42,119,000 for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training shall remain available until September 30, 2007, and of which not to exceed $5,500,000 for representation expenses.

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Notwithstanding sections of title 5 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act: Provided, That balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2006, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds through (1) creation of a program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriation acts; (4) uses funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; (5) contracts out any functions or activities for which funds have been appropriated for Federal full-time equivalent positions; unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2006, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $5,000,000 or to announce publicly the intention to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of $1,000,000, or to announce publicly the intention to make a grant allocation, discretionary grant award, discretionary contract award, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of $1,000,000, or to announce publicly the intention to make such an award, unless the Secretary of Homeland Security notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance: Provided, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 504. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security, except any payments to the "Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund", except for the activities and amounts allowed in section 602 of Public Law 109-13, excluding the Homeland Security Data Network: Provided, That any additional activities and amounts must be approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 30 days in advance of obligation.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances of funds provided by previous appropriations Acts to the Department of Homeland Security provided for the fiscal year 2006 from appropriations for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2006 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2007, for appropriations after June 30, except in extraordinary circumstances which may affect the safety of human life or the protection of property.

SEC. 506. (a) The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process, to include representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation agencies involved in law enforcement training, to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

(b) None of the funds in this Act may be used to make a grant allocation, discretionary grant award, discretionary contract award, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of $1,000,000, or to announce publicly the intention to make such an award, unless the Secretary of Homeland Security notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance: Provided, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 509. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, purchase, or other agreement for training which cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 510. The Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process and/or advanced law enforcement training at all four training facilities under the control of the
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that these training centers are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year.

S. 511. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus has been submitted to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 3301), has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of new prospects. SEC. 512. None of the funds in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

S. 513. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is in compliance with the second proviso of section 513 of Public Law 108–334 and shall report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives bimonthly beginning on October 1, 2005, on any reasons for non-compliance: Provided, That, furthermore, the Secretary shall take all possible actions, including the procurement of certified systems to inspect and secure passengers, to increase the level of air cargo inspected beyond that mandated in section 513 of Public Law 108–334 and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives every six months on the actions taken and the percentage of air cargo inspected at each airport.

SEC. 514. Notwithstanding section 3202 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration may impose a reasonable charge for the lease of real personal property to Transportation Security Administration employees and for use by Transportation Security Administration employees and may compensate to the extent of funds appropriated or fund initially charged for operating and maintaining the property, which amounts shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for expenditure for property management, operation, protection, construction, repair, alteration, and related activities.

S. 515. For fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, the use of any funds in this or any other appropriation Acts to provide the necessary management, systems, and equipment to the Department of Homeland Security for the Transportation Security Administration shall apply to the acquisition of services, as well as equipment, supplies, and materials.

S. 516. In addition to any other provision of law, the authority of the Office of Personnel Management to conduct personnel security and suitability background investigations, update investigative reports, reverify the identity of applicants for, or appointees in, positions in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, Analysis and Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Directorate for Preparedness, and the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of the Treasury for the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That on request of the Department of Homeland Security, the Office of Personnel Management shall cooperate with and assist the Department in any investigations or re-investigation under this section:

Provided further, That this section shall cease to be effective at such time as the President has selected a single agency to conduct security clearance investigations pursuant to section 3001(c) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458; 50 U.S.C. 3191 et seq.), or in the case of any other Federal agency other than the Department of Homeland Security, after the Secretary of Homeland Security has certified to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the Department of Homeland Security is in compliance with the second proviso of section 5001(a) of title 31, United States Code.

S. 517. None of the funds provided by this Act may be obligated for implementation, or on other than a test basis, of the Secure Flight program or any other follow on or successor passenger prescreening programs, until the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies, and the Government Accountability Office reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that all of the elements contained in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 522(a) of Public Law 108–334 (118 Stat. 1319) have been successfully met.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted within 90 days after the certification required by such subsection is provided, and periodically thereafter, if necessary, until the Government Accountability Office confirms that all ten elements have been successfully met.

(c) None of the funds provided by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be utilized to develop or test algorithms assigning risk to passengers whose names are not on Government watch list.

SEC. 518. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1323a).

SEC. 519. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to process or approve a competition required by such subsection is provided, and periodically thereafter, if necessary, until the Government Accountability Office confirms that all ten elements have been successfully met.

SEC. 520. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the lease of real property to any Federal entity.

SEC. 521. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1323a).

SEC. 522. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to process or approve a competition required by such subsection is provided, and periodically thereafter, if necessary, until the Government Accountability Office confirms that all ten elements have been successfully met.

SEC. 523. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the lease of real property to any Federal entity.

SEC. 524. The Secretary, in consultation with industry stakeholders, shall develop standards and protocols for increasing the use of explosive detection equipment to screen air cargo when appropriate.

SEC. 525. The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) shall utilize existing checked baggage explosive detection equipment and testing procedures to screen carry-on passenger aircraft to the greatest extent practicable at each airport: Provided, That beginning with November 2005, TSA shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing, by airport, the amount of cargo carried on passenger aircraft that was screened by TSA in August 2005 and each month thereafter.

SEC. 526. None of the funds available for obligation for the transportation worker identification credential program shall be used to develop a personalization system that is decentralized or a card production capability that does not utilize an existing government card production facility: Provided, That no funding can be obligated for the next phase of production until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been fully briefed on the results of the prototype phase and approved the program for further development.


(b) None of the funds available for obligations of the United States Coast Guard for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", an additional $78,630,689, to remain available until September 30, 2009, for the service life extension program of the current 110-foot Island Class patrol boat fleet and accelerated design and production of the Fast Response Cutter.

SEC. 528. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the Transportation Security Administration manages the Clearinghouse as the central identity management system for the deployment and operation of the registered traveler program and the Transportation Security Administration's passenger prescreening program for the purposes of collecting and aggregating biometric data necessary for background vetting, providing all associated record-keeping, and ensuring interoperability between different airports and vendors; and acting as a central activation, revocation, and transaction hub for participating airports, ports, and other points of presence.

SEC. 529. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any person other than the contracting officer to modify the Comptroller General's report in section 222 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 142) to alter, direct that changes be made to, delay, or prohibit the transmission to Congress of any report prepared pursuant to paragraph (5) of such section.

SEC. 530. No funding provided by this or previous appropriation Acts shall be available for the salary of any employee serving as a contracting officer’s technical representative (COTR) or anyone acting in a similar or like capacity who has not received COTR training.

SEC. 531. The Department of Homeland Security shall provide an ongoing report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on flight operations and protocols for increasing the use of explosive detection equipment to screen air cargo when appropriate.
The Secretary, not later than January 31 of each succeeding year, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the annual report required by this Act, together with detailed information required by paragraph (1) and (2). The Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the annual report required by this Act, together with detailed information required by paragraph (1) and (2). The Secretary shall also submit with the report a statement of any liability related to its own acts or intentional wrongdoing by a contractor, the name of the contractor, the amount of the liability, and the basis for it.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider eligible under the Federal Emergency Management Agency Public Assistance Program the costs necessary to replace or repair damage to canals and irrigation flumes, which were incurred during a 1996 storm and subsequent mudslide in El Dorado County, California. Provided, that the funds provided under this section, $34,000,000 may not be obligated or allocated for grants until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive and approve an implementation plan for the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security under the REAL ID Act of 2005 (Division B of Public Law 109–13), $40,000,000, to remain available until expended. Provided, That the funds provided under this section, $6,000,000 shall be made available within 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act. Provided, That the Funds provided under this Act for grants for the purposes of the Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive and approve an implementation plan for the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security under the REAL ID Act of 2005 (Division B of Public Law 109–13), including the proposed uses of the grant monies.

Provided further, That the funds provided under this section, not less than $6,000,000 shall be made available within 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act to States for pilot projects on integrating hand-held software, and information management systems.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall impose a fee for any registered traveler program under the Department of Homeland Security by notice in the Federal Register, and may modify the fee from time to time by notice in the Federal Register. Provided, That such fees shall not exceed the aggregate costs associated with the program and shall be credited to the Transportation Security Administration registered traveler fee account, to be available until expended.

A person who has completed a security awareness training course approved by or in cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security using funds made available in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter or in any prior appropriations Acts, who is employed by, or acknowledged by an Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and who reports a situation, activity or incident pursuant to that program to an appropriate authority, shall not be liable for any damages in any action brought in a Federal or State court which result from any act or omission unless such person is guilty of gross negligence or willful misconduct.

Nothing in this section shall relieve any airport operator from liability for its own acts or intentional wrongdoing by a contractor, the name of the contractor, the amount of the liability, and the basis for it. Provided, That the detailed information required by paragraph (1) shall include: whether the work will be performed by a governmental agency or a contractor; and, if performed by a contractor, the type of contract let, whether the contract is sole-source, full and open competition, or limited competition.

This may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006,” and the Senate agrees to the same.
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

JUDD GREGG, THAD COCHRAN, TOM THAYER, ARLEN SPECTER, PETE DOMENICI, RICHARD SHELBY, LARRY CRAWLEY, ROBERT F. BENNETT, WAYNE ALLARD, ROBERT C. BYRD, DICK J. INOUYE, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2360), making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Senate Amendment. The Senate deleted the entire title of the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill. Throughout the accompanying explanatory statement, the managers refer to the Committee and the Committees on Appropriations. Unless otherwise noted, in both instances, the managers are referring to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

The language and allocations contained in House Report 109-79 and Senate Report 109-83 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of managers. The statement of managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above, if provided in the accompanying conference report, in cases where both the House and Senate reports address a particular issue not specifically addressed in the conference report or joint statement of managers, the conference has determined that the House report and Senate report are not inconsistent and are to be interpreted accordingly. In cases where the House or Senate report directs the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both Committees on Appropriations. Further, in a number of instances, House Report 109-79 and Senate Report 109-83 direct agencies to report to the Committees by specific dates. In those instances, and unless alternative dates are provided in the accompanying conference report, agencies are directed to provide these reports to the Committees on Appropriations no later than February 10, 2006.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Recommended adjustments to classified programs are addressed in a classified annex accompanying this report.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

The conferences agree to provide $79,409,000 instead of $113,139,000 as proposed by the House and $64,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Office of the Secretary</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Office of the Deputy Sec-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>$4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>$4,131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Policy</td>
<td>$20,713,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Police Affairs</td>
<td>$8,312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Legislative and Intergov-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernmental Affairs</td>
<td>$6,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of General Counsel</td>
<td>$11,267,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Civil Rights and Liberties</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Serv-</td>
<td>$3,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ices Ombudsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy Officer</td>
<td>$4,381,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,409,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DHS REORGANIZATION

Since March 2005, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has been conducting an internal review of its policies, operations, and organizational structure, known as the “Second Stage Review”. On July 13, 2005, the Department announced a major reorganization that reflects the findings of this review. A budget amendment was submitted on July 21, 2005, requesting the reorganization be modified for fiscal year 2006 to reflect this reorganization proposal. For the most part, the conferences have complied with these requests. The conferences concur with the Department’s decision to abolish the Office of the Under Secretary for the Bureau of Transportation Security (BTS); BTS functions have been merged into other offices and component agencies throughout the Department. The conferences have agreed to support the Second Stage Review and move new staff in fiscal year 2006.

NEW STAFF

The conferences agree to provide funding to support a total of 134 new full-time equivalents (FTEs) in the Second Stage Review. The conferees, in agreement with the Department, have approved additional new FTEs for the Preparedness Directorate and the Office of National Capital Region Coordination elsewhere in this statement of managers, reflecting changes recommended as a result of the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005. The remaining FTE requests in the budget have been denied due to a large number of unfilled positions in individual offices. For example, the conference agreed to approve 12 FTEs for the Privacy Office, 11 FTEs for the Office of the Federal CIO, 15 FTEs for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, and 2 FTEs for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. The conferences have provided half-year funding for new staff in fiscal year 2006.

STOLEN PASSPORTS

The conferences agree to provide $20,713,000 instead of $8,770,000 as proposed by the House and $7,238,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement reflects the Department’s organizational restructuring plan on July 13, 2005, which included major changes to the Office of Policy; the conference agreement reflects these changes. The conferences, in agreement with the Department, removed the Special Assistant to the Secretary—Private Sector; Office of Immigration Statistics; 18 FTEs from the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy, the Office of the Secretary for Policy, and the National Counterterrorism Center; 3 FTEs from the Directorate of Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection. The conferences have denied funding for the Operational Integration staff as part of this office or any other entity within DHS.

OFFICE OF POLICY

Funding for the Office of Policy is provided in House Report 109-79, under the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.

OFFICE OF SECURITY

Funding for the Office of Security is provided in House Report 109-79, under the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION COORDINATION

Funding for the Office of National Capital Region Coordination is provided within the Preparedness Directorate, Management and Administration account as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Funding for the Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs is provided within the Department of Homeland Security, Management and Administration account as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.
The conferees agree to provide no funding for the Operational Integration staff, as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,381,000 as proposed by the House. The conferences believe the new Office of Policy will perform many of the proposed activities of the Operational Integration staff. For those few functions not performed by the new Policy Office, the conferences include three new FTEs within Analysis and Operations. These additional staff shall be located within the Home and Operations Center to coordinate departmental activities.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY OFFICER
The conferences agree to provide $3,350,000 for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to hire additional staff to fulfill requirements of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (Public Law 108-458), as discussed in the Senate report.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
While DHS has made progress in submitting reports to the Committees on Appropriations, there are many that are still overdue. DHS is to improve its responsiveness to Congress and better monitor the status of reports requested in this statement of managers and Appropriations and Senate reports. For reports that cannot be issued by the due date, the conferences direct DHS to inform the Committees in a timely manner, explain the reason for delay, and seek the occurrence of the Committee’s new issuance date.

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT
Both the House and Senate reports highlighted the alarming statistics regarding our Nation’s broken immigration system. In the context of threats facing our Nation, the disturbing growth in our illegal alien population and illegal immigration enforcement and border control are not succeeding. The conferees agree with the Sense of the Senate proviso expressed in section 519 of the Senate bill, which states that the reality of terrorists taking advantage of inadequate security along our border with Mexico, and the need for the United States and Mexico to improve border and security policies on the side of the border. The conferences include bill language directing the Secretary to develop a comprehensive immigration enforcement strategy that results in reducing the number of undocumented aliens in the United States by ten percent per year and direct that the strategy be in accordance with House Report 109-79. The funding is not contingent on the submission of this strategy to Congress as proposed by the House. Further, the conferences direct the report on the internal transport of illegal aliens requested in House Report 109-79 from the Under Secretary of Border and Transportation Security be included in the comprehensive immigration enforcement strategy report.

The conferences direct the Secretary to assume full responsibility for the joint report between DHS and the U.S. Department of Justice on reducing accusers required by Senate Report 109-83, and submit the report not later than September 30, 2006.

CARGO CONTAINER SECURITY
The report submitted by the Department on June 9, 2005, was late and did not fully respond to directions of the statement of managers accompanying the conference report (H. Report 108-774) on the fiscal year 2005 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-458). The conferences directed the Department to develop a strategy be in accordance with House Report 109-79 to ensure that all cargo containers entering the United States are inspected and any additional security measures that could increase the security of general aviation aircraft and airports.

CHEMICAL SECURITY
The conferees are pleased by the Department’s recent endorsement of mandatory security requirements for the chemical sector and believe enforceable Federal standards to protect critical infrastructure on chemical facilities within the United States are necessary. Despite testimony from the Director of Chemical Security that the chemical industry is vulnerable to a terrorist attack, no federal security measures have been established for the chemical sector. The Department has concluded that, from a regulatory perspective, the existing patchwork of authorities does not permit the effective regulation of the chemical industry. Yet, no legislation has been proposed by the Department or any other program to this effect. The Department should also include a description of the security requirements and any reasons why the requirements should differ from those already in place for chemical facilities in the nation’s critical infrastructure.

AWARDING OF GRANTS
With the Senate report, the conferences direct the Department to submit a report by February 10, 2006, providing an explanation of all grants made available by this Act, and for any prior year funds that remain unobligated. For those grant funds awarded after March 30, 2006, the conferences direct the Department to submit a detailed explanation for the delay.

QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW
The conferences agree there are benefits for the Department of Homeland Security in conducting a Quadrennial Homeland Security Review similar to the quadrennial reviews conducted by the Department of Defense. The conferences direct the Department to conduct such a review consistent with the terms and conditions listed in section 523(a) through (c) of the Senate bill. The review should be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the House Committee on Homeland Security no later than September 30, 2008.

DATA MINING
The conferences agree to eliminate the requirement set forth in the Senate report for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to submit a report that fully complies with the terms and conditions listed in section 532 of the Senate bill.

WORKFORCE DIVERSITY
The conferences agree to provide $4,000,000 for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to support a total of 71 new full-time equivalents (FTEs), including 60 FTEs for the Office of Diversity and one FTE for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer. Funding shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Diversity</th>
<th>$1,685,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Status Indicator Technology</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Serving Institutions</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>聲南手 Favtional Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer</td>
<td>$685,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $16,835,000

NEW STAFF
The conferences agree to provide funding to support a total of 71 new full-time equivalents (FTEs), including 60 FTEs in the Office of Diversity and one FTE for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer. Funding was not provided for the new FTEs in the other offices. Funding was not provided for the new FTEs for Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.
BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION OFFICE

The conferees agree to provide $1,880,000 for the Business Transformation Office, instead of $948,000 as proposed by the House and $920,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding levels reflect a transfer of seven FTEs from the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER

The conferees agree to provide $9,020,000 for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer. As discussed in the Senate report, the conferees direct the Chief Procurement Officer to use the increased funding to hire and train qualified procurement officers, to report on the number of procurement officers in the Department, including each organization, for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and proposed for 2006, and to provide an assessment of the adequacy of the numbers and training of those personnel.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF HUMAN CAPITAL OFFICER

The conferees agree to provide $38,500,000 instead of $61,951,000 as proposed by the House and $61,996,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, $3,900,000 is for salaries and expenses and $30,000,000 is for the new human resource management system, known as MAX-HR. As discussed in the Senate report, the conferees direct the Department to submit a report on the progress made to implement the MAX-HR system. In addition to the total funding available and needed for this program by year, the report shall include all obligations and expenditures by contractor by year, along with the purpose of the contract.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The conferees agree to provide $66,070,000 instead of $66,356,000 as proposed by the House and $66,801,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, $60,000,000 is for salaries and expenses and $6,070,000 is to consolidate and integrate headquarter operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC).

Of the $26,070,000 provided for the NAC, $8,300,000 is for security enhancements, $10,257,000 is for tenant improvements, $3,400,000 is for capital improvements, and $1,110,000 is for the design and execution of new plans for the NAC. The conferees agree to language included in the Senate report directing the Department to update the Committee on Appropriations regularly on the physical consolidation and planned expenditures for the NAC, as well as its plans for a permanent headquarters. These updates should occur as frequently as necessary but not less than annually.

OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS

Funding for the Office of Immigration Statistics is provided within the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.

OFFICE OF SECURITY

The conferees agree to provide $51,278,000 as proposed by the House instead of $55,278,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to move the Office of Security to the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.

SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

The conferees agree to include a general provision (section 537) on Sensitive Security Information (SSI) as proposed by the House. The conferees are concerned that because of insufficient management controls, information that should be in the public domain may be unnecessarily withheld from public scrutiny. The conferees recommend to the Secretary to ensure that each appropriate office has an official with the clear authority to designate documents as SSI and to provide clear guidance as to what is SSI material and what is not. Designation means an original determination made by a limited number of appointed officials pursuant to 49 CFR 1520.5 (1–16). The conferees direct the Secretary to report to the Committees not later than January 3, 2006, the titles of all documents that are designated by DHS as SSI in their entirety during the period beginning October 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005, and a full-year report each year thereafter.

CLASSIFIED AND SECURITY SENSITIVE DOCUMENTS

The conferees direct the Office of Security to ensure the Department’s classified and security sensitive documents clearly identify, paragraph-by-paragraph, which paragraphs contain classified information and which do not. This is consistent with actions taken by other federal agencies.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

The conferees direct the Under Secretary for Management to submit a report listing the Department’s classified and security sensitive documents, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Office of the Secretary for all IT investments. The conferees agree to provide $18,505,000 instead of $18,560,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding levels reflect a transfer of seven FTEs from the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.

MONTHLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Department is directed to submit a monthly budget execution report that includes: the total obligatory authority appropriated (new budget authority, unobligated carryover), undistributed obligatory authority, amount allotted, current year obligations, unobligated authority (the difference between total obligatory authority and current year obligations), beginning unexpended obligations, year-to-date costs, and year end unexpended obligations. This budget execution information is to be provided at the level of detail shown in the tables displayed at the end of this report for each departmental component and the Working Capital Fund. This report must be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations no later than 45 days after the close of each month.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

The conferees agree to provide $297,229,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) instead of $303,700,000 as proposed by the House and $286,540,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Services</th>
<th>$27,354,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Security and Infrastructure</td>
<td>$5,444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist watch list integration</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Support</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Program</td>
<td>$86,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace legacy border components</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Secure Data Network</td>
<td>$52,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure optimization and upgrade</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$297,229,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS

The conferees are concerned with the lack of coordination within the Department regarding its information technology (IT) activities. In the interest of fully leveraging and optimizing the potential contribution of IT investments in meeting the homeland security mission while controlling IT investment costs, maintaining schedules, and delivering capabilities, it is critical DHS clearly articulate its objectives and needs. In addition, the conferees are disappointed that, for the last two years, major portions of the IT activities have not been properly displayed in the budget. The conferees direct the CIO to follow the Committees’ direction regarding the content and format of appropriations justifications found within the Office of the Secretary for all IT investments.

The conferees agree to include a provision (section 542) that rescinds $15,000,000 from the Department’s Working Capital Fund (WCF), instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct the Department to use the WCF plan submitted on April 11, 2005, as the base document for funding decisions in fiscal year 2006. The Committees on Appropriations shall be notified and must approve any modifications from that plan. In addition, section 6024 of Public Law 109–13 excludes funding of the Homeland Secure Data Network (HSDN) within the WCF. The conferees continue to support this position and have provided adequate funding for HSDN within the Office of the Chief Information Officer. The WCF should not be used to supplement HSDN without notification and approval of the Committees.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The conferees agree to provide $19,405,000 instead of $18,505,000 as proposed by the House and $18,325,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding levels reflect a transfer of seven FTEs from the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, as requested in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005.
through reimbursable agreements. This expendi-
ture plan shall also include a detailed pro-
gram assessment of the scope; total esti-
mated cost; cost by year; and the schedule for
completion, including significant mile-
stones, for each individual project funded for
fiscal year 2006 for information technology
services, security activities, and wireless pro-
grams.

The conferees direct the CIO to provide a
report by February 10, 2006, to include:
an update of the information technology
portfolio; and the status of identifying the sys-
tems and/or applications that will migrate to
the National Center for Critical Information
Processing and Storage during fiscal year
2006.

The conferees agree to include bill lan-
guage requiring the Department to report on
the enterprise architecture; and a description of the
plan for addressing any shortfalls; a capital
project management plan; the status of imple-
mencing a new security policy—a major
priority as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct the Department to sub-
mit a detailed expenditure plan describing the
intended use of this funding. This plan shall be
provided no later than 60 days from the date of
enactment of this Act. The conferees re-
commend that enforcement of forced child labor
laws is now a responsibility of Immigration
and Customs Enforcement and by $49,651,000
to reflect all funding for procurement, oper-
ations and maintenance of aircraft and ma-
rine vessels is included in the Air and Marine
Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and
Procurement appropriation. The conferees
porate a detailed expenditure plan until a de-
tailed five year plan for air and marine
operations is submitted to the Commit-
tees on Appropriations. No funding is pro-
vided in this account for salaries and expenses
as associated with the integration of former
Border Patrol pilots. Funding was decreased by
$12,725,000 from the President’s request to re-
flect a strategic approach to the removal of
illegal labor. Budgetary authority exists in
this Act for the salaries and expenses as asso-
ciated with the integration of former Border
Patrol pilots. Funding was decreased by

The following table specifies funding by
budget activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Activity</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Headquarters Management and Administration</td>
<td>$655,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$590,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,245,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTAINER SECURITY

The conferees concur with the requirement, as detailed in the House report, for a report on how non-intrusive inspection technology system selection, use, and financing for the Container Security Initiative (CSI) could be improved, as well as the Senate report requirement on relations with CSI host nations, to include: steps to explain CSI targeting to host governments; coordination with the State Department; options for withdrawal from uncooperative CSI host nations; and actions taken on Government Accountability Office recommendations for improvement. The conferees direct the Commissioner to submit both reports not later than February 10, 2006.

EXPEDITED REMOVAL

The conferees are aware the Department has an approved plan to expand its expedited removal program, following success in reducing the overall cost of detention housing for other than Mexican nationals in the Laredo and Tucson sectors, in reducing the number of alien children in their own rooms, and in increasing deterrence. The conferees direct the Department to report not later than February 10, 2006, on Border Patrol costs associated with the expanded expedited removal program.

BORDER CROSING CARDS

The conferees endorse Senate report language requesting a report on Border Crossing Cards and their implementation.

ENFORCEMENT OF TRADE REMEDIES LAW

The conferees have ensured that, of the amounts provided within this account, sufficient funds are available to enforce the antidumping regulations contained in section 754 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c).

The conferees direct CBP to continue to work with the appropriate Department of Commerce, the Department of Treasury, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and all other relevant agencies, to provide semi-annual reports of efforts to collect past due amounts and to increase current collections. Furthermore, by June 30, 2006, CBP is to provide the Committees on Appropriations with a description of the specific reasons for the non-collection with respect to each order.

The conferees direct CBP to confirm that it has completed all of the Initiatives, processes, and procedures identified in its February 2005 report to the Committees on Appropriations (including Attachment 1) regarding implementation of the recommendations that were contained in the U.S. Treasury Department Office of the Inspector General report on the continued Dumping and Subsidy Injury probe. The conferees direct CBP to implement the five recommendations for executive action contained in the GAO report (GAO-05-979) dated September 2005. If those processes and procedures have not been completed, CBP is directed to provide an explanation as to why they have not been completed, and a deadline for when they will be completed. This includes the deadlines for implementing the processes and procedures for verification, including, in particular, the development of the sampling methodology to validate the claimed amount; the testing plan; and all accompanying aspects of verification.

AMERICA’S SHIELD INITIATIVE

The conferees have not provided the requested increased funding for America’s Shield Initiative (ASI). At this time, the conferees understand the Department is reviewing the entire planning process for ASI and may suspend major procurement action until it has resolved fundamental questions about scope and architecture, and possibly its relation to overall, nationwide border security for domain security. The conferees expect to be kept informed of the results of this review before the Department proceeds with any significant action and encourage the conferees to adopt the most cost-effective long-term solution for the maximum life extension of current systems. In the meantime, the conferees encourage program managers to explore the use of commercial, airborne, off-the-shelf wireless technology as it develops this program.

AGRICULTURAL INSPECTIONS

The conferees direct the Department, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to submit a report by February 10, 2006, providing the information requested in Senate Report 109-83 concerning reduced agricultural inspection levels.

TEXTILE TRANSSHIPMENT ENFORCEMENT

The conferees endorse Senate report language authorizing funding for Customs Service textile transshipment enforcement, and specifies how the funds be spent. The conferees include $4,750,000 to continue this effort and direct CBP to report not later than February 10, 2006, on obligating these funds, as well as those appropriated in fiscal years 2004 and 2005. The report should include staffing levels in fiscal years 2003-2006, differentiated by position, as authorized in section 352 of the Trade Act of 2002, and include a five-year enforcement plan. The report should also describe how CBP has redeployed its workforce previously assigned to enter and monitor quota information now that quotas have expired.

TOBACCO IMPORTS

The conferees endorse the requirements set forth in both the House and Senate reports regarding tobacco product imports and direct the Department to comply with them.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

The conferees agree to provide $456,000,000 instead of $458,009,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. This includes $16,000,000 for IT&Ds, of which $16,000,000 is for IT&Ds, and all of which remains subject to approval of an expenditure plan.

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

The conferees agree to provide $400,231,000 instead of $424,780,000, as proposed by the House and $320,580,000 as proposed by the Senate. This includes: $15,000,000 for palletized sensor systems for P-3 long range tracker aircraft; $15,000,000 for P-3 service life extension; $14,000,000 for manned, covert surveillance aircraft; $12,000,000 for the Montana Northern Border air branch; $20,000,000 for replacement of Border Patrol helicopters; $10,180,000 for unmanned aerial vehicles; $10,000,000 for operations and maintenance of legacy Border Patrol aircraft and marine vessels; and $2,000,000 to begin work on a North Dakota air wing.

P-3 AIRCRAFT

The conferees recognize the CBP P-3 fleet is a critical asset in both homeland security and drug interdiction missions. As CBP implements the service life extension program for its P-3 aircraft, the conferees encourage CBP to adopt the most cost-effective long-term solution for the maximum life extension of current systems. In the meantime, the conferees expect to be kept informed of the results of such a service life assessment into the modernization plan.

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES

The conferees agree to provide $10,180,000 for unmanned aerial vehicles, as requested by the Senate and opposed by the House. This includes $5,000,000 for operations and maintenance of legacy Border Patrol aircraft and marine vessels, which may be deployed between ports of entry on the Southwest Border.

CBP AIR PROGRAM

The conferees are aware that the Commissioner plans to combine air operations of the Office of Air and Marine Operations and the Office of Border Patrol into “CBP Air”, and the conference agreement adjusts the budget accordingly. The conferees direct the Department to implement fully the recommendations in GAO report GAO-05-584 and Integration Plan to consult with the Committees on Appropriations before making any changes in the nature and level of support for legacy air missions.

STRATEGIC PLAN, MODERNIZATION AND RECAPITALIZATION

The conferees remind the Department that detailed information requested in previous conference reports has yet to be provided. With CBP air integration under way, it is essential Congress receive information to understand the status and requirements of the CBP air and marine programs. The conferees include $30,000,000 for salaries and Expenses appropriation until the Committees on Appropriations receive a five-
The conferees understand the Oklahoma City National Aviation Center has augmented its pilot training with computer-based simulation, which has increased training efficiency while decreasing costs. The conferees direct the Department to continue this approach.

**NORTHERN BORDER AIRWINGS**

The conferees believe remaining gaps in air patrol coverage of the Northern Border should be closed as quickly as possible and include $2,000,000 for the initial site assessment, facilities evaluation, lease preparation and other activities associated with the fifth Northern Border airwing in Grand Forks, North Dakota. The conferees direct the Department to include in its fiscal year 2007 budget request the resources necessary to establish the airwing.

**CONSTRUCTION**

The conferees agree to provide $270,000,000 instead of $260,000,000 as proposed by the House and $311,381,000 as proposed by the Senate. This includes: $1,963,000 for facilities to accommodate 1,000 additional Border Patrol Agent positions; $35,000,000 for the San Diego fence construction project; $35,000,000 for tactical infrastructure projects in the Tucson sector; and $25,000,000 for the Advanced Training Center. The conferees direct CBP to provide a spending plan and a revised master plan to the Committees on Appropriations that reflects this funding.

**IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

The conferees agree to provide $3,108,499,000 for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Salaries and Expenses, instead of $3,064,081,000 as proposed by the House and $3,052,416,000 as proposed by the Senate. This includes an additional $90,000,000 for additional bedspace capacity, including corresponding support positions; $42,000,000 for additional criminal investigator positions; $25,000,000 to annualize new positions and programs funded in Public Law 109–13; $9,000,000 for Immigration Enforcement Agents to support civil and administrative investigations; $16,000,000 for additional fugitive operations teams; $18,000,000 to expand the Institutional Removal Program; $10,000,000 to expand Alternatives to Detention, including the Intensive Supervision Appearance Program; $1,000,000 to increase the speed, accuracy and efficiency of immigration enforcement information currently being entered into the National Criminal Information database; $5,000,000 for the Cyber Crimes Center; $15,770,000 for enforcement of laws against forced child labor; as offsets, a reduction in Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses; $5,000,000 for implementation of section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; $10,000,000 for the worksite enforcement program; and $2,000,000 for transfer to the U.S. Department of Justice for the Legal Orientation Program. The conferees make $5,000,000 unavailable for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations receive a national detention management plan as described in the House report. The following table specifies funding by budget activity:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Activity</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters Management and Administration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Compensation and Benefits, Services and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Headquarters Managed IT investment</td>
<td>$133,194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Proceedings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Operations</td>
<td>$130,181,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Investigations:</td>
<td>$256,704,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Removal Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Removal Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Detention and Removal</td>
<td>$1,373,676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>$3,108,499,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**TEXTILE TRANSSHIPMENT ENFORCEMENT**

Section 352 of the Trade Act of 2002 authorizes funding for Customs Service textile transshipment enforcement and specifies how the funds be spent. The conferees include $5,750,000 to continue this effort and direct ICE to report not later than February 10, 2006, on obligating these funds, as well as those appropriated in fiscal years 2004 and 2005. The report should include staffing levels in fiscal years 2003–2006, differentiated by position, as authorized in section 352 of the Trade Act of 2002, and include a five-year enforcement plan.

**IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT AND DETENTION STATISTICS**

The conferees concur with the immigration enforcement and detention reporting requirements identified in the House and Senate reports, and direct ICE to submit them on a quarterly basis beginning February 10, 2006.

**STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT**

The conferees support the “287(g) program” to cross-designate State and local law enforcement officers to perform limited immigration enforcement functions, and provide $5,000,000 in support of this program, including training participants, as authorized. The conferees encourage the Department to be more proactive in encouraging State and local governments to participate in this program. The conferees fully support the 287(g) program and view it as a powerful force multiplier to better enforce immigration laws and, consequently, to better secure the homeland.

**LEGAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM**

The conferees include $2,000,000 for the Legal Orientation Program, to be transferred to the U.S. Department of Justice, Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR). The Office of Management and Budget is directed to include future funding for this program in funding requests for EOIR.

**FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE**

The conferees agree to provide $487,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

**AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION**

The conferees agree to provide $40,150,000 as proposed by the House instead of $50,150,000 as proposed by the Senate. These funds may not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations receive and approve an expenditure plan, which includes a...
The conferees provide $28,546,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate.

Screening Workforce:

- Privatized screening ........................................................ $139,654,000
- Passenger screeners—personnel, compensation and benefits .......................................................... $1,520,000
- Baggage screeners—personnel, compensation, and benefits ............................................................. $884,800,000

Subtotal, Screener Workforce ........................................... $2,543,654,000

- Screener training ................................................................. $88,004,000
- Passenger screeners—other .................................................. $2,375,000
- Checked baggage screeners—other ........................................ $118,591,000
- Tort claims ........................................................................ $4,000,000
- Representation funds .......................................................... $3,000
- Model workplace ................................................................. $2,400,000
- Hazardous materials disposal ............................................. $9,800,000

Subtotal, Screen Training and Other............................... $246,550,000

Human Resource Services .................................................. $307,234,000

Checkpoint Support ........................................................... $165,000,000

Explosive Detection Systems:

- EDS/ETD purchase ............................................................ $175,000,000
- EDS/ETD installation .......................................................... $45,000,000
- EDS/ETD maintenance and utilities ....................................... $200,000,000
- Operation integration ........................................................ $23,000,000

Subtotal, Explosive Detection Systems ......................... $443,000,000

Aviation Direction and Enforcement:

- Aviation regulation and other enforcement ....................... $222,416,000
- Airport management, information technology and support .......................................................... $868,032,000
- Federal law enforcement, aircraft and flight crew training ................................................................. $90,500,000
- Air cargo ......................................................................... $55,000,000
- Foreign and domestic repair stations ...................................... $3,000,000
- Airport perimeter security ............................................... $5,000,000

Subtotal, Aviation Direction and Enforcement .................. $1,001,948,000

Total, Aviation Security .................................................. $4,607,386,000

STAFFING LEVELS

The conferees agree to continue longstanding bill language that caps the full-time equivalent screener workforce at 45,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees expect the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to have no more than 45,000 full-time equivalent screeners by the end of fiscal year 2006. The conferees recognize TSA may need to realign its workforce throughout the year due to attrition or advances in detection technologies. TSA has the flexibility to hire screeners during the fiscal year at those airports where additional or replacement screeners are necessary to maintain aviation security and customer service.

PRIVATIZED SCREENING AIRPORTS

The conferees agree to provide $139,654,000 as proposed by the House instead of $146,151,000 as proposed by the Senate. If additional airports are not interested in privatization, or airports currently under this program decide to begin using federal screeners resulting in the need for less funding in fiscal year 2006 to support the current privatized screening airports, TSA is directed to notify the Committees on Appropriations prior to these changes occurring. After that time period has expired, TSA shall adjust its program, project, and activity line items to account for changes in third party private screening contracts and screener personnel, compensation and benefits to reflect the award of contracts under the screening partnership program (SPP).

PASSPORT ISSUANCE SCREENERS, PERSONNEL, COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

The conferees agree to provide $1,520,000 for passenger screening and $884,800,000 for baggage screening activities for both federal screening and SMAC contracts awarded under SPP for all airports other than the six current privatized screening airports. The conferees agree TSA needs the flexibility to manage the SPP without the need for reprogramming actions for each individual contract and direct TSA to provide the Committee on Appropriations with advance notice ten days before an announcement is made an airport has been selected under SPP or if an airport has decided to begin using federal screeners. At the time the contract is awarded, TSA shall notify the Committees and adjust its program, project, and activity line items to account for changes in third party private screening contracts and screener personnel, compensation and benefits to reflect the award of contracts under SPP.

RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The conferees agree to include bill language that provides reimbursement for secure services and related equipment and supplies in support of general aviation access to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as proposed by the Senate. These reimbursements shall be credited to the “Aviation Security” appropriation and be available until expended for those purposes.

CHECKPOINT SUPPORT

The conferees agree to provide $165,000,000 instead of $157,651,000 as proposed by the House and $172,461,000 as proposed by the Senate. This funding should be used to accelerate the testing, procurement, installation, and deployment of new checkpoint technologies. TSA should test these new technologies and equipment at airports using both federal and nonfederal screeners and submit the report originally requested in fiscal year 2005 on testing and deploying emerging technologies to screen passengers and carry-on baggage to the Committees on Appropriations as expeditiously as possible.

STANDARDS FOR CHECKPOINT TECHNOLOGIES

The conferees recommend TSA work with the National Institute of Standards and Technology to develop standards for checkpoint technologies, as discussed in the Senate report.

EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEMS INSTALLATION

The conferees agree to provide a total of $295,000,000 for explosive detection systems (EDS) installation, including $250,000,000 in mandatory funding from the Aviation Security Capital Fund and $45,000,000 in the Act. This funding is sufficient to fulfill the federal commitment for the eight Letters of Intent and to install next-generation EDS machines at airports worldwide. The conferees have modified bill language proposed by the Senate clarifying the federal government’s cost under a Letter of Intent shall be 75 percent for any medium and large hub airport and 90 percent for any other airports. The conferees also include bill language to permit the Secretary to distribute this funding to enhance aviation security and fulfill the federal commitment to Letters of Intent. The conferees encourage TSA to pursue innovative financing solutions to improve the baggage screening process, as discussed in the House report.
EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT

The conferees agree to provide $175,000,000 instead of $170,000,000 as proposed by the House and $180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of these funds, $45,000,000 shall be made available to procure next-generation explosive detection systems, including inline systems, which have been tested, certified, and piloted. The conferees expect these new systems to replace explosive trace detection systems as much as possible as they are considerably less costly to operate.

EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE COSTS

The conferees are concerned about the skyrocketing costs of maintaining explosive detection systems. The conferees direct the Government Accountability Office to report by April 2006 on the reasons for past cost increases, including TSA contracting practices. This report is to recommend actions TSA might take to control these costs in the future.

REMOTE BAGGAGE SCREENING

The conferees are aware of TSA’s participation with airports and airlines in pilots at various airports around the country to evaluate off-site baggage check-in models. The conferees encourage TSA to widely test remote baggage screening, including coupling systems with off-site screening within the airport grounds at secure sort facilities before the baggage is introduced into the terminal and other critical airport infrastructure.

MULTI-COMPARTMENTAL BINS

The conferees direct TSA to develop a plan to research, test, and potentially implement multi-compartmental bins to screen passenger belongings at security checkpoints.

SCREENING EXEMPTIONS

The conferees agree to retain bill language proposed by the Senate that does not allow head of federal agencies and commissions to be exempt from passenger and baggage screening.

AVIATION REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The conferees agree to provide $222,416,000 instead of $230,000,000 as proposed by the House and $230,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AVIATION MANAGEMENT, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SUPPORT

The conferees agree to provide $886,692,000 instead of $865,000,000 as proposed by the House and $748,370,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, $245,662,000 is for management and support staff and $442,370,000 is for information technology.

FEDERAL FLIGHT DECK OFFICER AND FLIGHT CREW TRAINING

The conferees agree to provide $30,500,000 instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the House and $32,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, $27,000,000 is for federal flight deck officer training and $3,500,000 is for voluntary flight crew training.

AIR CARGO

The conferees agree to provide $55,000,000 instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, $10,000,000 is for hiring 100 additional regulatory inspectors and any new inspectors or canine teams.

Travelers and associated travel costs, and $5,000,000 is to enhance the automated indirect air carrier maintenance system and known shipper data base, as well as for security threat assessments and pending air cargo rulemaking activities.

In addition to the funds provided to TSA for air cargo, the conferees provide $30,000,000 to the Science and Technology (S&T) Directorate to conduct three cargo screening pilot programs testing different concepts of operation. TSA is to cooperate with S&T on this effort.

The conferees direct TSA to work with other DHS components to develop technologies that will move TSA forward to achieving 100-percent screening of air cargo on passenger aircraft.

GENERAL AVIATION

The conferees concur with the House report supporting the Airport Watch program.

AIRPORT PERIMETER SECURITY

The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 for airport perimeter security pilots. While this funding was not provided for this work in the past, the conferees are aware of a variety of innovative technologies that may reduce security weaknesses and vulnerabilities in airports throughout the United States. This funding should be awarded competitively.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

The conferees agree to provide $36,000,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate. Funding is provided as follows:

Enterprise staff .......................................................................................................................... $24,000,000
Hazardous materials truck tracking and training ................................................................. 4,000,000
Rail inspectors and canines ................................................................................................... 8,000,000

Total ........................................................................................................................................ 36,000,000

RAIL SECURITY INSPECTORS AND CANINES

The conferees are very disappointed with TSA’s reluctance to quickly hire rail inspectors and deploy canine units at transit systems nationwide. While these activities were funded in fiscal year 2005, TSA does not have a full contingent of rail inspectors on board and only announced the deployment of canine teams on September 27, 2005. This is unacceptable. The conferees direct TSA to report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than February 10, 2006, on the deployment of the 100 rail security inspectors and canine teams funded in fiscal year 2005 and any new inspectors or canine teams planned for fiscal year 2006.

Direct Appropriations:

Secure flight .......................................................................................................................... $56,696,000
Crew vetting ......................................................................................................................... 13,300,000
Screening administration and operations ........................................................................... 5,000,000

Total, direct appropriations ................................................................................................. 74,996,000

Fee Collections:

Registered traveler .............................................................................................................. 20,000,000
Transportation worker identification ................................................................................ 100,000,000
Hazardous materials ........................................................................................................... 50,000,000
Alien flight school (by transfer from DOJ) ....................................................................... 10,000,000

Total, fee collections .......................................................................................................... 180,000,000

SECURE FLIGHT

The conferees agree to provide $56,696,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House. TSA has failed to provide a fully justified cost estimate for this program for fiscal year 2006 or achieve initial operational capability with two airlines on August 19, 2005, as originally planned. TSA does not have a revised schedule and milestones. The conferees have reduced funding for Secure Flight accordingly.

The conferees support the additional layer of aviation security that will be provided through the Secure Flight program. However, delays in obtaining Passenger Name Records by air carriers necessary for a testing that have postponed initial operating capability of the system. The conferees encourage TSA to commence rulemaking proceedings, and, if necessary, issue a security directive at the earliest possible date to require air carriers to release data necessary for operational tests expected to commence shortly.

The conferees agree to include and modify a general provision (section 518) which directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to continue to evaluate DHS and TSA actions to meet the ten elements listed in section 522 of Public Law 108-334 and to report to the Committees on Appropriations whether either incrementally or when all elements have been satisfied. The provision also prohibits the use of commercial data.

On July 26, 2005, GAO reported that TSA had not adequately disclosed the use of personal information during Secure Flight testing, violating the Privacy Notice. The conferees are concerned with the recent GAO findings, giving further credence for GAO to continue reviewing the Secure Flight program.

TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL

The conferees agree to include a general provision (section 526) directing the Department to develop a personalization system that is centrally managed and uses an existing government card production facility for these purposes as proposed by the House, consistent with direction issued in previous years. TSA may not move into the next phase of production until the Committees on Appropriations have been fully briefed on the results of the prototype phase and agree the program should move forward. Because of the deep interest in this program, beginning...
on January 1, 2006, and quarterly thereafter. TSA shall submit reports on the progress of meeting the goals established for the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) program.

Screening and Operations

The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 for screening and operations and as proposed by both the House and the Senate. The conferees direct that none of the funds may be used to augment the Secure Flight program and expect funds to be used to support existing transportation screening and credentialing programs that are user fee funded, such as TWIC, alien flight school, and hazardous materials. The conferees are aware these fee-funded programs have carry-over balances from previous fiscal years that may be used to augment administrative and operational needs.

Transportation Security Support

The conferees agree to provide $510,483,000 instead of $541,008,000 as proposed by the House and $491,673,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding is provided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Headquarters Administration</th>
<th>Information Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td>$275,921,000</td>
<td>$210,092,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Transportation Security Support</td>
<td>$510,483,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending and Deployment Plans

The conferees agree to include bill language to require TSA to submit 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act a plan to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the optimal deployment plan for explosive detection equipment at the Nation’s airports on a priority basis. Funding is available to place explosive trace detection machines; and an expenditure plan for explosive detection systems procurement and installation on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2006. The conferees have requested this information for the past two years in report language and TSA has repeatedly ignored these requests. The conferees include bill language withholding $5,000,000 from obligation until this plan is received.

Federal Air Marshals

The Secretary’s organizational restructuration plan submitted on July 13, 2005, recommended moving the appropriation for the Federal Air Marshals (FAMs) from Immigration and Customs Enforcement to TSA. The conferees concur with this recommendation and agree to provide $668,200,000 for FAMs instead of $698,860,000 as proposed by the House and $678,994,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within this amount, $4,200,000 is for management and administrative expenses, $70,800,000 is for travel and training, and $2,000,000 is to implement the air-to-ground communications and alert system. Funding is available for one year as proposed by the Senate.

Staffing

The conferees have fully funded the new staff requested; however, funding has been provided for half a year, consistent with actions taken elsewhere in the Department because of the time it takes to hire new employees. A classified report on the status of hiring and training new Federal Air Marshals shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations no later than February 10, 2006.

Airport Law Enforcement

The conferees direct FAMs to submit a report, in conjunction with the fiscal year 2007 budget, that details a proposal to expand its mission beyond the aircraft and enter the airport security arena, including surveillance in the airport environment and airport-related investigations. The report should elaborate on these expanded responsibilities and the potential implications to FAMs and the Commandant. The conferees, in addition to FAMs commission, include the types of investigations that would be conducted in airports; the potential tangible benefits of FAMs conducting surveillance in an airport environment; and whether this expansion would merit and require the conversion of air marshals to 1811 status; a timeframe for implementation; statistical distribution of workload between hours of airport and aircraft missions; additional FTE required; additional costs associated with an enhanced airport mission; additional training requirements; and how an expanded FAMs mission would interrelate with the numerous law enforcement agencies that are currently conducting airport security operations. FAMs shall not move forward with this proposal until the report has been submitted and reviewed by the Committees on Appropriations.

Air-to-Ground Communications

The conferees agree to provide $2,000,000 for the air-to-ground communications program. The conferees are aware of FAMs working with Science and Technology (S&T), the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Aviation Administration to implement an airborne communications system in 2006. The conferees consider this a critical security program and direct FAMs, in conjunction with S&T, to brief the Committees on Appropriations quarterly on its progress.

United States Coast Guard Operating Expenses (Including Rescission of Funds)

The conferees agree to provide $5,492,331,000 instead of $5,500,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,476,016,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within this amount, $2,300,000,000 is available for defense-related activities as proposed by both the House and the Senate. Further, within this total, $15,450,000 is provided for command, control, communications, computer intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (CHISR) follow-on costs; $10,000,000 is provided as an increase for the Area Security Maritime Exercise Program; $12,000,000 is provided as an increase to implement the May 13, 2005, decision by the Commandant to restructure the Mariner Licensing and Documentation Program; and an additional $4,000,000 above the amounts enacted in fiscal year 2005 is included for C-130J operations. No funding is provided for radiological/nuclear detection and one-time reinvestment costs due to inadequate budget justifications for these activities. The conferees agree to rescind $15,105,569 in obligated balances from funds provided for port security assessments at tier one ports due to successful completion of this program. Funding for operating expenses shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal, Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance</th>
<th>956,970,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Training and Recruiting</td>
<td>177,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance:</td>
<td>1,134,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attache Costs</td>
<td>185,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Command</td>
<td>169,188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st District</td>
<td>177,894,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th District</td>
<td>47,366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th District</td>
<td>58,076,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th District</td>
<td>39,134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th District</td>
<td>28,431,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th District</td>
<td>28,238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th District</td>
<td>14,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters directorates</td>
<td>23,951,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters supported units</td>
<td>267,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>120,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Pay and Benefits</td>
<td>3,004,818,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Recruiting</td>
<td>83,554,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>91,576,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Training and Recruiting</td>
<td>177,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance</td>
<td>956,970,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSIVENESS TO CONGRESS

The conferees are disappointed and frustrated with the Coast Guard’s poor responsiveness to Committee direction. For this reason, the conferees note reductions to the budget request for operating expenses as directed at the Coast Guard’s senior management and not its field units. The conferees recognize the sacrifices of Coast Guard field personnel and have provided the full amount requested in the fiscal year 2006 budget request to support operational units.

POLAR ICEBREAKING

Both the House and Senate approved the transfer of $47,500,000 in polar icebreaking funding from the Coast Guard to the National Science Foundation (NSF) as requested in the budget. The conferees encourage the Coast Guard, NSF, and the Executive Office of the President to finalize a long-term strategy for polar icebreaking. The conferees direct the Coast Guard to pursue a sustainable cost sharing agreement with the NSF for unanticipated and extraordinary maintenance of the polar icebreakers.

The conferees are disappointed and frustrated with the Coast Guard’s inadequate responsiveness to Committee direction. For this reason, the conferees direct the Coast Guard to pursue a sustainable cost sharing agreement with the NSF for unanticipated and extraordinary maintenance of the polar icebreakers. The conferees are disappointed and frustrated with the Coast Guard’s inadequate responsiveness to Committee direction. For this reason, the conferees direct the Coast Guard to pursue a sustainable cost sharing agreement with the NSF for unanticipated and extraordinary maintenance of the polar icebreakers.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

The conferees agree to provide $12,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

RESERVE TRAINING

The conferees agree to provide $139,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

The conferees agree to provide $1,141,800,000 instead of $796,152,000 as proposed by the House and $1,141,802,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding is provided as follows:

DEEPWATER

The conferees agree to provide $933,100,000 for the Integrated Deepwater System instead of $500,000,000 as proposed by the House and $988,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are troubled by the progress of the Deepwater program. In response to the post-9/11 reassembling requirements set forth within Public Law 108-334, the Coast Guard responded by missing deadlines, submitting inadequate information, and taking what was a structurally sound acquisition program and turning it into a confusing plan that did not sufficiently explain how the Coast Guard intends to manage what is now a $24,000,000,000, 25-year effort. The conferees are supportive of Deepwater and want to see tangible progress in the modernization of the Coast Guard’s fleet. However, the conferees are frustrated with the Coast Guard’s inadequate justification and poor planning for Deepwater resources.

The conferees include a new provision directing the Coast Guard to submit a review of the Revised Deepwater Implementation Plan in conjunction with the President’s fiscal year 2007 budget request. This report shall include: a detailed explanation of any changes to the plan for fiscal year 2007; a detailed, annual performance comparison of Deepwater assets to pre-Deepwater legacy assets in terms of operations and maintenance costs, operational availability (including mean time between failure and mean time to restore), mission performance, and crewing; a status report of legacy assets, including modernization progress, operational availability, and the projected, remaining service life of each class of legacy Deepwater asset; a comprehensive explanation of how the Coast Guard is accounting for the costs of legacy assets in the Deepwater program;
an explanation of why many assets that are elements of the Integrated Deepwater System are not accounted for within Deepwater’s appropriation (such as the missionized assets of the C-130J, the 179-foot Cyclone class cutters, and the airborne use of force outfitting of the HH60s and HH65s); a description of the competitive process conducted in all contracts and subcontracts exceeding $5,000,000; a description of how the Coast Guard is planning for the human resource needs of Deepwater assets including recruiting; and an explanation for each asset utilizing such crewing and qualification training for commanding officers and petty officers in charge of Deepwater patrol boats; and the earned value management system gold card data, including data for all the factors in this system, for each asset being procured under Deepwater, including C130R and C-130J missionization.

The conferees acknowledge the Coast Guard’s assertion that the accuracy of a Revised Deepwater Implementation Plan beyond five years is based upon numerous, unpredictable variables such as national security priorities and resource constraints. Therefore, the conferees believe the acquisition schedule for the duration of the plan will likely undergo significant modifications in five-year increments. The Coast Guard has also pointed to five-year increments, beginning in 2011, as benchmarks for measuring the performance of Deepwater assets as an entire system of systems, vice a fleet of non-integrated assets. These reasons, the conferees have included a new provision directing the Coast Guard to submit a comprehensive review of the Revised Deepwater Implementation Plan every five years beginning in fiscal year 2011. This plan shall include a complete projection of the acquisition costs and schedule for the duration of the plan through fiscal year 2027.

As Deepwater progresses, the conferees recognize there must be a methodical transition to integrate the new assets into Coast Guard operations. The conferees believe diligent management of transition is central to ensuring the effectiveness of the Deepwater program as well as the operational readiness of the Coast Guard. To address this concern, the conferees direct the Coast Guard to conduct an operational gap analysis for all Deepwater assets and provide an action plan on how the revised Deepwater plan addresses the shortfalls between current operational capabilities and operational requirements, as specified in the revised, post-9/11 Mission Needs Statement approved on January 21, 2005. This report should apply advanced analytical methods for forecasting future needs, as required in the Senate report, and should be submitted concurrently with the Coast Guard’s fiscal year 2007 budget request.

**PATROL BOATS**

The conferees are very concerned about the availability and performance of the Coast Guard’s patrol boat fleet. The 110-foot Island Class patrol boats are currently experiencing major maintenance problems as well as technological obsolescence and the planned patrol boat replacement under Deepwater—the Fast Response Cutter (FRC)—is several years away from sea trials and production. The Coast Guard’s patrol boat needs are further stressed given the termination of the 110-to-123 conversion program that was intended to bridge the gap between the phase-out of the 110 and the deployment of the FRC. To address this critical issue and looming shortfall in patrol boat mission hours, the conferees agree to include a provision (section 527) rescinding unobligated funds in the amount of $78,630,689 appropriated for 110-to-123 conversions in fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 and re-appropriating the funds for the service life extension of Island Class patrol boats and the design, production, and long lead materials of the FRC. The conferees direct the Coast Guard to provide a patrol boat availability report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than February 10, 2006, which includes an expenditure plan for the 110 service life extension program; a detailed explanation of the FRC’s accelerated design and production that includes the application of the funds provided by this Act; and a mission hour and operational availability report for each 110 foot and 123 foot patrol boat in service.

**COVERT MANNED SURVEILLANCE AIRCRAFT**

The conferees do not include a rescission of $13,999,000 in prior appropriations for the purchase of covert manned surveillance aircraft as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct the Coast Guard to move forward with this procurement and agree to provide $10,000,000 for sensor procurement and installation as proposed by the House.

**RESCUE 21**

Due to high unobligated balances and extended procurement delays, the conferees agree to provide $41,000,000 for Rescue 21 instead of $91,000,000 as proposed by the House and $81,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**ALTERATION OF BRIDGES**

The conferees agree to provide $15,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. Within this total, funds shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Name and Location</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Street Bridge in Chelsea, Massachusetts</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Pacific Railroad Bridge in La Crosse, Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen Mile Bridge, Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston Railway Bridge, Galveston, Texas</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Northern Santa Fe Bridge in Burlington, Iowa</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway Company Bridge, Morris, Illinois</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**

The conferees agree to provide $17,750,000 instead of $18,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House proposed $17,000,000 within the Science and Technology Directorate. The conferees expect the Commandant of the Coast Guard to continue to coordinate with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology on research and development activities.

**RETIRED PAY**

The conferees agree to provide $1,014,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

**UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

The conferees agree to provide $1,208,310,000 instead of $1,228,981,000 as proposed by the House and $1,188,630,000 as proposed by the Senate. This includes: $2,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, for Secret Service costs related to National Special Security Events; $39,600,000 to support investigations of electronic crimes; and $7,889,000 for services related to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, including $2,389,000 for forensic support. Funds shall be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection: Protection of persons and facilities</td>
<td>$576,316,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Special Security Event Fund</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective intelligence activities</td>
<td>56,215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House mail screening</td>
<td>16,365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Protection</td>
<td>651,936,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field operations: Domestic field operations</td>
<td>238,888,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International field office administration, operations and training</td>
<td>20,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic crimes special agent program and electronic crimes task forces</td>
<td>39,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Field operations</td>
<td>299,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: Headquarters, management and administration</td>
<td>203,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Missing and Exploited Children</td>
<td>7,889,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Administration</td>
<td>211,121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training: Rowley Training Center</td>
<td>46,337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>1,208,310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NATIONAL SPECIAL SECURITY EVENTS**

The conferees agree to provide $2,500,000 for the costs associated with National Special Security Events (NSSEs), instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and no funds as proposed by the Senate. When combined with an unobligated balance of $3,229,000 from fiscal year 2005 appropriations, a total of $4,829,000 is available for...
NSSEs; funds appropriated in this Act for this purpose are made available through September 30, 2007. The conferees are aware of additional funds available through the Counterterrorism Fund, which may be made available for this purpose. The conferees are disappointed with the Secret Service’s lack of budgetary planning for the costs associated with preparations for NSSEs. Despite the considerable growth in size, complexity, and cost of NSSEs since their inception, the Secret Service has not effectively managed the resources and impact of these events. The conferees prohibit the obligation of funds provided under this heading until the Committees on Appropriations receive a current NSSE budget model, as described in the House report.

**WORKLOAD RELABALCING**

The conferees note the unacceptable high workload of personnel that has resulted from the significant increase in the scope of the Secret Service’s dual mission. An average overtime rate of 80 hours per special agent per month has arisen from a constantly evolving, post-9/11 threat environment; a three-fold increase in the number of protectees since 9/11; proliferation of identity theft; and the occurrence of increasingly complex NSSEs; and support of Departmental missions such as critical infrastructure protection and cyber security. The conferees believe current workload conditions are unsustainable and direct the Secret Service to submit a workload rebalancing report as described within the House report no later than February 10, 2006.

**ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES**

The conferees agree to provide $1,699,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate.

**TITLE III—PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY**

**MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION**

The conferees agree to provide $16,079,000 for management and administration of the Preparedness Directorate. Included in this amount is $13,172,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Preparedness; $2,000,000 for the Office of the Chief Medical Officer, as proposed in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005; and $892,000 for the Office of National Capital Region Coordination, including half year funding for two new staff. The conferees encourage the Office of National Capital Region Coordination to detail these personnel to the Homeland Security Operations Center if appropriate and necessary.

The conferees establish this new account in response to the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005, and include resources previously provided under the Office of the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP); the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security; the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness; and the Office of National Capital Region Coordination previously funded in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management.

The conferees understand the newly created Preparedness Directorate will assess and prioritize policies and operations to enhance preparedness for a natural disaster or terrorist attack. The conferees direct this Directorate to work with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to continue an all-hazard approach for preparation, response and recovery to any type of disaster.

**OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS**

**SALES AND EXPENSES**

The conferees agree to provide $8,741,000 for Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP) salaries and expenses.

**STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS**

The conferees agree to provide $2,501,300,000 instead of $2,831,400,000 as proposed by the House and $2,714,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. State and Local Programs funding is allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Formula Grants:</th>
<th>$550,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Homeland Security Grant Program</td>
<td>$550,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, State Formula Grants</td>
<td>$950,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Grants:</td>
<td>$765,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area</td>
<td>$765,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and Transit Security</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Security</td>
<td>$175,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zone Protection Plan</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Bus Security</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucking Security</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Discretionary Grants</td>
<td>$1,185,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Equipment Direct Assistance Program</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Programs:</td>
<td>$1,135,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Domestic Preparedness Consortium</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Exercise Program</td>
<td>$52,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Medical Response System</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Training Grants</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Training Grants</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations and Assessments</td>
<td>$14,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, National Programs</td>
<td>$346,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, State and Local Programs</td>
<td>$2,501,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of eligibility for funds under this heading, any county, city, village, town, district, borough, parish, port authority, transit authority, intercity rail provider, commuter rail system, freight rail provider, water district, regional planning commission, council of government, Indian tribe with jurisdiction over Indian country, authorized tribal organization, Alaska Native village, independent authority, special district, local subdivision of any state shall constitute a “local unit of government.”

The conferees expect ODP to continue all current overtime reimbursement practices. The conferees continue bill language prohibiting the use of funds for construction, except for Port Security, Rail and Transit Security, and Buffer Zone Protection Plan grants. Bill language is included, however, to allow State Homeland Security Grant Program, Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP), and High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area grants to be used for minor perimeter security projects and minor repairs or renovation of necessary guard facilities, fencing, and related efforts, not to exceed $1,000,000 as deemed necessary by the Secretary. The conferees further agree that the erection of communication towers, which are included in a jurisdiction’s interoperable communications plan, does not constitute construction for the purposes of this Act.

In addition, the conferees include bill language requiring the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the validity of the threat and risk factors, and the application of those factors in the allocation of funds provided to ODP, and to report to the Committees on Appropriations by November 17, 2005, on the results of this review. The Department is required to provide GAO with the necessary information within seven days of enactment of this Act to ensure that this review does not impact the allocation of grants to state and local entities. Further, the conferees direct GAO to review the validity of risk factors used to allocate discretionary grants, including a project-by-project analysis of grants to nonprofit organizations, in fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005, and report to the Committees on Appropriations by May 5, 2006, on the results of this review.

The conferees are concerned with the length of time, some in excess of three years, which certain State and local jurisdictions take to fully expend grant funds. The conferees direct the Department to report, by February 10, 2006, on the status of all open grants made prior to fiscal year 2003, including the specific reasons why the grant dollars have not yet been expended. Further, the report should include recommendations on actions being taken to ensure grant funds are spent in a timely manner and include an update on the execution of recommendations of the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding Report, dated June 2001.

The conferees agree that for State Formula Grants and High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area grants, application kits shall be made available within 45 days after the start of fiscal year 2006, states shall have 90 days to apply after the grant is announced, and ODP shall act on an application within 90 days of its receipt. The conferees further agree that no less than 80 percent of these funds shall be passed by the states to local units of government within 60 days of the state receiving funds. Not to exceed three
The conferees agree to provide $550,000,000 for SHSGP instead of $800,100,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate proposed $1,338,000,000 for State and Local Assistance, combining SHSGP and High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area Grants into a single account. The conferees also provide $400,000,000 for LETTP as proposed by both the House and Senate.

**STATE FORMULA GRANTS**

The conferees agree to provide $1,155,000,000 instead of $1,190,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,338,000,000 for State and Local Assistance, combining SHSGP and High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area Grants into a single appropriation, and provided $250,000,000 for Transportation and Infrastructure Grants in a separate appropriation. Of the funds provided, $755,000,000 is made available to the Secretary for discretionary grants to high-threat, high-density urban areas, including $25,000,000 for grants to non-profit organizations determined by the Secretary to be at high risk of terrorism and national terrorism priorities as proposed by the Senate. The Secretary may not delegate this determination authority and the Secretary shall retain operational subject matter expertise of these grants and will be fully engaged in the administration of related grant programs.

**PORT SECURITY**

The conferees agree to provide $175,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct ODP to ensure all port security grants are coordinated with the state, local port authority, and the Captain of the Port so all vested parties are aware of the threat and that limited resources are maximized. The conferees encourage the Secretary to consider the importance of liquefied natural gas facilities and liquefied petroleum gas vessels among the risk factors when deciding eligibility for port security grants.

**RAIL AND TRANSIT SECURITY**

The conferees agree to provide $150,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. ODP shall continue to work with TSA to develop a robust rail and transit security program and with the Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) to coordinate with existing research and design requirements for rail and transit security.

The conferees are concerned by a recent ODP risk assessment that highlights the need for redundant transit operation control abilities in the national capital region to maintain federal government continuity of operations. The conferees direct ODP to submit a report no later than February 10, 2006, on the steps that may be taken to ensure this deficiency is addressed.

**COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT DIRECT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

The conferees agree to provide $50,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate.

The conferees concur with both the House and Senate report language on the Commercial Equipment Direct Assistance Program. The conferees encourage ODP to work with the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure promising technologies, such as skin decontamination kits currently in use by DOD, are made available on the commercial market for purchase by homeland agencies responsible for homeland security.

**NATIONAL DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM**

The conferees agree to provide $145,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House. This funding shall be allocated in accordance with the Senate report.

**METROPOLITAN MEDICAL RESPONSE SYSTEM**

The conferees agree to provide $30,000,000 instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

The conferees agree to provide $20,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees recognize the importance of interoperable communications standards, which are key to the Department’s efforts to improve communications nationally. The conferees direct the Under Secretary for Science and Technology (S&T) to expedite the development of standards and coordinate with ODP to ensure ODP’s technical assistance program incorporates these standards, as appropriate, and as spelled out in the Memorandum of Agreement between S&T and ODP.

The conferees note there is no existing capability for real-time exchange of information at the regional or interstate levels regarding equipment and supplies inventory, readiness, or the compatibility of equipment. The conferees encourage ODP to review the use of logistics centers to consolidate State and local assets, provide life-cycle management and maintenance of equipment, allow for easy identification and rapid deployment during an incident, and allow for the sharing of inventories across jurisdictions.

**DEMONSTRATION TRAINING GRANTS**

The conferees agree to provide $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are concerned, while terrorism prevention is a national priority, little is being done to create prevention expertise in our nation’s first responders. Without well-developed terrorism prevention plans, state and local agencies lack a key piece in the fight against terrorism. The conferees encourage ODP to create a terrorism prevention certificate training program that will enable graduates to help their communities or organizations develop the necessary terrorism prevention plans.

**CONTINUING TRAINING GRANTS**

The conferees agree to provide $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House.

**CATASTROPHIC PLANNING**

The conferees agree to provide $20,000,000 instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Mobilizing communities and citizens to assist law enforcement in preventing and responding to terrorism is as important as preparing communities and citizens to respond to a terrorist incident. The conferees are aware of the work the Citizen Corps has done in partnership with the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) in organizing comprehensive community planning. The conferees encourage ODP to expand the Citizen Corps program to provide technical assistance in all of its programs and to work with the NCPC.

**RURAL DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM**

The conferees agree to provide $10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate included no similar provision. The conferees direct ODP to continue the development of comprehensive training and accreditation for rural first responders and ensure the coordination of such efforts with existing ODP training partners.

**INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATIONS**

The conferees concur with the Senate report language regarding interoperable communication implementation plans.

**HOMELAND SECURITY PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE 8**

The conferees concur with the House report language regarding Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 implementation; however, ODP shall issue the final National Preparedness Goal no later than December 31, 2005, and complete the National Preparedness Assessment and Reporting System no later than September 30, 2006.

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

The conferees are very concerned with the lack of first responder grant funding being provided to the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) community. The conferees direct ODP to require state and local governments to include representatives of emergency committees as an equal partner and to facilitate a nationwide EMS needs assessment. The conferees do not mandate that a certain percentage of grant funding for any one type of first responders. However, the conferees direct ODP to evaluate how much money goes to EMS providers and to require prioritization from providing at least ten percent of its grant funding to EMS providers to better train and equip them to provide critical life-saving assistance in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, or explosive event.

**CATASTROPHIC PLANNING**

The conferees note the tragic events in the wake of Hurricane Katrina indicate the importance of preparation and having plans in place to deal with catastrophic events. It is imperative all states and Urban Area Security Initiative grantees ensure there are sufficient resources devoted to putting in place plans for the complete evacuation of residents, including special needs groups in hospitals and nursing homes, or residents with disabilities that require transportation and after such an event, as well as plans for sustenance of evacuees.

The conferees direct the Secretary to report on the status of catastrophic planning including mass evacuation planning in all 50 states and the 75 largest urban areas by February 10, 2006. The report should include certifications from each state and urban area as to the exact status of plans for evacuations of entire metropolitan areas in the state and the entire state, the dates such plans were last conducted, the date exercises were last conducted using the plans, and plans for sustenance of evacuees.

**HURLIGIBILITY**

The conferees urge the Department to work with state and local governments to ensure regional authorities, such as port, transit, or tribal authorities are given due consideration in the distribution of State Formula Grants.

**RAPID DECONTAMINATION PREPAREDNESS**

The conferees are concerned with the lack of planning and preparation for a rapid decontamination response in the event of a large scale biological or chemical attack. The conferees direct ODP to continue the interagency cooperation with S&T, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other relevant federal agencies,
to report, not later than February 10, 2006, on the feasibility and plan for establishing a regionally based, pre-positioned rapid response capability for the decontamination of biological and chemical agents based on technologies that meet the decontamination standards for those agents.

**EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY**

The conferees direct the Secretary to comply with section 522 of the Senate bill with regard to a survey of state and local government emergency officials.

**FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS**

The conferees agree to provide $656,000,000 instead of $650,000,000 as proposed by the House and $655,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, $110,000,000 shall be for firefighting grants as authorized by section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $115,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are concerned by the Department’s proposed shift in grant focus from all-hazards to placing a priority on terrorism, and the proposed deletion of several eligible activities, specifically, wellness and fitness programs, emergency medical services, fire prevention and education programs, and modifications of facilities for health and safety of personnel. The Department shall continue the current practice of funding those applications according to local priorities and those established by the United States Fire Administration (USFA), continue direct funding of grants to fire departments, continue the peer review process for determining funding awards, reinstate all previously eligible funding areas, and include the USFA during grant administration. The conferees further agree to make $3,000,000 available for implementation of section 205(c) of Public Law 108-169, the United States Fire Administration Reorganization Act of 2003.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS**

The conferees agree to provide $135,000,000 instead of $180,000,000 as proposed by the House and $190,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPGs) are vital to state and local emergency management systems. The Department shall continue funding personnel training without a limit and continue current grant administrative practices, including grant allocation and a focus on all-hazards, in a manner identical to fiscal year 2005. The conferees agree ODP shall continue to include the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) subject matter experts in the review of EMPG applications, determinations of eligibility, and making award determinations. Furthermore, the conferees expect FEMA to honor commitments to states by making grants and ensuring funds reach the emergency management communities as quickly as possible.

**RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM**

The conferees agree to provide for the receipt and expenditure of fees collected, as authorized by Public Law 105-276 and as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees move these programs from the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate to the Preparedness Directorate, as proposed in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan dated July 13, 2005.

**UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION AND TRAINING**

The conferees agree to provide $41,948,000 for the United States Fire Administration and Training. Of this amount, $1,507,000 is for the Noble Training Center. The conferees move these programs from the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate to the Preparedness Directorate, as proposed in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan dated July 13, 2005. The conferees concur with Senate report language on the preparedness of local fire departments; however, the report shall be provided by March 1, 2007, instead of February 18, 2006.

**INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY**

The conferees agree to provide $625,499,000 for infrastructure protection and information security (IPIS) programs. The conferees move these programs from Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP), Management and Administration and Evaluations, to the Preparedness Directorate, as proposed in the Secretary’s organizational restructuring plan submitted on July 13, 2005. Funding is allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio surveillance</td>
<td>$32,342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Identification and Evaluation</td>
<td>$68,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Security</td>
<td>$1,399,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security/Emergency Preparedness Telecommunications</td>
<td>$93,349,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$112,032,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHEMICAL FACILITY SECURITY**

The conferees direct the Secretary to complete vulnerability assessments of the highest risk chemical facilities in the United States by December 2006. In determining which facilities to assess, the Secretary shall give priority to facilities that, if attacked, pose the greatest threat to human life and the economy. The conferees also direct the Department to complete a national security strategy for the chemical sector by February 10, 2006.

**NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE SIMULATION AND ANALYSIS CENTER (NISAC)**

The conferees agree to provide $20,000,000 instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House and $21,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories shall continue to develop NISAC and the C3I centers in securing the Nation’s critical infrastructure.

**CYBER SECURITY**

The conferees agree to provide $93,349,000, including $30,000,000 for continued National cyber security exercises and outreach. The conferees strongly support cyber partnerships among federal, state, local agencies, and the private sector that demonstrate the ability to transfer technologies from federal laboratories and package them into tools, training, and technical assistance to meet the needs of federal, state, and local end users. Included in the amount provided is the budget request level for United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team operations.

**COUNTERTERRORISM FUND**

The conferees agree to provide $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2006, and $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect the Secretary to provide written notification to the Committees on Appropriations upon the designation of a National Special Security Event. The written notification shall include the following information: location and date of the event, federal agencies involved in the protection and planning of the event, the estimated federal costs of the event, and the source of funding to cover the anticipated expenditure. Further, the conferees will appropriate funds to address the protection of the nation’s critical infrastructure.

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE AND REGIONAL OPERATIONS**

The conferees agree to provide $221,240,000 instead of $227,747,000 as proposed by the House and $220,747,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within these funds, the conferees agree to provide $4,369,000 for the Office of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and $5,000,000 for the Document Management Support Program.

The conferees are concerned with administrative actions being taken to close FEMA’s Pacific Area Office (PAO). The PAO provides the primary and responsive command and support to disasters throughout the Pacific Islands. Given the PAO’s proximity to the other Pacific Islands...
The conferees agree to provide $394,058,000 instead of $349,499,000 as proposed by the House and $193,899,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to reallocate $9,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within these funds, the conferees agree to provide $20,000,000 for catastrophic planning. The conferees agree to reallocate $3,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided for catastrophic planning, the conferees agree FEMA shall reimburse non-governmental organizations with operating agency responsibilities under the Department’s National Response Plan (NRP) and Catastrophic Incident Annex/Supplement (CIA/S) for planning activities required by the NRP-CIA/S, provided costs do not exceed $5,000,000. Further, the Secretary is directed to include these costs in future budget submissions. The conferees concur with Senate bill language encouraging acquisition of an integrated mobile medical system. The conferees agree that FM broadcast radio infrastructure and public television stations are moving forward with several integrated Public Alert and Warning System programs as part of the national alert and warning policy and architecture and encourage FEMA to support these efforts.

The conferees understand the Crisis Counseling Program, funded to provide mental health services for first responders who responded to the Hurricanes Katrina and September 11, 2005, and proposed for 2007 to continue to receive mental health and other services. In order to ensure first responders continue to receive mental health and other services, the conferees direct FEMA to provide a report on the transition of these services from federal to city administration by February 10, 2006.

The conferees agree to provide $34,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees believe that, while the new flood mitigation programs targeted at repetitive loss properties will strengthen the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Fund in the long-term, it is important that Congress manage the short-term health of the Fund as well. Therefore, the conferees direct FEMA, in the execution of these programs, to manage the Fund in the most appropriate manner in order to maintain solvency.

The conferees agree to provide $42,000,000 to support the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. The conferees agree to provide $80,000,000 for backlog elimination, as well as $15,000,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees agree to provide $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to provide $115,000,000, instead of $130,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to provide $115,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees recognize the importance of the Flood Map Modernization Program to state and local governments. When allocating federal flood mapping modernization funds, the conferees encourage FEMA to bifurcate the floodplain data and stream gauge data into retrievable federal flood data in coastal miles within the state, the Mississippi River Delta region, and the participation of the state in leveraging non-federal contributions.
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Missions ...... 80,000,000
Chemical Countermeasures 95,000,000
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measures ............... 110,000,000
Field Testing and Assessment 43,000,000
Conventional Missions ..... 80,000,000

Rapid prototyping program 35,000,000
Emerging Threats 8,000,000
Critical Infrastructure Protection 40,800,000
University Programs/ Homeland Security Fellowship Programs 63,000,000
Counter MANPADS 110,000,000
Safety Act 7,000,000
Cyber Security 16,700,000
Interoperability and Compatibility 26,500,000
Research and Development Consolidation 99,897,000
Radiological and Nuclear Countermeasures 19,086,000
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office 318,014,000

Total, Research, Development, and Operations 1,420,997,000

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER

The conferees do not provide separate funding for Technology Development and Transfer as proposed by the House.

BIOTERRORISM COUNTERMEASURES

The conferees agree to provide $380,000,000 for Biological Countermeasures instead of $360,000,000 as proposed by the House and $394,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to provide $23,000,000 to select a site and other pre-construction activities for the National Bio and Agrodefense Facility.

AIR CARGO

Based on recommendations in Science and Technology’s (S&T) system engineering study of civil aviation security, the conferees direct $30,000,000 be used to conduct three cargo screening pilot programs—one at an all cargo airport facility and two at passenger cargo airports (top twenty in size)—to test different concepts of operation, as described in the House report. The conferees expect S&T to utilize TSA airport management staff to manage the oversight and day-to-day operations of these pilot programs to the greatest extent possible. One of the pilots should test whether a significant amount of cargo can be screened in the terminal using existing checked baggage security infrastructure. The conferees also expect S&T to locate these pilots at airport or
The conferees agree to provide $338,614,000 for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) instead of $327,314,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate. The conferees agree to provide $35,800,000 for Critical Infrastructure Protection instead of $35,800,000 as proposed by the House and $13,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees recommend $26,500,000 to support existing work in research, development and application of technology for community based critical infrastructure protection efforts. The conferees are concerned the Department lacks appropriate assessment tools to help prioritize security risks for critical infrastructure and urge DNDO to examine well-established scientific analysis tools commonly used in assessing and design, including six sigma analysis.

RAPID PROTOTYPING

The conferees agree to provide $35,000,000 for Rapid Prototyping instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees support the budget request and include additional funds of $4,000,000 to encourage further implementation of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and to increase the speed innovative products are being reviewed, certified, and released to market. An additional $74,650,000 is provided for Rapid Prototyping instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount includes $25,000,000 for piloting a rapid prototyping initiative and the Container Security Initiative (CSI) to work with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the Army Research Office to develop technology, utilizing geographic information systems for protective gear; proteomic pathogen reference libraries; aquatic bioassessment; airborne rapid response mapping mobile and portable scanning; investments that focus on nuclear threats and biological attacks, such as aerosolized pathogens and the spread of zoonotic diseases as well as the spread of infectious disease such as SARS and avian flu; real-time detection, identification and assessment of chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological, and explosive agents; and to continue to examine prototype technologies for protecting transit systems.

TUNNELS

The conferees support language in the House report and section 524 of the Senate bill with regard to tunnel detection technologies.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONSOLIDATION

The conferees agree to provide $110,000,000 for R&D consolidation as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees do not support using $10,000,000 of this amount for investigating alternative technologies as proposed by the House.

INTEROPERABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY

The conferees agree to provide $26,500,000 for R&D consolidation instead of $41,500,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided $5,000,000 for additional conference support in addition to $10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees concur with the House report language regarding the Risk Assessment Policy Working Group. The conferees direct the Office of Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) to work with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the U.S. Department of Justice to require, when Project 25 equipment is purchased with such funds, the equipment meets the requirements of a conformity assessment program. The conference agreement specifies that connectivity assessment program be funded by this appropriation and be available by the end of fiscal year 2006. Consistent with current SAFECOM guidelines, the conferees believe that technology can also be funded, but the grant applications should present a compelling argument why the use of these other technologies may significantly help the Department as it seeks to secure our homeland. The conferees support the department to develop such technologies as lightweight miniature cool-down systems for protective gear; proteomic pathogen reference libraries; aquatic bioassessment; airborne rapid response mapping mobile and portable scanning; investments that focus on nuclear threats and biological attacks, such as aerosolized pathogens and the spread of zoonotic diseases as well as the spread of infectious disease such as SARS and avian flu; real-time detection, identification and assessment of chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological, and explosive agents; and to continue to examine prototype technologies for protecting transit systems.

NANOTECHNOLOGY

The conferees believe nanotechnology is a promising technology that can contribute significantly in the defense against terrorism. The conferees encourage DNDO to pursue nanotechnology research and development that may aid in the detection of biological, chemical, radiological, and explosive agents; and to continue to examine prototype technologies for protecting transit systems.

CONVENTIONAL MISSION SUPPORT

The conferees agree to provide $114,760,500 may not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations receive and approve an expenditure plan prepared by the Secretary and reviewed by the Government Accountability Office. None of the funds provided shall be used for deployment of detection systems at airline facilities willing to contribute both existing and new detection systems.

AGROTERRORISM

The conferees encourage the Department to work in conjunction with USDA and HHS to continue the other forms of agroterrorism, including the development and stockpiling of veterinary vaccines. The conferees also encourage DNDO to work with one or more states to develop a model integrated agricultural response system, utilizing geographic information systems, and providing federal and state entities with information on critical infrastructure. Such a system should help prevent, and mitigate the impact of, incidents.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES

The conferees believe that new technologies may significantly help the Department as it seeks to secure our homeland. The conferees encourage the Department to develop such technologies as lightweight miniature cool-down systems for protective gear; proteomic pathogen reference libraries; aquatic bioassessment; airborne rapid response mapping mobile and portable scanning; investments that focus on nuclear threats and biological attacks, such as aerosolized pathogens and the spread of zoonotic diseases as well as the spread of infectious disease such as SARS and avian flu; real-time detection, identification and assessment of chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological, and explosive agents; and to continue to examine prototype technologies for protecting transit systems.
Section 513. The conferees include a new provision requiring the Department to take actions to comply with the second proviso of section 513 of Public Law 108-334 and to submit to the Committees on Appropriations bimonthly beginning on October 1, 2005, if the Department is not in compliance. Additionally, the Secretary shall take all possible measures to ensure that none of the funds may be used for cargo screened beyond the level mandated in section 513 of Public Law 108-334 and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations every six months on the actions taken and the quantity of air cargo inspected at each airport.

Section 514. The conferees continue a provision that allows TSA to impose a reasonable charge for the lease of real and personal property to TSA employees. When the Department submits a reprogramming or transfer request to the Committees on Appropriations and does not receive identical responses from the House and Senate, it is the responsibility of the Department to reconcile the House and Senate differences before proceeding, and if reconciliation is not possible, to consider the reprogramming or transfer approved.

The Department is not to propose a reprogramming or transfer of funds after June 30th of the fiscal year, except in the case of an emergency or extraordinary circumstances such as lives or property are in imminent danger. The conferees continue a provision to make payment to the Department’s Working Capital Fund, except for activities and amounts allowed in section 6024 of Public Law 109-13, excluding the Homeland Secure Data Network, as proposed by the Senate.

Section 505. The conferees continue a provision that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department may be used to make payment to the Department’s Working Capital Fund, except for activities and amounts allowed in section 6024 of Public Law 109-13, excluding the Homeland Secure Data Network, as proposed by the Senate.

Section 506. The conferees continue a provision that provides that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized during fiscal year 2006 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2006.

Section 507. The conferees continue and modify a provision that directs the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) to lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process.

Section 508. The conferees continue and modify a provision that requires notification of the Committees on Appropriations three business days before any grant allocation, discretionary grant award, discretionary contract award, letter of intent, or public announcement of the intention to make such an award totaling in excess of $1,000,000.

Section 509. The conferees continue a provision that none of the funds shall be used to construct, or lease additional facilities for federal law enforcement training centers that could not have been predicted when formulating the budget request for the current fiscal year. Further, the conferees note that when the Department submits a reprogramming or transfer request to the Committees on Appropriations and does not receive identical responses from the House and Senate, it is the responsibility of the Department to reconcile the House and Senate differences before proceeding, and if reconciliation is not possible, to consider the reprogramming or transfer approved.

The Department is not to propose a reprogramming or transfer of funds after June 30th of the fiscal year, except in the case of an emergency or extraordinary circumstances such as lives or property are in imminent danger. The conferees continue a provision to make payment to the Department’s Working Capital Fund, except for activities and amounts allowed in section 6024 of Public Law 109-13, excluding the Homeland Secure Data Network, as proposed by the Senate.

Section 505. The conferees continue a provision that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department may be used to make payment to the Department’s Working Capital Fund, except for activities and amounts allowed in section 6024 of Public Law 109-13, excluding the Homeland Secure Data Network, as proposed by the Senate.

Section 506. The conferees continue a provision that provides that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized during fiscal year 2006 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2006.

Section 507. The conferees continue and modify a provision that directs the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) to lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process.
Section 454. The conference includes a new provision that rescinds $5,500,000 from unobligated balances previously appropriated to the Transportation Security Administration, and $3,000,000 from the Development of the Transportation Security Administration’s security screening opt-out program. The conference agreement deletes section 513 of the Senate bill requiring the Coast Guard to provide a statement of approved but unfunded priorities each year. The conference agreement deletes section 539 of the House bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 532 of the Senate bill requiring the submission of an implementation plan for the Cooperative$lang-0x000$ Homeland Security Act to facilitate the implementation of the Real ID Act of 2005. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a survey of local government emergency officials on homeland security related matters. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 534 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 536 of the Senate bill requiring a quadrennial review of homeland defense. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 533 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 536 of the Senate bill requiring a quadrennial review of homeland defense. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 533 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 536 of the Senate bill requiring a quadrennial review of homeland defense. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 533 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 536 of the Senate bill requiring a quadrennial review of homeland defense. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 533 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 536 of the Senate bill requiring a quadrennial review of homeland defense. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement deletes section 533 of the Senate bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to submit a security plan to open general aviation at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The conference agreement deletes section 531 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate that the Department of Homeland Security should continue to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan in the United States. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.
The conference agreement deletes section 538 of the Senate bill, which would prohibit the Departments of Homeland Security and State from issuing regulations to limit United States citizens to a passport as the exclusive document to be presented upon entry into the United States from Canada by land. The proposed rule, as issued for public comment on September 1, 2005, is in compliance with the Senate provision. The conferees expect that the Department will provide alternatives to SENTRI, NEXUS and FAST for residents of small and rural Northern Border communities.

The conference agreement deletes section 539 of the Senate bill directing the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the justification and effects of raising the Homeland Security Advisory System alert level to Code Orange.

The conference agreement deletes section 540 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate on strengthening security at nuclear power plants.

The conference agreement deletes section 541 of the Senate bill reflecting the sense of the Senate regarding threat assessment of major tourist attractions. This requirement is addressed in the statement of managers.

The conference agreement does not include Title VI of the Senate bill, “Homeland Security Grant Enhancement” as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar matter.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The conference agreement’s detailed funding recommendations for programs in this bill are contained in the table listed below. The fiscal year 2006 budget request column reflects the Department of Homeland Security’s organizational restructuring plan transmitted to Congress on July 13, 2005.
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Operations</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Office of the Secretary</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>2,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>4,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>4,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Policy</td>
<td>25,027</td>
<td>20,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public Affairs</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>8,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of General Counsel</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>11,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Civil Rights and Liberties</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>3,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy Officer</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>4,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>48,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Office of the Secretary and Executive Management</strong></td>
<td>137,040</td>
<td>79,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Screening Coordination and Operations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Secretary for Management</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Security</td>
<td>61,278</td>
<td>51,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Transformation Office</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Procurement Officer</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX - HR System</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer</strong></td>
<td>61,996</td>
<td>38,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>40,731</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC-DHS Headquarters)</td>
<td>26,070</td>
<td>26,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer</strong></td>
<td>66,801</td>
<td>66,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management</strong></td>
<td>203,170</td>
<td>168,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>19,765</td>
<td>19,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Information Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>75,756</td>
<td>75,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology services</td>
<td>110,944</td>
<td>83,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security activities</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless program</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Secure Data Network (HSDN)</td>
<td>33,029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Office of the Chief Information Officer</strong></td>
<td>303,700</td>
<td>297,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and operations</td>
<td>311,180</td>
<td>255,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Departmental operations</strong></td>
<td>974,855</td>
<td>824,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83,017</td>
<td>83,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office of Inspector General**

- Operating expenses: 83,017

**Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations:** 1,057,872

**TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS**

**U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology**

- Office of Screening Coordination and Operations:
  - Management and administration: 20,000
  - U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology: 390,232
  - Secure Flight: 94,294
  - FAST: 7,000
  - NEXUS/SENTRI: 14,000

- Fee Funded Program:
  - TWIC/TSA Credentialing: (100,000)
  - Registered Traveler: (20,000)
  - HAZMAT: (50,000)
  - Alien Flight School (By transfer): (10,000)

- Total, Office of Screening Coordination and Operations: (705,526)
  - Appropriations: (525,526)
  - (Fee funded programs): (180,000)

**Customs and Border Protection**

**Salaries and expenses:**

- Management and administration, border security inspections and trade facilitation: 656,826
- Management and administration, border security and control between ports of entry: 593,207

Subtotal, Headquarters management and administration: 1,250,033

**Border security inspections and trade facilitation:**

- Inspections, trade, and travel facilitation at ports of entry: 1,274,994
  - Harbor maintenance fee collection (trust fund): 3,000
- Container security initiative: 138,790
- Other international programs: 8,629
- Customs trade partnership against terrorism/
  Free and Secure Trade (FAST) NEXUS/SENTRI: 54,268
- Inspection and detection technology investments: 188,024
- Automated targeting systems: 28,253
- National Targeting Center: 16,697
- Other technology investments, including information technology: 1,018
- Training: 24,351

Subtotal, Border security inspections and trade facilitation: 1,738,024
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border security and control between ports of entry:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border security and control</td>
<td>1,464,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air program operations</td>
<td>57,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanned aerial vehicles</td>
<td>10,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America Shield Initiative (ASI)</td>
<td>51,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>22,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Border security and control between ports of entry</strong></td>
<td>1,606,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air and marine operations, personnel compensation and benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>4,730,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automation modernization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated commercial environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS)</td>
<td>321,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated commercial system and legacy IT costs</td>
<td>136,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Automation modernization</strong></td>
<td>458,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air and marine interdiction, operations, maintenance, and procurement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and maintenance</td>
<td>230,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanned aerial vehicles</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>62,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Air and marine interdiction, operations, maintenance, and procurement</strong></td>
<td>292,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Border patrol)</td>
<td>93,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Direct appropriations</strong></td>
<td>5,574,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee accounts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration inspection user fee</td>
<td>(464,816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration enforcement fines</td>
<td>(6,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land border inspection fee</td>
<td>(29,878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRA passenger inspection fee</td>
<td>(334,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHIS inspection fee</td>
<td>(204,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico collections</td>
<td>(97,815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small airport user fees</td>
<td>(5,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, fee accounts</strong></td>
<td>(1,142,146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Customs and Border Protection Appropriations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fee accounts)</td>
<td>(6,716,897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Customs Enforcement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters Management and Administration (non-Detention and Removal Operations):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel compensation and benefits, service and other costs</td>
<td>277,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters managed IT investment</td>
<td>134,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Headquarters management and administration</strong></td>
<td>412,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Budget Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal proceedings</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,215,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>17,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Investigations</strong></td>
<td>1,233,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intelligence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters Reporting Center</td>
<td>4,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Operations Center</td>
<td>56,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Intelligence</strong></td>
<td>61,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detention and removal operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody management</td>
<td>600,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>166,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Operations</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive operations</td>
<td>103,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional removal program</td>
<td>70,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to detention</td>
<td>33,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and removal program</td>
<td>211,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Detention and removal operations</strong></td>
<td>1,184,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>2,892,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal protective service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic security</td>
<td>109,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building specific security (including capital equipment replacement/acquisition)</td>
<td>377,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>-487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automation modernization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS/CHIMERA IT connectivity</td>
<td>40,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Direct appropriations</strong></td>
<td>2,958,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee accounts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration inspection user fee</td>
<td>(91,621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breached bond/detention fund</td>
<td>(71,280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exchange and visitor fee</td>
<td>(66,552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, fee accounts</strong></td>
<td>(229,433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (gross)</strong></td>
<td>(3,675,410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>(-487,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (Fee accounts)</strong></td>
<td>(3,188,410)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Amounts in thousands)*
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

Budget Request | Conference
----------------|------------------

Transportation Security Administration

Aviation security:

Screening operations:

Screener workforce:
- Privatized screening ........................................... 146,151 139,654
- Passenger screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits ... 1,590,969 1,520,000
- Baggage screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits ...... 931,864 884,000

Subtotal, Screener workforce ................................... 2,668,984 2,543,654

Screening training and other:
- Passenger screeners, other ..................................... 91,004 88,004
- Screener training .................................................. 170,246
- Screener other .................................................. 23,752

Subtotal, Screening training and other ......................... 261,250 246,550

Human resource services ......................................... 207,234 207,234

Checkpoint support ................................................ 157,461 165,000

EDS/ETD Systems:

Purchase ........................................................... 130,000 175,000

Installation ....................................................... 14,000 45,000

Maintenance ......................................................... 200,000 200,000

Operation integration ............................................ 23,000 23,000

Subtotal, EDS/ETD Systems ...................................... 367,000 443,000

Subtotal, Screening operations ................................ 3,661,929 3,605,438

Aviation direction and enforcement:

Aviation regulation and other enforcement ....................... 238,196 222,416

Airport management, IT, and support ............................ 758,370 886,032

FFDO and flight crew training ................................... 36,289 30,500

Air cargo .................................................................. 40,000 55,000

Airport perimeter security ....................................... 5,000

Foreign repair stations ......................................... 3,000

Subtotal, Aviation direction and enforcement ................... 1,072,855 1,001,948

Subtotal, Aviation security (gross) .............................. 4,734,784 4,607,386

Offsetting fee collections ....................................... 3,670,000 -1,990,000

Total, Aviation security (net) ................................ 1,064,784 2,617,386

Surface transportation security:

Surface transportation security staffing ......................... 24,000

Enterprise staffing ............................................... 24,000

Hazardous materials truck tracking/training .................. 4,000

Rail security inspectors and.canines ......................... 8,000 8,000

Subtotal, Surface transportation security ....................... 32,000 36,000

Transportation Vetting and Credentialing:

SecureFlight ......................................................... 56,696

Crew vetting ....................................................... 13,300

Screening administration and operations ........................ 5,000

Registered Traveler Program fees ................................ (20,000)

TWIC fees .................................................................. (100,000)

HAZMAT fees .......................................................... (50,000)

Allen Flight School (by transfer from DOJ) - fees ........... (10,000)

Total, Transportation Vetting and Credentialing ............... 85,696 (120,000)
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Transportation Vetting and Credentialing (Gross)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(254,996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Funds Programs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(180,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Transportation Vetting and Credentialing (net)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>74,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation security support:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters administration</td>
<td>302,781</td>
<td>279,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission support centers</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>210,092</td>
<td>210,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate training</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Administration</td>
<td>524,008</td>
<td>489,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Transportation security support</td>
<td>545,008</td>
<td>510,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Air Marshals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Administration</td>
<td>616,927</td>
<td>613,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Training</td>
<td>71,933</td>
<td>70,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-to-ground communications</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Federal Air Marshals</td>
<td>688,860</td>
<td>686,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation security capital fund</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Transportation Security Administration (gross)</td>
<td>6,250,652</td>
<td>6,345,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offseting fee collections</td>
<td>-3,670,000</td>
<td>-1,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation security capital fund</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee accounts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(180,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Transportation Security Administration (net)</td>
<td>2,330,652</td>
<td>3,925,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United States Coast Guard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military pay and allowances</td>
<td>3,011,130</td>
<td>3,004,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian pay and benefits</td>
<td>535,836</td>
<td>531,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and recruiting</td>
<td>178,212</td>
<td>177,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating funds and unit level maintenance</td>
<td>985,309</td>
<td>956,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally managed accounts</td>
<td>193,936</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate and depot level maintenance</td>
<td>642,977</td>
<td>636,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Operating expenses</td>
<td>5,547,400</td>
<td>5,492,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less adjustment for defense function</td>
<td>-340,000</td>
<td>-1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Operating expenses</td>
<td>5,547,400</td>
<td>5,477,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(5,207,400)</td>
<td>(4,292,331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-15,104)</td>
<td>(-15,104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>(340,000)</td>
<td>(1,200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental compliance and restoration</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (Amounts in thousands)</td>
<td>Budget Request</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve training</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition, construction, and improvements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response boat medium (41ft UTB and NSB replacement)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed helicopter equipment (Phase I) (legacy asset)</td>
<td>19,902</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert surveillance aircraft</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-130J Missionization</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Aircraft</td>
<td>24,902</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic identification system</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National distress and response system modernization (Rescue 21)</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF Recap</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Other equipment</td>
<td>140,100</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel compensation and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core acquisition costs</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct personnel cost</td>
<td>75,950</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Personnel compensation and benefits</td>
<td>76,450</td>
<td>73,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated deepwater systems:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft, other</td>
<td>125,800</td>
<td>156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH-65 re-engining</td>
<td>133,100</td>
<td>133,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Aircraft</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>289,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface ships</td>
<td>522,400</td>
<td>509,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4ISR</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems engineering and integration</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government program management</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Integrated deepwater systems</td>
<td>966,000</td>
<td>933,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore facilities and aids to navigation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore operational and support projects</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore construction projects</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace USCGA Chase Hall Barrack, Phase I</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Sound</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct breakwater - Station Neha Bay</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways aids to navigation</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Shore facilities and aids to navigation</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>31,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Acquisition, construction, and improvements (net)</td>
<td>1,269,152</td>
<td>1,141,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of bridges</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test, and evaluation</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, U.S. Coast Guard discretionary</td>
<td>8,947,552</td>
<td>6,782,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired pay (mandatory)</td>
<td>1,014,080</td>
<td>1,014,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, United States Coast Guard</td>
<td>7,961,632</td>
<td>7,796,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(7,961,632)</td>
<td>(7,811,961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(-15,104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United States Secret Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses: Protection:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of persons and facilities</td>
<td>572,232</td>
<td>576,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National special security event fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective intelligence activities</td>
<td>55,561</td>
<td>56,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House mail screening</td>
<td>16,365</td>
<td>16,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Protection</td>
<td>649,158</td>
<td>651,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field operations:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic field operations</td>
<td>238,888</td>
<td>238,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International field office administration, operations and training</td>
<td>19,768</td>
<td>20,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic crimes special agent program and electronic crimes</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Field operations</td>
<td>294,256</td>
<td>299,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters, management and administration</td>
<td>203,232</td>
<td>203,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Missing and Exploited Children</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Administration</td>
<td>210,332</td>
<td>211,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowley training center</td>
<td>48,337</td>
<td>48,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,200,083</td>
<td>1,208,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Acquisition, construction, improvements and related expenses      | 3,699          | 3,699      |

| Total, United States Secret Service                               | 1,203,782      | 1,212,009  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority</td>
<td>20,555,320</td>
<td>22,401,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(20,555,320)</td>
<td>(22,416,784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(-15,104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Accounts</td>
<td>(1,551,579)</td>
<td>(1,575,698)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY

#### Preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness operations:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary</td>
<td>17,836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Medical Officer</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of National Capital Region Coordination</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Protection and Information Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical infrastructure outreach and partnership</td>
<td>81,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
### (Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical infrastructure identification and evaluation</td>
<td>89,593</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center</td>
<td>17,635</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosurveillance</td>
<td>12,817</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective actions</td>
<td>108,076</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber security</td>
<td>83,086</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security/Emergency Preparedness Telecommunications</td>
<td>163,250</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security</strong></td>
<td>556,317</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Preparedness operations</strong></td>
<td>577,225</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and administration: Office of the Under Secretary</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Medical Officer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of National Capital Region Coordination</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, management and administration</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>16,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office for Domestic Preparedness:</strong> Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>44,300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Local Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Homeland Security Grant Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Basic Formula Grants</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management performance grants</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, State Homeland Security Grant Program</strong></td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement terrorism prevention grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Area Security Initiative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-threat, high-density urban area</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted infrastructure protection</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer zone protection program</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port security grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and transit security</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucking security grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity bus security grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Urban Area Security Initiative</strong></td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial equipment direct assistance program</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Domestic Preparedness Consortium</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National exercise program</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Medical Response System</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration training grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing training grants</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations and assessments</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>14,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, National Programs</strong></td>
<td>156,810</td>
<td>348,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, State and Local Programs</strong></td>
<td>3,016,910</td>
<td>2,501,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Assistance Grants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Firefighter Assistance Grants</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management performance grants</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Office for Domestic Preparedness</td>
<td>3,561,210</td>
<td>3,346,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program</td>
<td>-1,266</td>
<td>-1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fire Administration and Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Fire Administration</td>
<td>40,441</td>
<td>40,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Training Center</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>4,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, U.S. Fire Administration and Training</td>
<td>44,948</td>
<td>44,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Protection and Information Security Management and administration</td>
<td>83,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical infrastructure outreach and partnership</td>
<td>112,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical infrastructure identification and evaluation</td>
<td>68,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosurveillance</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective actions</td>
<td>91,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber security</td>
<td>93,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security/Emergency Preparedness Telecommunications</td>
<td>142,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security</td>
<td>625,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Preparedness</td>
<td>4,182,117</td>
<td>4,031,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counterterrorism Fund

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterterrorism fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Emergency Management Agency

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and regional operations</td>
<td>170,240</td>
<td>173,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Administrative and regional operations</td>
<td>218,240</td>
<td>221,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating activities</td>
<td>188,058</td>
<td>184,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban search and rescue teams</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery</td>
<td>195,058</td>
<td>204,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National disaster medical system</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td>2,140,000</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster assistance direct loan program account: (Limitation on direct loans)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood map modernization fund</td>
<td>200,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National flood insurance fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>36,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe repetitive loss mitigation</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive loss mitigation</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood mitigation</td>
<td>87,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer to National flood mitigation fund)</td>
<td>123,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer to National flood mitigation fund)</td>
<td>-28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National flood mitigation fund (by transfer)</td>
<td>(28,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National pre-disaster mitigation fund</td>
<td>150,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency food and shelter</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, FEMA (net)</td>
<td>3,090,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title III, Preparedness and Recovery:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority</td>
<td>7,283,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on direct loans)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>(-28,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(28,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE IV - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

| Backlog reduction initiative: | | |
| Contracting services | 70,000 | 70,000 |
| Other | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Digitization and IT transformation | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Subtotal, Backlog reduction initiative | 80,000 | 115,000 |
| Adjudication services (fee account): | | |
| Pay and benefits | (807,000) | (857,000) |
| District operations | (389,000) | (348,000) |
| Service center operations | (260,000) | (250,000) |
| Asylum, refugee and international operations | (74,000) | (74,000) |
| Records operations | (66,000) | (66,000) |
| Subtotal, Adjudication services | (1,396,000) | (1,396,000) |
| Information and customer services (fee account): | | |
| Pay and benefits | (80,000) | (80,000) |
| Operating expenses: | | |
| National Customer Service Center | (47,000) | (47,000) |
| Information services | (14,000) | (14,000) |
| Subtotal, Information and customer services | (141,000) | (141,000) |
| Administration (fee account): | | |
| Pay and benefits | (44,000) | (44,000) |
| Operating expenses | (193,000) | (193,000) |
| Subtotal, Administration | (237,000) | (237,000) |
| Total, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services | (1,854,000) | (1,889,000) |
| Appropriations | (80,000) | (115,000) |
| (Immigration Examination Fee Account) | (1,730,000) | (1,730,000) |
| (Fraud prevention and detection fee account) | (31,000) | (31,000) |
### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H1B Non-Immigrant Petitioner fee account..</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Law Enforcement Training Center**

Salaries and expenses:
- Salaries and expenses: 183,362
  - Direct appropriation: 40,836
  - Total: 224,198

**Science and Technology**

Management and administration:
- Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology: 81,399
  - Subtotal, Management and administration: 81,399

Research, development, acquisition, and operations:
- Biological countermeasures:
  - Operating expenses: 23,300
  - Defense function: 339,000
  - Subtotal, Biological countermeasures: 362,300

- Chemical countermeasures: 102,000
- Explosives countermeasures: 14,700
- Threat and vulnerability, testing and assessment: 47,000
- Conventional missions in support of DHS: 93,650
- Rapid prototyping program: 20,900
- Standards: 35,500
- Emerging threats: 10,400
- Critical infrastructure protection: 20,800
- University programs/homeland security fellowship: 63,600
- Counter MANPADs: 110,000
- Safety act: 5,600
- Cyber security: 16,700
- Office of interoperability and compatibility: 20,500
- Research and development consolidation: 118,897
- Radiological and nuclear countermeasures: 19,086
- Domestic Nuclear Detection Office: 227,314

Subtotal, Research, development, acquisition, and operations: 1,287,047

Total, Science and Technology: 1,358,446

**Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training and Services:**
- New budget (obligational) authority: 1,672,444
- Fee Accounts: (1,774,000)

**TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Sec. 527:
## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110ft Island Class Patrol Boat procurement or refurbishment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>78,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 538: REAL ID Grants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rescissions, sec. 542 through 546:**

- Sec. 542: Working Capital Fund
- Sec. 543: Transportation Security Administration
- Sec. 544: Coast Guard operating expenses and acquisition, construction, and improvements (P.L. 105-277, 106-69, 107-87, and 108-90)
- Sec. 545: Counterterrorism Fund (P.L. 108-90)
- Sec. 546: Science and technology research, development, acquisition, and operations (P.L. 108-334)

Subtotal, Rescissions, sec. 542 through 546: --- 20,000

Total, title V, General Provisions:

- New budget (obligational) authority: --- 14,869

**Grand total, Department of Homeland Security:**

- New budget (obligational) authority: 30,568,748 31,860,080
- Appropriations: (30,568,748) (32,008,684)
- Recissions: --- (148,604)
- Fee funded programs: (3,325,579) (3,346,998)
- (Limitation on direct loans): (25,000) (25,000)
- (Transfer out): (-28,000) (-40,000)
- (By transfer): (28,000) (40,000)
Conference Total—With Comparison

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2006 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2005 amount, the 2006 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2006 follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2005 Amount</th>
<th>2006 Budget Estimate</th>
<th>2006 House Bill</th>
<th>2006 Senate Bill</th>
<th>House vs. 2005</th>
<th>Senate vs. 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,210,103</td>
<td>$100,210,103</td>
<td>$100,210,103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bill, fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>30,568,748</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>+1,291,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bill, fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>30,568,748</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>+1,291,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference agreement, fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference agreement compared with House bill, fiscal year 2005</td>
<td>30,568,748</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>+1,291,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bill, fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>30,568,748</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>+1,291,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bill, fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>30,568,748</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>31,860,080</td>
<td>+1,291,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the leader, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me, and while I am the temporary majority leader, I am still the whip and always am glad to be called the whip and to refer to the gentleman as the whip.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene Thursday at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules, and a final list of those bills will be sent to Members by the end of this week.

We will also consider two measures under a rule, H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, and the Gasoline for America’s Security Act of 2005.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority whip and acting leader.

Mr. Leader, so that Members can be certain as to the schedule for next Thursday and Friday, on Thursday the House will begin business at 10 a.m., I understand, with no votes to occur before 5 p.m., and votes will conclude suspension bills and the conference report on the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, and then the House will meet on Friday at 9 a.m. to consider the energy bill. Is that accurate, Mr. BLUNT?

Mr. BLUNT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is accurate at this point. We have not finalized the absolute sequence of bills, but that is our plan at this time. And the one reason we are starting in 10 a.m. Thursday is to try to finish our work, even though it is an abbreviated workweek, in a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could tell us, because we have discussed with our Members from California, from Washington State, Oregon, and others, if they take a 7:30 a.m. plane, they do not get here much before 4 or a little after 4. Therefore, if those votes will conclude at 2 p.m., that requires some of our Members to leave the night before.

Some of our Members, as you know, because of their religious observance, cannot leave immediately after a suspension, requiring them to take the red-eye. I discussed this with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) last week, and I am wondering whether or not, because I am sure Members on your side, well, I guess they do not, now that I think about it, have similar problems. But the fact of the matter is that it causes some difficulty for our Members traveling. I wonder if there is a possibility of starting at 10, continuing debate, but rolling votes until after 5 rather than after 2.

Mr. BLUNT. I think the gentleman did have extensive discussion on this last week. I know this week really created a number of challenges for us because of those religious holidays. I believe we have accommodated those in the best way we can and still get Members out of here at a reasonable hour on Friday. And for that reason I think those votes that could be as early as 2 are important for us to get Members on the road Friday.

And, again, our California Members always have so many of the challenges in travel, but I think this plan accommodates that. I certainly wish we could have perhaps not even come in for these days, but I think the work we have to do on these 2 days is so significant that we do need to come back. And if we do not get started early on Thursday, we will have another problem on Friday with Members who want to get back for what turns out to be a holiday weekend for many of them.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. When we talk about all the Members from California, occasionally some Members there think the western-most county is Hawaii, of California, but I think those of us either from California, the far west in general, and even further west, out in Hawaii, have seldom, if ever, complained about having to make the votes in late afternoon on a Monday or a Thursday or a Tuesday or whatever. But I would just plead for this, and I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding to me, but if the gentleman could give those of us west of the Mississippi the opportunity to come and vote, say after 4:30, or about 4:30 or 5, we can do it.

Other than that, it really changes the entire day and night, in my instance the night before, because I come directly from the plane to vote, and many Members of the California, Oregon, Washington, and even some of the other western States who have interconnections they have to make north and south before they come east to have to do that.

That is the only reason we ask about that. Maybe we could start a little earlier on Friday and still accommodate what needs to be done. But it is not self-indulgent, it is really a practical question of scheduling.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and perhaps the gentleman and I can discuss this after the colloquy.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to discuss it further. At the same time, I do think that this particular week and the way the holidays fell in this week have created a unique set of circumstances, and our planning for that have been a challenge, there is no question about that.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate those problems. Perhaps we will discuss that. I
We are trying to move to the earliest possible conclusion on Friday, which is one of the reasons, again, to try to be sure we are getting our work done on Thursday. Another reason for Thursday, not only the 10 a.m. start but the effort for Members to return, is I know a number of chairmen are hoping to take advantage of that day in their committees as well. And our friends from the west coast would want to be and I hope are able to be part of that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the permission, and I am sure the Members will be pleased about that objective as well.

The week of October 17. I know that is some time away, but we will not be having a scheduling colloquy next Friday, probably. Can you give us any indication as to what bills may be on the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. We have not finalized our plan for the week of October 17 yet. Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of litigation reform bills coming out of the Judiciary Committee. I think those are likely candidates for that week, and there may be some other legislation develop. But those bills from the Committee on the Judiciary are likely to be ready and be coming to the floor that week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MAC THORNBERY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH OCTOBER 6, 2005

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

To the House of Representatives, Washington, DC, September 29, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Mac Thornberry to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through October 6, 2005.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Intparliamentary Group in addition to Mr. Manzullo of Illinois, Chair, and Mr. McCotter of Michigan, Vice Chairman, appointed on March 8, 2005:

Mr. Oberstar, Minnesota
Mr. Shaw, Florida
Ms. Slaughter, New York
Mr. Stearns, Florida
Mr. English, Pennsylvania
Mr. Souder, Indiana
Mr. Tancredo, Colorado
Mr. Lipinski, Illinois

NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS REGARDING PROPOSED USE OF PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDS PROVIDED TO VICTORIA OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-58)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message to the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with title I of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2006, Public Law 109-335, I am notifying the Congress of the proposed use of $10,151,538 provided in title I under the heading “Federal Payment for Emergencies Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia.” This will reimburse the District for the costs of public safety expenses related to security events and responses to terrorist threats.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

IN HONOR OF CONGRESSMAN TOM DELAY

(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 strong support of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Congressman Tom Delay has been one of the most effective leaders in the history of the House of Representatives. Under his leadership, over 4 million Americans have found new jobs, Medicare beneficiaries have gained prescription drug coverage, and U.S. troops have received unprecedented support to protect American families. I am proud of his accomplishments and grateful for his service.

While Congressman Delay’s effectiveness has greatly helped American families, it has unfortunately motivated his critics. By issuing an indictment yesterday against Mr. DELAY, liberal Democrat Ronnie Earle is demonstrating politics at its worst by politicizing his position as prosecutor and is continuing his personal vendetta against Republican leaders.

In 1994, Earle indicted U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, and his charges were proved false. I am confident that Congressman DELAY will also be vindicated from this blatant partisan attack.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.
Mr. Speaker, it will surprise no one that St. Mary’s College is in my district. Furthermore, for full disclosure, I am on the board of trustees of St. Mary’s College. It is an extraordinary institution of higher learning.

In fact, according to the latest college rankings by the magazine U.S. News and World Report, St. Mary’s College is again one of the top 100 liberal arts colleges in the Nation, rising to 84 from 87 the year before. So not only is it number two of small colleges; it is the number 84 in the entire Nation of all colleges.

When it comes to public liberal arts colleges, St. Mary’s finished only behind the Virginia Military Institute in the U.S. News rankings.

Those rankings are based upon several criteria of academic excellence, including graduation and retention rates, faculty resources and peer assessment.

And this year, St. Mary’s peer assessment rose to 2.9 out of a possible 5.0, and the freshmen retention rate rose to 88 percent.

Mr. Speaker, with roots going back to 1840, St. Mary’s College is the State of Maryland’s only public honors college, offering the academic excellence of a top private college with the openness and affordability of public education.

Today, about 1,950 men and women from 33 States and 23 countries attend St. Mary’s, and the average SAT score for the freshmen is 1,352. The faculty also has distinguished itself, and more than 94 percent hold doctorate degrees.

By combining the virtues of public and private education, St. Mary’s provides a unique alternative for students and their families. This special identity underpins the college’s success and its reputation for excellence, in a waterfront setting in the heart of the Chesapeake Bay region just 70 miles southeast of Washington. It is an extraordinary setting for an extraordinarily excellent college.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the college’s board of trustees since 1995, I have seen this wonderful institution flourish over the last decade, and I am particularly pleased to see St. Mary’s is winning national recognition among its peers. This is not the first time that has been the case, but it is a continuing affirmation of the excellence at St. Mary’s.

Our 34th President, John F. Kennedy, once said: “Education is the main-spring of our economic and social progress. It is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life.”

Mr. Speaker, St. Mary’s College of Maryland truly enriches southern Maryland and our entire State. I want to congratulate the entire St. Mary’s College community on receiving this latest national recognition. Well done, well deserved.

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. Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary faculty, Brien and the extraordinary faculty, St. Mary’s College is in my district. I am on the board of trustees since 1995, I want to congratulate the entire St. Mary’s College community on receiving this latest national recognition. Well done, well deserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give my Special Order speech at this time.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the markup we had last night in the Committee on Energy and Commerce on the energy bill. The purpose of the energy bill being brought forth by the Republican majority is to address price gouging. We would like to see the price of gasoline go down; and certainly with the excessive profits being demonstrated by the oil companies, especially the refinery companies, we have to do something instead of being gouged at the gas pump.

So last night the committee worked some 16 hours, until well after midnight. What we found was this. This chart was in The Washington Post last Sunday. The price of a gallon of gas in 1 year, the price to take it out of the ground, domestic and foreign countries pump crude from the ground, has increased 46 percent in 12 months.

The refiners, refiners process crude oil and a variety of products, including gasoline. In 1 year, their profit or their increase was 32 percent.

Down here are the distributors. They ship the gasoline from the terminal by truck to the gas station. Their cost has only gone up 5 percent. The end result is in the last 12 months, gas has gone up 64 percent for the American consumer. Even State, Federal, and local taxes have only gone up 2 pennies, a negligible increase.

When Members look at the chart, if we want to try to control the price of gasoline, you have to look at the crude oil producers and definitely the refiners at a 255 percent increase in their costs and price to a gallon of gas in the last 12 months.

Price gouging is what happened last night in committee?

The Democrats said let us take a look at the Republican bill that we just saw. What they did was this, and we almost defeated it. It was a 26-24 vote. We lost by two votes. It is a bill we will be discussing next week on the floor.

The Republicans said we are not going to go after the producers; they can make a 46 percent profit in 12 months. We are after the refiner; they can make a 255 percent increase profit in 12 months. We are going after the gas station dealer, the one at 5 percent. If they increase their profits more than 10 percent, we are going after the gas station operator, but not all gas station operators, only ones located in the area where the President has declared a disaster.

The Republican bill basically says this, we have two disasters in this country, Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. So parts of Texas, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, they cannot increase their price for gasoline. But the rest of the Nation and north Louisiana, north Alabama, Mississippi and north and west Texas, they can still increase their prices, no control. They can gouge 255 percent, 46 percent and that is okay under our bill. We are only concerned about the gas station owner who has the least amount to say about the cost of a gallon of gas.

So once again Big Oil wins out. Big refiners win out, and the poor person trying to make a penny off a gallon of gas at the gas station is going to get nailed by the majority party’s legislation.

The Democratic side has our legislation, Free Us From Price Gouging. In our bill we apply all of the way down the chain here every type of oil product: home heating oil, propane, natural gas. It all comes under our bill we apply all of the way down to producers, refiners, and retailers. We are not going to go after the refiner; they can make a 255 percent increase profit in 12 months. We are going after the gas station dealer, the one at 5 percent. If they increase their profits more than 10 percent, we are going after the gas station operator, but not all gas station operators, only ones located in the area where the President has declared a disaster.

The Democratic side has our legislation, Free Us From Price Gouging. In our bill we apply all of the way down the chain here every type of oil product: home heating oil, propane, natural gas. It all comes under our price gouging legislation. We apply it to producers, refiners, and retailers. We take them all into consideration. We apply our price gouging to the entire Nation.

This winter the Midwest is going to pay a 71 percent increase in the price of natural gas. Underneath the Republican bill, there is nothing you can do about it because it only applies to gasoline and diesel. Under the Democratic bill, we can see if there is excessive profits, then you have a right to do something about price gouging.

Under the Democrats’ bill, we are going to have the FTC define what
price gouging is and what factors go into it and then apply it to the facts of this case. We are after excessive profits like 255 percent in 12 months or 46 percent in 12 months, not the person who makes 5 percent in 12 months. And we want it to apply throughout the Nation, not just at the time of disaster and in the area affected by the dis- aster.

We provide the FTC with the right and authority to watch market manipul- ulation. The majority party is silent on that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle- man from Texas (Mr. Poe) is recogn- ized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. Poe addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle- man from Ohio (Mr. Brown) is rec- ognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. Brown addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle- man from North Carolina (Mr. McHenry) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McHenry addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle- woman from California?

There was no objection.

IRAQ AND PRISONER ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle- woman from California (Ms. Woolsey) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago standing outside this dome, the President of the United States spoke these words as he was sworn into office: “We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation, the moral choice between oppression, which is al- ways wrong, and freedom which is eternally right. All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know the United States will not ignore your oppression or excuse your oppressors.”

Beautiful words, honorable senti- ments, if only the Bush administration were conducting this war in Iraq in a way that actually reflects those values.

Human Rights Watch released a report that details once again how Iraqi war prisoners were subjected to acts of sadistic cruelty at the hands of their supposed liberators. This time it was at Forward Operating Base Mer- cury, where beatings and other forms of humiliation took place on a daily basis for several months. Often, this was not even about interrogation or se- curing some vital piece of national se- cret, but rather was a ploy to try and one sergeant in the 82nd Airborne, a way to “work out your frustration.”

□ 1800

What is perhaps most tragic is that our soldiers who have committed these acts are themselves victims as well, victimized by their incompetent and amoral superiors who give a rank and a nod to torture and then blame it on a few bad apples. One officer in the 82nd Airborne, Captain Ian Flashback, was appalled by the prisoner abuse and tried in vain for a year and a half to get some clarification from his superi- ors about how prisoners should be treated, given that the administration had essentially tossed the Geneva Conven- tions in the trash can. He got no an- swers because the Pentagon seemed to want the abuse to continue but did not want to take responsibility for it.

That is how it works with this crowd: The powerless take the fall while the high-level decisionmakers who make bad decisions are left in place to make more bad decisions. So it is that Lyndon Johnson’s time for her conduct at Abu Ghraib while Tommy Franks gets the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The prisoner abuse episode is con- sistent with everything else about the way this war has been handled. It indi- cates both a moral blind spot and a staggering incompetence that has cost nearly 2,000 Americans their lives. The Bush administration had no plan for how to conduct this war, they had no plan for securing the country once Sad- dam was deposed, and now they have no plan for ending the war. We need a compassionate and we need a viable exit strategy, one that ends the occupa- tion but still gives us a constructive role in the rebuilding of Iraqi society. If the President will not do it, we will. If the President will not lead, we will.

Two weeks ago, I held an informal bi- partisan hearing to discuss plans to with- draw our troops and end the war. We heard from a panel of Middle East experts and military strategists, just the kind of people George Bush should have listened to along his march to war, all of whom testified about the need for a change in U.S. policy in Iraq. The hearing was not about endorsing one particular approach. My goal was to put ideas on the table, to start a conversation that the Nation wants and the Nation deserves. Two-thirds of the American people disapprove of the President’s handling of Iraq, and yet it has been some sort of taboo around Lyndon Johnson’s face. Withdrawal. The American people are way ahead of Congress on this. It is about time we caught up, it is about time we realized...
power. He knows how powerful these particular words are. An apology is definitely in order, and a rejection of these remarks also is in order from the President of the United States.

KATRINA UNEARTHS DISASTROUS FISCAL STATE OF COUNTRY

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, almost a year ago, I spoke on this House floor warning of the dangers posed by the latest effort of the majority party to raise the debt limit for the third time during this administration to a whopp...
and, of course, spending time with her three grandchildren. And when most of us are content cruising through life with our careers and family, Donna’s love of learning and public policy motivated her to get her legal degree from UCLA in 1996.

Before I came to Congress, Donna served as my chief of staff in my final two terms as a member of the California State Assembly. Any chief of staff and, in particular, a district and legislative office knows that job has its rewards, but also many challenges. As I transitioned to Congress, Donna came east to Washington to fulfill a long-time goal of developing public policy, a job she is well suited for. She has an ability to put her arms around an issue and see all sides of it. Instead of sound bites, Donna is always able to see the whole picture.

She has been so much more than a trusted adviser on the issues. She has been in crafting legislation on teacher quality, improving curriculum, promoting renewable energy, protecting open spaces in San Diego, and negotiating the complex issues of the 2000 electricity crisis in San Diego. In the midst of immersing herself in politics and policy, Donna has also immersed herself in the cultural and artistic endeavors that Washington has to offer, as she did in San Diego.

She is not only a multitasker, but a multi-talented renaissance woman. From playing her cello, to singing in the choir at the National Cathedral, to traveling to such exotic locales as Egypt, New Zealand and India, it can certainly be said that Donna has not let life pass her by.

Many of us in Congress know that a good staff is the key component to our ability to create public policy, and Donna has been such a vital asset to my office and to my successes as a public servant. Donna has been more than an invaluable member of the staff; she has been a good and loyal friend.

She not only will be missed in our office. I am sure she will go on and be envied by all of us. As we are all heading off to work next week, Donna will continue to travel, to sing, to play, to taste the flavors life has to offer. And in the middle of all that, she will find and give great joy as the consummate grandparent. And knowing Donna, she will be an active player in making our country and the world a better place to live.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the years of hard work and public service that Donna Smith has provided to San Diego, to California, to the Congress, and to our Nation.

Thank you, Donna.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gingrey of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrey) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. Gingrey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. Kaptur addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONDEMNING REMARKS OF WILLIAM J. BENNETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise before this House condemning the words spoken yesterday by former Secretary of Education William Bennett. It is truly reprehensible that as we try to heal the wounds that were laid bare following the disaster of Hurricane Katrina, that powerful elements in the Republican Party still insist on espousing racial rhetoric while trying to divide Americans based on the color of their skin.

I was shocked, I was appalled that the former Secretary of Education, William Bennett, a prominent member of the Republican Party, would go on public radio and say, “But I do know that it is true that if you wanted to reduce crime, you could, if that were your sole purpose, you could abort every black baby in this country, and your crime rate would go down.”

Mr. Speaker, as a proud black American who was honorably discharged from the U.S. Army, I know that this is precisely the kind of insensitive, hurtful, and ignorant rhetoric that Americans have grown tired of.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bennett still has power and influence within this Republican administration; and he is representative of the ignorant, inconsiderate politics that have been displayed in this government today. And I am calling on my friends, the responsible Republicans, to rebuke Mr. Bennett for his damaging statement.

Where is the indignation from the GOP, as one of their prominent members talks about aborting an entire race of Americans as a way of ridding this country of a ridiculous, How insane. How insane can one be?

Mr. Bennett’s remarks were thoughtless, mean-spirited, and well, well off the mark. We all know that aborting black babies would not decrease or erase the crime rates in this country. Aborting the Republican policies which have hurt the disadvantaged, the poor, and average Americans for the benefit of large corporations would be a much more sane and reasonable way to address crime and poverty in this Nation.

Americans want a government that is patriotic, inclusive, and that applies to both countries and individuals. The history of the United States and Kazakhstan’s cooperation is a vivid example of a partnership between true friends and allies with shared values.

Kazakhstan inherited the world’s fourth largest nuclear arsenal from the Soviet Union but choose not to keep that lethal legacy, which could have been used to harm their own people and defile the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gohmert) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. Gohmert addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. Engel addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF KAZAKHSTAN FOR THEIR ASSISTANCE TO AMERICA AND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Melancon) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Melancon. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Katrina has caused not only colossal damage to the economy of Louisiana and the entire gulf coast but she has also taken away hundreds of innocent lives and left thousands homeless. As the Representative of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, half of which was leveled by this disaster, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who have responded to this American calamity. I would especially like to thank the people of the Republic of Kazakhstan and their president, Nursultan Nazarbayev, for the condolences and readiness to render financial assistance to Katrina’s victims.

No one can have too many friends, and that applies to both countries and individuals. The history of the United States and Kazakhstan’s cooperation is a vivid example of a partnership between true friends and allies with shared values.

Kazakhstan inherited the world’s fourth largest nuclear arsenal from the Soviet Union but choose not to keep that lethal legacy, which could have automatically placed Kazakhstan among the world’s nuclear superpowers. Instead, the people of
Kazakhstan, led by their president, chose the path of peaceful development and, together with the United States, dismantled these weapons of mass destruction. That was a worthy move of a strategic partner.

After the tragic events of September 11, Kazakhstan unhesitatingly and unconditionally supported the United States and declared its full assistance in the war on terrorism. That was a demonstration of sincerity and steadfastness of the people of Kazakhstan.

As the only country from Central Asia to send its military contingent to Iraq, Kazakhstan, despite some wavering among other coalition members, has repeatedly stated that it remains committed to its obligations and it will keep its military engineers in this unstable country as long as it takes. That was a courageous act of a genuine ally.

As we face this colossal tragedy, the Government of Kazakhstan has announced its readiness to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina, and this is a noble gesture of a true friend.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Kazakhstan is one of our most reliable and strongest allies and a true partner. After only 13 years of its existence as an independent state, Kazakhstan has achieved tremendous success and economic development in the building of a true democracy.

President Nazarbayev in his address to Parliament earlier this month outlined a very impressive profile of his country’s future development. He listed concrete goals and objectives on further improvement for the social and economic well-being for all Kazakh citizens, as well as moves to deepen political and democratic reforms. He proposed expanding the role of Parliament, introducing local elections, enhancing the role of political parties, introducing jury trials, expanding the role of nongovernmental organizations, and strengthening and developing a free media.

I support the determination of Kazakhstan’s leader to develop small and medium enterprises and agree with him that the success of political and economic programs depends on the creation of a class of private property owners who will make up a newly formed bourgeoisie.

As the President has stated, the main goal is to stay the course and sustain the pace of transformation. I believe the United States’ response should be our readiness to assist this process.

I urge my colleagues and the administration to devote more attention to our strategic partnership with Kazakhstan.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with President Nazarbayev that we are deeply optimistic about the future of Kazakhstan and the future of the United States and Kazakhstan partnership.

FAREWELL TRIBUTE TO JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF CHAIRMAN AIR FORCE GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to talk a little bit about a great American leader who is winding up his tenure as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States of America, and that is, of course, General Richard Myers.

General Myers had his last appearance before the Committee on Armed Services today, and I was reminded of all the many wonderful appearances that he has made in advising not only the President and the Secretary of Defense but also the membership of both of the Houses of Congress with respect to the United States and our military requirements.

I was looking over the statements that were made by the President and others in 2001, really just a few days after 9/11, when General Myers was nominated for this position by the President of the United States, and I thought I would read that statement that the President made. I am quoting the President, George W. Bush, who said then in 2001: "Today I name a new chairman of the Joint Chiefs, one of the most important appointments a President can make."

“...This appointment is especially so because it comes at a time when we need great leadership. Secretary Rumsfeld and I thought long and hard about this important choice, and we enthusiastically agree that the right man to preserve the best traditions of our Armed Forces, while challenging them to innovate, to meet the threats of the future, is General Richard B. Myers." The President went on to say, "General Myers is a man of steady resolve and determined leadership. He is a skilled and steady hand. He is someone who understands that the strengths of America’s Armed Forces are our people and our technological superiority, and we must invest in both."

Now, later, after the President had made that nomination, a number of people weighed in on this, commentators in the main weighed in on this nomination by the President and one, in one of the discussions, General Richard Hawley, retired, was asked about General Myers. He was asked to give his take on this particular appointment by the President. He said, "Well, Dick Myers has wonderful credentials at the tactical, operational, and the strategic level. He has had diplomatic assignments. I think perhaps as an example, he had his tenure as the commander of the Space Command, he really helped our combatant commanders understand how to fully integrate our space capabilities into their operations. And he also helped particularly those of us in the Air Force, but also I think others who work in defense issues understand what the potential is of our space forces to contribute in the future of our operational success."

Now, of course, after that initial nomination and confirmation by the Senate, General Myers was thrust into this role, this very demanding role at a time in which we were engaged in a shooting war in Afghanistan on the heels of 9/11 and, shortly thereafter, combat operations in Iraq which have been ongoing. Through all of that, General Dick Myers has truly been a steady hand. He has been thoughtful, he has been able to handle the exigencies, the emergencies of the moment and, at the same time, look over the horizon to the problems that may face us 5 or 10 or 15 years down the line.

All the while he was operating or maintaining this unusual level of our operational requirements in a combat sense, General Myers has been there when we have had national emergencies. I remember the hails of firestorms that we had in California. The massive part of our State, literally, on fire, and we desperately needed help. I remember the bureaucracy that we had in California in those days, and the fact that the State of California had not requested that our military capabilities, our military aircraft, that have a tremendous capability to put out forest fires, they had not requested that those be brought in because, in their words, they wanted to use all the contractors that they could before they went to the military. While that was happening, much of California was burning up.

I remember the decision that General Myers made to not wait on the bureaucrats in California, but to send these units, these emergency units out to California, and his reasoning was, by the time the planes got there, California would understand that they, in fact, needed some help in putting those fires out. Sure enough, before that first unit landed at Point Magoo, the State of California had, in fact, decided that they were not going to be able to put this one out in an expeditious fashion, and they requested the aircraft that General Myers had already sent.

So it was an example of a leader who understood how important it is to act quickly. Now, he has acted quickly as an adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense. He is not in the chain of command. The combatant commanders go directly up to the President and to Secretary Rumsfeld and the President when they are receiving their orders for the prosecution of a war. But General Myers’ advice on operations, on moving troops, on putting together a plan to handle the challenges of things like the improvised explosive devices, the hand-made bombs, this tremendous stress on our forces as we move forces in and out of theater, and as we bring the Guard and Reserve in and we
match them up with the active duty forces and have them in the present combat situation in Iraq and in Afghanistan, have the Reserve and Guard forces working side-by-side with the active duty forces to the point in which they cannot be distinguished, one from the other, in defense of the freedom of the people of this nation.

So he leaves us with his last appearance before the House Committee on Armed Services today, and he is going to earn hopefully a little more money with his wife, Mary Jo. I know that we will be calling on him to give us his great judgment in the future, because he is a great American with lots of integrity, lots of respect from all sides of the aisle on Capitol Hill in both bodies, and a great deal of respect from those people that work and serve this country every day, wearing the uniform of the United States. We are going to call on General Richard B. Myers many times. A wonderful American.

Now, I would also like to talk very briefly about another great American, and an American family. I was reminded about this family when General John Kelly came in and we discussed some of the challenges that we are facing in Iraq. He is the liaison for the United States Marine Corps on Capitol Hill.

I thought about that family, that Kelly family, as he walked out the door, and about the fact that while General Kelly was the Deputy Commander of the First Marine Division, and a very tough conflict and contest in Fallujah, in the western area of operations in Iraq, one of the most volatile and one which is very, very dangerous. While he was the Deputy Commander of the First Marine Division, his son John was a communications officer, also a United States marine in country, and his other son Robert was a rifleman, a member of the Marine fire team, also a United States marine who was, in fact, on the ground floor going house-to-house, street-to-street, and carrying out the mandates of the leadership of the First Marine Division in which his dad was the Deputy Division Commander. What a great American family. What a tradition this Kelly family has manifested. Of course, General Kelly has a wonderful daughter, Kathleen Kelly, who has spent a lot of time in places like Bethesda Hospital, comforting wounded marines and letting them know that Americans care about them.

That is the tradition of this country, and it is one that the Kelly family has done a lot to promote and to extend, and our great thanks to them for what they have done.

Also, Mr. Speaker, today I wanted to mention two wonderful leaders in my community who have passed on very recently. I have discussed before Jim Kuhn, who is a great, wonderful guy from the Imperial Valley, the guy who started the Salton Sea International Bird Festival. We are down there in Imperial Valley, we are very close to, and in fact, touch the Mexican border; we have an immense inland sea that is full of salt water, the Salton Sea. Jim Kuhn was a farmer who was a standout citizen who started in football and wrestling and went to Stanford, but came back to his beloved Imperial Valley and became one of the leading farmers of the leading innovators, a guy who was very creative in his area of agriculture, but also a guy with a great heart for the community. He founded this International Bird Festival which has brought people from all over the world to the banks of the Salton Sea there in Imperial Valley, California.

Jim died, as I noted earlier, very tragically in an automobile accident. He leaves a wonderful wife Heidi and the children, Vienna and Fritz, to carry on his legacy, and I know that they will.

Another dear friend and a great leader in California passed away, and we had services for him yesterday, and that was Corky McMillan. Corky McMillan was a guy who started his business with a pickup truck and a few carpenter’s tools and rose from that and I might say is a guy who built much of San Diego, built a career and built a community in San Diego from those humble beginnings to become San Diego’s finest homebuilder, one of the finest homebuilders in the Nation, and a person who literally built communities, not only in San Diego, but also in other parts of California and in other States.

Corky McMillan was a guy with a great heart. He was a guy who did lots of stuff for the community and was centered on his family. His family, Scott and Mark and Lauri and, of course, his beloved wife Bonnie were everything to Corky.

He became one of the great off-road racers in southern California. Those are the people that go down into Baja, California, with machines that go over holes in the ground that are 2 and 3 feet deep over ravines, literally taking those vehicles, those desert vehicles over them in a surreal manner, sometimes at speeds far exceeding 100 miles an hour, and manage to survive all of that. It is a rare breed of people. It started out with guys like Parnelli Jones, and has become a very high-tech sport, and it is one in which Corky McMillan and his sons Scott and Mark excelled and elevated to a level in which it is appreciated by people throughout the world.

Corky McMillan was a wonderful guy who gave a lot to his community and a lot to his country and a lot to the sport of racing, and we are going to miss Corky McMillan.

So I thank my colleagues for letting me reflect on some transitions today and talk about some Americans who truly deserve to be well remembered.

DISCUSSING THE AFTERMATH OF HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues tonight and address this House of Representatives. As I sat and listened to the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter), I cannot resist the sense of duty and obligation to weigh in on some of his remarks that he made with regard to General Myers as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter) has worked very closely with General Myers and he knows him far better than I do. My work in relationship there has been not deep, but I have been impressed as the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter) has been with Richard Myers, the chairman of our Joint Chiefs, and with his vision and his ability to see beyond the horizon, as the gentleman said.

I also had the privilege of meeting General John Kelly over in Iraq before the operation that ended the battle of Fallujah, and I was impressed with his dedication and his vision and his understanding of who our enemy was and what needed to be done, and I was pleased to sit here tonight and hear the remarks made by the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter), honoring the family, the family commitment to the military and to the defense of this fine Nation that was made by General John Kelly and his children.

Mr. Speaker, let me shift to the subject matter that I asked to speak about tonight and that is the subject matter that I have come to call “Katrina.” We have been here on this floor a couple of hours in the past 2 weeks, and I have spoken at great length about Katrina and in these past 2 weeks, we have seen the aftermath now of Hurricane Rita. I just merge them together, because essentially they did merge together. Mr. Speaker, as Katrina hit New Orleans and points on the east and Rita hit points to the west of New Orleans on over into the bay and into Texas, so they have crossed those lines and the damage of the two hurricanes have overlapped on each other.

To take Katrina on the one side and Rita on the other side and merge them together, I get Katrina. It is the largest natural disaster I believe that this Nation has ever seen. We are fortunate that it has not been the largest loss of life, although we mourn those who we have lost, and we are still in the process of recovery. But this financial loss and the term of time that will be required for reconstruction I think is the most devastating that America has seen. We are going to need to pull together on this.

I am well aware that there are Members of Congress who have districts
that were hit hard by the dual hurricanes, and they are the most sensitive to these issues. I am up in the upper Midwest, although I have made my trip down there and much of my staff has been down there, and in fact, I have a staff person there today who is to be there for some time. We want to lend a good hand to the people in the gulf coast intelligently and responsibly.

Before I get into that in any great depth, I will be happy to yield the floor to one of those individuals who does have now, if you follow the area, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King) for yielding and for hosting this hour to discuss these important issues.

When the two ladies of the gulf came in to Southeast Texas and southwest Louisiana just in the last few weeks, in some respect the whole area and our attitude about natural disasters changed. As you mentioned, this is not the greatest loss of life regarding hurricanes. In fact, the greatest disaster that occurred in American history was the year 1900 when the so-called "storm" as it was called across Galveston, Texas, that island, and killed at least 8,000 people, maybe even 12,000 people.

Times have changed a great deal because those hurricanes as our weather forecasters did with the two ladies of the gulf, Katrina, and more recently, Rita.

As you know, the folks in Louisiana disbursed throughout the United States but many, probably most came to Texas. And Texas is on the other side of the Savine River, and many of those people stopped off in my congressional district in Beaumont. Even this past week before Rita hit, there was still 15,000 people from Louisiana in Jefferson County, where Jefferson County Texas is. Many of them went on further to Houston which is about 90 miles away.

The good folks in Texas and other parts of the country have tried to take care of those displaced citizens the best they can. Just last week, almost a week ago Hurricane Rita came down hurricane alley and hit us in Jefferson County and Liberty County and Harris County, three counties that I represent or portions of those three counties.

We did some good things. I say "we," the government officials, local officials, Federal officials, and the community did some good things before Hurricane Rita came ashore. Of course, they were aware of the fact that there was a hurricane coming so there was an evacuation plan implemented. There was an expectation that about a million people would evacuate southeast Texas and move further west into other parts of Texas, but the truth of the matter was there was over 2½ million people evacuated.

By any imagination this would have been a large scale military operation in time of war. Moving 2½ million people logistically is a massive undertaking. The mayor of the City of Houston, Bill White, and the county judge, which is our county president, Robert Eccles, did a tremendous job moving people and evacuating people. And so, those are all the people that had to go back to southeast Texas as we speak.

The counties that I represent, Jefferson County, is still without power tonight. It has been almost a week. Still without power, almost a week. The same is true in parts of Liberty County. As you know, in southeast Texas and southwest Louisiana from New Orleans to Corpus Christie, Texas, 60 percent of the Nation's gasoline is refined in that one area. In Port Arthur, Texas, which was hit by Hurricane Rita, 27 percent of the gasoline is refined in that one small community for the whole United States. And because of the Katrina and Rita, several of those refineries have had to shut down. Many of those refineries have never shut down since the day they opened some 20, 25 years ago. Those refineries invented the phrase of working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, many years ago. It takes several days to get these refineries up and running once again.

I will mention something about the refineries momentarily. But for the most part, there was no damage to these refineries that cannot be repaired in just a few weeks except for losing a power source to start up again.

The county of Jefferson County, Beaumont and Port Arthur, evacuated about 90 percent of the people who lived there. Most of them are still displaced in parts of Texas. I think some of them are gone to Iowa and looking at Iowa for the first time in their lives. They, of course, want to come home.

The situation there now after a week, local officials are trying to maintain, of course, order. For the most part there has been very little looting, and our first responders are spending 12 hours a day working in shifts. The biggest problem our first responders have is that they are sleeping in their police cars. Of course, they have no electricity. They have no air conditioning and they are doing a marvellous job. It is interesting to note that not one member of the Beaumont Police Department left town during Hurricane Rita.

Something remarkable occurred and I think it is worthy to note that the port of Beaumont ships most of the military cargo to Iraq and Afghanistan. Docked in the Port of Beaumont at the time the hurricane was the Cape Victory and the Cape Vincent, two cargo ships that transport military cargo to Iraq and Afghanistan.

They were all expecting a surge of water and, of course, take over Port Arthur but further north, Beaumont as well. So the mayor and the first responders were concerned about their vehicles, what to do with them because they were doing to need them as soon as the hurricane was over. So the two captains of the Cape Victory and the Cape Vincent and the mayor, Mayor Guy Goodson, came up with the idea to put all of these vehicles on the two cargo ships. One does not think of shipping safety on a ship during a hurricane, but that is exactly what happened.

So they, in just a few minutes, made the decision and started within an hour without any red tape, without any permission, without any bureaucracy, without any committee meetings, just loading those two ships with police cars, fire trucks, ambulances and dump trucks from several surrounding towns. Tug boats went into operation during the hurricane to secure the ships, and as soon as the hurricane passed by those vehicles were ready to be used and they are being used and they were all taken care of in a very safe manner.

We are thankful to these two salty sea captains for coming up with that idea and protecting the first responders there.

I do want to thank the President for coming down to my district and viewing the situation firsthand. He did so in Louisiana, came into Texas. He had a meeting with the local officials and the first responders. And then he flew over the entire area in a helicopter to see southeast Texas and of course Louisiana as well.

The need for American petroleum and natural gas and dependence on ourselves could not be more evident in this hurricane, in these last two hurricanes.

We in this country for various reasons have not built a new refineries since over 25 years ago. It is not economically profitable to do so they, there has not been any. We are now 60 percent dependent on oil in the United States, and every day we take more and more away from our own selves and we have to import crude oil to make sure that the American public has gasoline.

These two disasters are evident that we need to do something about being energy self-sufficient. Most of our refineries are in southeast Texas, southwest Louisiana. Most of the offshore rigs are in the gulf in the same area. That is why it is important in my opinion that we drill in other parts off shore, not just off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas but even further east, even off the coast of Florida, the East Coast and West Coast as well. We are the only major power in the world that has the policy of not drilling off our own shores.

People complain and are concerned, and that is rightfully so about the idea and protecting the first responders there.

We are thankful to these two salty sea captains for coming up with that idea and protecting the first responders there.
Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would pose a question to the gentleman, as the gentleman raised the issue with the natural gas and oil drilling that goes on in the gulf, I have seen the map of where those rigs are, the platforms that are out to sea, and I cannot see them when I go along there along that shore and what I cannot see when I go along there and in a plane or a helicopter is any rigs. Can you see the rigs from the shoreline, say if you are sitting on the beach there and in a plane? I cannot see them.

Mr. POE. Well, of course they are not on a beach and the only way you could ever see is them on a clear night you could sometimes see the lights from the rigs that are offshore; but generally speaking, in the daytime you cannot see them at all.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would pose a follow-up question. Does the gentleman have any idea why it is some folks oppose the drilling offshore when it is out of sight?

Mr. POE. I do not understand why. I think, in my own opinion, there is a certain fear and panic about offshore drilling that is unfounded. Those folks that can drill offshore today can do it in a safe, environmentally clean manner. The best example is probably using the North Sea. The roughest seas in the world are in the North Sea. And the North Sea has numerous offshore rigs. Most of them built by, of course, Texans, and they can do so in a safe manner.

We can drill offshore in a safe manner. We can drill in an environmentally safe manner. No one wants polluted air or water. I think the day has come now where we have to get rid of the unnecessary and abusive regulations so we can drill offshore. It will not only bring us natural gas, crude oil for gasoline, but it will bring an income to the American public, because when the Federal Government leases offshore, oil companies pay for those leases.

And some estimate that the American Treasury could receive up to $7 billion a year by leasing in those areas where we have not leased before.

So it is a decision that the American public is going to have to make, depending on foreign gas, natural gas, depending on foreign crude oil or drill offshore; and I think we should drill in numerous places. And it is a security issue, because if you know when those hurricanes get in the gulf, they have to go somewhere. And we got all those rigs in one place, the refineries in one place as we have seen, it could have been a whole lot worse and the country could be in a whole lot worse shape just because of the energy and the lack of offshore drilling.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the last oil spill we had in any offshore drilling for oil was 1969. I do not know if the gentleman can confirm that, and what I cannot see could the gentleman also respond to the question of, does the gentleman know if there has ever been a spill of natural gas drilling offshore? And if it did spill, would it kind of look like the gas that is boiling up out of the water in New Orleans where it would just dissipate into the air and is there a reason to be concerned, even if we were irresponsible with regard to natural gas drilling?

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there has not been any major problems. We know we have had these two hurricanes and with very little environmental impact with the offshore rigs. Those the platforms are built very, very well. The refineries knew that the hurricanes were coming. They started burning the fuel that was in the pipe so there would not be any pipe disasters.

Just to mention as a side note, one-third of the pipelines in the United States go right through my congressional district. They go to all parts of the United States, but one-third are through that congressional district. It is all very highly concentrated, but we can drill offshore in a very clean manner. And like I said, the American public has to make that decision, and I hope they make the right decision which would be that we become more self-sufficient on energy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming to the floor to stand up and let America and the Speaker know the circumstances in southern Texas and how that has impacted you all down there. I will pick up on the flow of this.

I had the opportunity of going down there very early. In fact, my district director was on the ground near New Orleans on an air base on Labor Day which was just barely in the aftermath of the hurricane. It was important, I thought, to have someone down there to see what was going on so we could measure the magnitude of the disaster down.

He went down with a KC-135 load of Air Force MP’s out of Colorado and reported back to me. From what he saw down there, he said he thought there was so much military activity on Labor Day that it reminded him of the DaNang base during Vietnam when he was there.

So that gave me a sense of how much military effort there was even that early, and yet the public does not have the perception that there was a Federal response that was nearly as aggressive or as comprehensive as it actually was. I cannot say further that I did not wait. The following week I was there on the eleventh and twelfth of September. I came in very early on that Sunday morning. I got a good look at much of what was going on and went up in a Black Hawk helicopter and flew all over New Orleans for a couple of hours. I went back down and had the meetings that I had asked for. I was given a ride over the Corps of Engineers headquarters.
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There I entered their administrative offices where they rode out Hurricane Katrina, and looking at the drawings that they had and the maps of the area, and I had studied the elevations and the levees and the system that had been constructed. I had also read the reports that were predicting the worst-case scenario, particularly Katrina was the worst-case scenario for New Orleans with the exception that maybe the winds could have been a little stronger, but it went in the most damaging path it could have. It was almost the perfect system, and I will return to that description perhaps in a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

But when I think of the immediate military response that kept the air bases looking like Danang with so many planes landing, we had fixed-wing aircraft landing more often than one every minute, whether it be C-130s or KC-135s, cargo aircraft coming in with manpower and also with supplies, equipment, everything they could imagine that they could must up on the runway. We had fixed-wing aircraft were landing on the runway. The military had set up their power system, and they had taken over the communications for the air traffic controllers which did not have power.

They had to take over their command, and they were controlling the fixed-wing aircraft to land one more often than every minute on the runway there. Then, on top of that, the helicopters were coming and going; and they were landing every minute on the runway, asked to yield the right-of-way to the planes that were landing, a very, very busy place on Labor Day that early after Katrina hit.

So I would just fast forward to, in fact, exactly 7 days later when I found myself in a shelter in Slidell, Louisiana, visiting some of the people who had been evacuees from their homes and were looking for a place to lay their weary heads. They had set up the gymnasium there, perhaps 300 cots, a Red Cross-structured shelter. As I walked through there and visited some of the victims of the storm, I got a sense of the stories that they had lived through and a feel for the way they had been helped out and the helping hands that came from volunteers from all across this country, and in fact, hearing the stories of the traffic that was going south, while the evacuation was going north, people coming to the highway ways.

That is the American spirit, Mr. Speaker; and in that gymnasium, I met a young man who was a specialist with the 711th Signal Battalion out of Mobile, Alabama. He was a Specialist Cunningham, and I asked him, of course, what unit he was with. He said, 711th Signal out of Mobile, Alabama, sir. I said, how did you get here out of Alabama? Didn’t you get hit by a hurricane there, too? He said, Yes, but our orders were to come over here and help them make a safe escape and that is what we did. I said how did you get across Mississippi? His answer was, We used chainsaws and we used Humvees and
chainsaws, and we essentially cut away across the trees that were down over the highway, and we drug them out of the way and we opened the road and worked our way over here. So they had cut all the way or worked their way and cleared some of the way, if not all the way. Witnesses told me, Louisiana, on the eastern side of the Louisiana border, right next to the Mississippi line.

People from Mobile, Alabama, 300 strong, and history tell they started out on Monday. That is Monday Labor Day, the same day my district director landed down there near New Orleans, the same day that the air traffic was landing, one plane more often than every minute, with helicopters landing in between, bringing manpower and machines and equipment and supplies in for people that were in need.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government did provide a fast response; but it was a huge area, 90,000 square miles to start with. It has been littered by Katrina; and some of the things that were in place in Texas in preparation for evacuees, particularly those that might come out of Galveston, were a huge mess, and those of the things that appeared to have no dome, it was a very, very filthy and littered place that appeared to have no pharmaceutical shop that was set up in the Astrodome to have medicine. I think the report was 400 that day in for people that were in need. Plentiful volunteers were able to take thousands of people into the Astrodome and have the supplies there so that was remarkably clean, and neat. It was not littered.

Apparantly, the people who went to the Astrodome helped clean the place up. I do not know, but every time I saw a picture of the Superdome, it was a very, very filthy and littered place that appeared to have no order, and it was a chaotic location, as we all pretty well know by now.

As the Committee on Government Reform holds hearings and examines the circumstances that unfolded, I really do think that we need to let them do their due diligence. I think we need to let them listen to the testimony, and we heard the now-just-resigned director of FEMA give his testimony today, and I understand. It will follow here. It will follow today, I understand. It will follow in the days and weeks ahead.

It is important that we put on record the chronology of what happened when, where was the storm in the path, what not was brought, what decision was made at what time, who was in the position of authority, and at what time did they make those decisions, who did they consult with, what was the basis of the facts of the information, what equipment did they have to work with, what alternatives did they have, what had they done in the past history to prepare themselves for such a disaster. Certainly, it is not a surprise that a hurricane might someday hit of that magnitude, because that was published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune newspaper, I believe it was in late 2002. I have read all those articles, and I have read the worst-case scenario, and I cannot believe that I would be one of the few people, but many, many people in that region were aware of the worst-case scenario, and that is essentially what transpired.

I think it is important to let the committee do their work, the Committee on Government Reform, bring the witnesses forward, put their testimony on the record, take the documents, the supporting documents, and put those into the record and have the staff there, and have the public and the media be able to take a good look and examine the facts and then write up the scenarios.

This committee will issue a report, and I want to reserve my judgment on the report, but I am quite impressed with the effort that the director of Homeland Security made, Mr. Poe, a few moments ago. I am quite impressed with the effort that the director of Homeland Security made, and I want to reserve my judgment on the report, and I want to reserve my judgment on the report.

I will give, Mr. Speaker, a couple of opinions on what I think happened, and not to be passing previous judgment but simply to give an overall sketch of how it looks to me from what I have seen, what I have been involved in, and that is, that I think Hurricane Katrina, and Rita to a significantly less effect, but Katrina particularly was almost the perfect storm.

It did what the director of Homeland Security said here on this floor, that it came in in a military fashion. If you wanted to immobilize a city, what you would do is wipe out the communications, the power and electricity. That is the first thing that Katrina did. Then you would cut off all the transportation routes into the city, and that is what happened with the flooding and the roads that were taken out. Then the third thing that would happen would be, of course, you would attack, and that was the flood. The flood, when you start filling up a city like that, it immobilizes it. It put everybody out of commission.

So it was almost a perfect storm from the standpoint of the damage that it did and the direction that it took. I can speak about that perhaps a little bit more, Mr. Speaker; but I would add to that then, I think that decision was made in just a few minutes to place vehicles on a ship. They did that right away, and they protected all of those vehicles, they were in good condition, good shape, because a decision was made at the local level. Quick-thinking people that looked around and saw the resources that they had, that has always been the American way.

When we let government make decisions, we delay. For government to make decisions, the bureaucracy moves too slowly, the information moving up to the bureaucracy gets there too slowly; and even if the right decision is made, chances are it does not get back down through and does not get implemented in time for it to have the effect that it might have.

You really need people on the ground that are thinking for themselves and have enough self-confidence, enough leadership ability and enough authority to make those decisions like that decision was that recommended by the two ships’ captains that saved all those vehicles, so that as soon as the storm was over, they could roll them off the ship, and put them right to work rescuing people.

I thought that was a good example, and to think that we maybe could have
had those kinds of decisions in other areas around the disaster area if we had gotten government more out of the way and let the local and those people make those decisions, but they had to make the right ones in preparation, too. That is the part that I think that the Committee on Government Reform will bring out here so that Americans will see it with a true perspective.

If I could, I would appreciate the opportunity to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) who knows my heart and my mind, and speaks it, speaks up for the right causes and the right principles; and I am very pleased to be associated with the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed listening to my colleague from Iowa, and we share a lot of things in common, being able to know our own minds and speak them. I think they are in the face sometimes of running against the flow, but I think that is what all of our representatives of the States sent us here for, and so I think that is what we should be doing.

I have appreciated the comments that you have made. I heard a little bit from my classmate, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe), and his comments that he was making, too, and I think that all of us owe a great debt to the people from our districts who have stepped up and helped in so many ways.

I know that the people of the 5th Congressional District of North Carolina, as my gentlewoman from Iowa mentioned, and I got to see, are extremely generous with their time and money in helping with the hurricane relief. They, and all the other people, have exemplified what a wonderful country we live in and how volunteers do step up when we need them to.

Our government can do very, very many great things, and our government does do many great things. We have a lot of fabulous people who work for the Federal Government and the State Government, and I got to see that there are things that we are not equipped to do.

I, like you and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe), have been extremely saddened by the devastation that we have seen inflicted by these hurricanes. They are not the greatest disasters necessarily that have hit our country, but they have certainly been the greatest ones that have come in a long time.

I think that what our military and the Federal agencies have done has been positive, but I think that we have to do more at the State level and the local level; and I think we have to urge people to do more through the volunteer organizations, as you talked about.

I supported $10 billion in aid that we gave for this relief. I have supported every other bill that has come through except the one big omnibus bill that we had, the $52 billion bill.
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We have done a lot to provide relief measures, tax relief measures for people for college students, for workers and worker training programs. But my concern is that we spend the money that we spend here from the Federal level wisely. As a State Senator, I thought we should spend our government’s money wisely, but have to be careful that we do not let our hearts override our heads. If I am spending my own money, it is okay if I let my heart dictate. But if I am spending other people’s money, I think I have to make sure that I am voting with my own heart.

One of the concerns that I have is that we have oversight in the money that is being spent on the hurricane relief. We have to have oversight and accountability or else we will waste the precious money that we have. Every dollar wasted is a dollar not going to help some family in need or some agency in need. And I think that it is shameful that members of the minority party have often exploited the suffering of the people in order to score political points. We do not need to be dealing with partisan issues here. We need to work together to help the people of the gulf coast. But we need to do it in the most effective and fiscally responsible way possible.

I supported the select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation For and Response to Hurricane Katrina. I think that that is the way we should be operating. We are going to have to take a look, as the gentleman mentioned, and the report is going to come out on February 15. All the facts have to come out so that we can take steps on the Federal, State and local level to make sure that we do not have a debacle like we had there before. I think it is very important we examine the role of the Federal Government in disaster relief.

I am really proud to be a member of the Committee on Government Reform, and I appreciate from Iowa mentioning the Committee on Government Reform and the potential role it has to play in looking at this. What I hope is that the Committee on Government Reform is going to review many, many government programs and how they operate, and that this will be a catalyst for us to see what we are doing, particularly with rules and regulations as they apply to what is happening in the recovery.

But as we do, it seems to me we should expand the way we look at rules and regulations. Are they doing what we need them to do? Not only what went wrong with Hurricane Katrina, but what can we do to streamline the way we operate? I want measured, common sense solutions to what we have seen as a result of the hurricane, but I want common sense solutions to all of the problems that we face in this country, and I think our citizens are saying that.

I know when I am at home, people are saying please do not just throw money at this problem. Let us use this as an opportunity to make things better in the future, not just put a Band-Aid on the issues, but make sure we do not lose the opportunity to find out what went wrong, fix that, and then go even further. And let us reduce the role of the Federal Government, because as my colleague said, in many instances, just some good common sense on the part of average citizens can solve a lot of problems and keep us from wasting a lot of money in trying to solve a problem.

I commend the gentleman for having this special order tonight, for bringing this to our colleagues’ attention. We need to keep talking about it. We need to keep talking about it in a positive way, not a negative way. We need to let us look for solutions, let us solve the problems, and let us make the gulf coast a better place to live. Let us make our entire country a better place to live by reducing the role of the Federal Government in our lives.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) for her contribution to this discussion and this debate and her involvement on the Committee on Government Reform, which has got an important role to play, and always has when it comes time to streamline government and bring more responsibility out of government.

This is an especially important time. There are a lot of Federal dollars being poured into this region as we speak. And as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) said, she voted no on the $52 billion. I am one of those people that voted no on that. Actually, $51.8 billion, to be precise, not that a couple hundred million dollars is not splitting hairs in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is. And I voted no because there was approximately $5 billion in there that was easily identifiable as not emergency spending, Mr. Speaker. It was money that was being directed towards 300,000 trailer houses, of which 270,000 were back ordered. Back ordered trailer houses, and mitigation of future disasters is not emergency spending.

I wanted to focus the money on emergency spending, and I wanted to get about another $10 billion down there to keep FEMA going for another week so that we could do a better job of oversight. Because, as you know, once the money goes out the door, it is a lot harder to watch where it is spent than it is to put the strings on it before it leaves the door.

I believe we could have done a better job of that, but I do believe that we are joining together here to do a better job and looking back on some of that appropriations, to do the best we can to do the best we can to do the best we can in any future requests. I want to make sure that we weigh in very carefully on where those dollars go.

That is the biggest reason that I was down there fairly early in this, on September 11 and 12, and I got a good look at all of New Orleans from the air. I also flew down from the Corps of Engineers’ headquarters there over the
Mississippi River, which runs approximately 90 miles south, in a little bit of a winding pattern down to the Gulf of Mexico where the Mississippi River outlets into the gulf. Most people in the upper Midwest think that New Orleans, on the coast, that it is only a half mile of bottom land. That is protected with another levee about 25 feet high which protects the gulf, so that the gulf does not come into the backside of that levee that controls the Mississippi River.

The area in between those two 25-foot levees is the area that is about a half mile wide and generally about 90 miles long, perhaps 45 square miles, with six or seven towns in there. Those six or seven towns were all wiped out. The winds had all hit them severely. Even some of the best structures were really damaged severely.

The wind hit, and then the water surged over the levee from the Mississippi River side and flooded that area in between those two 25-foot dikes with that half a mile in between, and then the water surged over from the gulf side and did the same thing. So I am going to say wind damage like I have never seen before. It was in the worst of those, the entire area wind damaged like that, with entire buildings just blown away into splinters. Then, when the flood came from the surge, any buildings that were not blown away were mostly washed away. They floated and crashed up against each other against the levee.

Mr. Speaker, I have here on the easel a picture of one of the better built buildings down there in that bottom land of the Mississippi River. This may be, just guessing, perhaps 50 miles south of New Orleans along the Mississippi. This is a building that is built with steel pilings driven in, and who knows how deep, but down deep enough to get a very solid bearing in order to build a building that can withstand a hurricane and can withstand the kind of water surge that was going to come.

As you can see, as good as it was built, it still blew everything from here down away, and there is not a lot left to salvage here. One might be surprised that the structure seems to be fairly sound. I saw this all over, but I also square mile after square mile that had been homes that was nothing but a footing or a foundation or a concrete platform. I did not bring pictures of those because they are not so impressive, Mr. Speaker. That is just water—water had covered concrete footings and nothing left.

There were trees were the wind blew so hard it simply blew the leaves off the tree and the trees died. The salt water had covered concrete footings and nothing left.

On the positive side, Mr. Speaker, this is a very resilient Nation, and we have a strong character and a strong resilience. We also have a sense of defiance, which is rooted back in the defiance of King George. So when we are met with disaster, no matter how bad the disaster, no matter how bad the people have survived and they look around and they think, all right, if that is the best you can give me, then I can take that and I am going to rebuild. I will put my life back together, my business back together, my house back. I am going to live here and make it. I am going to be profitable and contribute back to this country and the neighborhood and the economy.

This is a symbol of that defiance, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the things that warmed my heart as we flew by there. The individual or the family that owned this place had lost almost everything. This is mostly trash and rubble. If you look up here, this debris that has all been pushed over by the wind. That is just floating debris, and the water has been over the top of this levee. That is the Mississippi River right at the top of the picture. The owner, when he went and found nothing, he did find a flag pole that was still standing. There is no way the flag that was on that flag pole originally survived that wind. But, Mr. Speaker, the first thing he did was went and got a fresh Old Glory and ran it up to the top of that flag pole in defiance of the storm and in proud independence that he would be, and I assume it is a he, rebuilding.

One day I will go back down there, and I hope I can identify that flag pole, because I think there is going to be some buildings that have been reconstructed again, and the place will one day look better than it did the day before the storm hit.
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We have a lot of big decisions to make; where the Federal dollars will go. We have an obligation to look for offsets. We cannot continue to put debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren. We can find the savings.

I am convinced that this Congress, working together in a bipartisan manner, will be able to find ways to save money so we can get the resources into the gulf coast to help out our friends in Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama, and to a lesser extent some of Florida. I am hopeful that we can join together in a way to do that.

I have a few ideas myself. I am not going to enter into this debate here tonight with them, but I have been working on my own list on how to fund Hurricane Katrina’s reconstruction. It is essential that we find offsets, and we can do some reconciliation legislation. It will be a blessing for us because we will find a way to make government more efficient. We will have that debate here. It will be on the floor of Congress.

But also finding ways to pay for it is not enough. We also have to spend the
money wisely. We need to limit it to the extent we can while still taking care of our obligations from the Federal Government. I have looked at the things that we need to do to protect New Orleans against the storm surge off the gulf. We need to have a levee that can stand up to the pressure of 16 feet of water standing in parts of New Orleans. That whole area with standing water is below sea level. We have to find a way, and there was discussion whether we could construct below sea level. Those questions landed on my ears. Actually, I thought they were prudent questions that needed to be asked, deliberated upon, and we need to bring more facts to the table before we can come up with a definitive answer.

But when you look at New Orleans and see the downtown buildings that rise up out of the water, and I was able to see it on a day when it was a bright blue sky, and the sunlight reflecting off the downtown buildings made the water shine as though the city buildings stood up, I looked and it was clear to me, yes, you cannot let a great city like New Orleans stand in water and not be reconstructed better than it was before. We need to rebuild the city, but we need to rebuild the city in a wise fashion.

My first recommendation is New Orleans, the levees that protect it and the systems that protect it from a hurricane, be constructed in preparation for a category 5 hurricane. If you can imagine a worse one, let us reconstruct for that. Let us do the hurricane mitigation work so the worst storm we can imagine cannot come in and do the kind of damage that Hurricane Katrina did to New Orleans.

The first step is as the water in Lake Pontchartrain increased by that 14 to 15-foot average water depth, and as it went up another 8 to 10 feet, because of the storm surge from the gulf, as the low pressure system raised the level of the water in the ocean and that hard south wind at 150 miles an hour drove that water up into the lake, stacked it up against the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain and filled that lake up with 8 to 10 feet more water, and then when the hurricane shifted to the east and winds came from the north, it drove that high wall of water down against the levees on the south side of Lake Pontchartrain. The waves added another 8 to 10 feet, it washed over the levees and flooded the city.

We know what happened, and to prevent it from happening again, I believe we need to do the engineering study, do the financial analysis, but repair the levee on the outfall of Lake Pontchartrain, a levee that can be breached, and to put hurricane gates in where necessary so we can close those in the event of a storm and keep the ocean water out of Lake Pontchartrain. That is step one.

Step two is if it gets in there or if there is a surge of the water in there, and I do not know if it is possible to have that kind of an effort under any kind of a storm, but if the water does get into Lake Pontchartrain, then we need to be prepared for the second level of protection. That second level would be to build levees between Lake Pontchartrain and New Orleans to an elevation that will protect New Orleans from 25 feet above sea level from a category 5, and then to put hurricane gates in at the inlets of the lake that is behind the levees, like the 17th Street Canal being the most infamous of them all. That can be done and protected. We need to come out with a cost and engineering analysis of that and make a decision in this Congress.

I believe that that cost is anywhere near reasonable, we need to get that done before there is new construction going on down below sea level in New Orleans itself. So that is two systems that would protect New Orleans from a flood.

It point out there is a significant amount of construction done in the world below sea level. Holland is one of those examples. I am told a third of Holland is below sea level; and when I was told that, I said they have problems against the sea since when I went to school and a fourth of the nation was underwater. That is probably the case. They continually reclaim. They construct below sea level. I believe we can do that in New Orleans. We have some more questions from the engineering perspective that I do not have the answers to, but protect the outlet of Lake Pontchartrain to keep the ocean water out and storm surge out, and keep the water in Lake Pontchartrain there by putting gates at the inlet of the canals, and perhaps raise the level of the hurricane levees on Lake Pontchartrain.

The third thing is the pump stations have to be raised up well above the high water mark, and they need to have redundancies built in so they can pump water if the power goes out. If the power goes out, they automatically kick on. And the water that is being pumped out of New Orleans now over the last week or a half or so, it is a massive quantity of water. It is 27,000 cubic feet per second, more than twice the amount of water that runs down the Missouri River at Sioux City, Iowa, in the area where I live.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of experience with reconstructing in preparation for category 5 hurricanes. They have perfected a lot of the method of how to prepare for a hurricane, how to evacuate, how to zone the houses and the buildings so they are prepared for that kind of wind and damage. Requiring shutters is one thing, and building off the ground is another. There are a number of ideas from an architectural standpoint. There is much that has already been established. We should look at the engineering study that came out of the Department of Homeland Security of those zoning restrictions that they have and the emergency response system that they developed in Florida and bring that into Louisiana, Mississippi and parts of Texas; but Louisiana needing the most help, it appears.

I think we can learn from our experience. We need to also be able to have a regional cooperation with the reconstruction of the levee so if there is a levee that can be breached and put that much property in jeopardy, we need to have Federal oversight over that levee. There is much that can be done and should be done.

I will be involved in the effort to identify the mitigation work and looking at the cost and the engineering design and the recommendations. I would also point out that there will be a population loss in New Orleans. I do not know that number, no one knows that number, but perhaps a loss of a quarter of the population, perhaps more. If that is the case, the homes that will be condemned, many are still under water today, that will be the last place that needs to be reconstructed.

The reconstruction of the homes can go in the higher elevation areas where they do not have water. Those decisions need to be made so people can make plans for the future. That is part of the Congress responsibility. Wherever there are Federal dollars, we have an obligation to the taxpayers that they are spent wisely.

There are private sector solutions to this, and we need to listen to our representatives from that area, those that are advocating for less pressure on taxpayers and more pressure on individuals, and the solutions of tax credits and I will say commerce-friendly zones, tax free zones, for example, lay all of those ideas out on the table.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) both have been very active, along with the other Representatives from Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCuerry) has been very vocal here. I am looking forward to their input and working in cooperation with them so we put a solution together that will leave a legacy of making it better when things are bad in the event of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2360, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (during the Special Order of Mr. King of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-242) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.
ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2005. AND ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2005 TO THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (during the special order of Mr. King of Iowa). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 6, 2005.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today on account of illness in the family.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today after 5:10 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HOIBON (at the request of Mr. Blunt) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. CULIERMAN (at the request of Mr. Blunt) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. Blunt) for today after 5:15 p.m. on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. Woolsey) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MELANCON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PETENFORD, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. Westmoreland) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1235. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the availability of $400,000 in life insurance coverage to servicemember and veterans, to make a stillborn child an insurable dependent for purposes of the Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance Program, to make technical corrections to the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, to make permanent a pilot program for direct housing loans for Native Americans, and for other purposes. Senate referred to the Committee on Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1778. An act to extend medicare cost-sharing for qualifying individuals through September 2006, to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, to make technical corrections to the Medicaid Program, and related programs through March 31, 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means and to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 3864. An act to assist individuals with disabilities affected by Hurricane Katrina and Rita through vocational rehabilitation services.

SENATOR ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1792. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to reauthorize that Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 3, 2005, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1235. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the availability of

10 U.S.C. 2309a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

401. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

402. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

403. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Arab Emirirates pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.


407. A letter from the Associate Managing Director/PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2005 [MDocket No. 05-58]; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2004 [MDocket No. 04-73]; received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

408. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Section 68.4(a) of the Commission’s Rules Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Telephones [WT Docket No. 01-309] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


411. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s
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final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Dallas, Oregon) [MB Docket No. 04-124; RM-10936; RM-10937; RM-10938; RM-10939] received July 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

431. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Georgetown, Mason, Oxford and West Union, Ohio, and Salt Lick, Kentucky) [MB Docket No. 04-127; RM-11173; RM-11174] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


434. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations (RIN: 1018-AT6) received September 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

436. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

440. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

442. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

443. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

444. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Federal Vacancies Reform Act Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

446. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant (IAAP) in Burlington, Iowa, to have IAAP added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on Health and Education, Labor, and Pensions.

447. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Y-12 Nuclear Energy Facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy.
Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4348. A letter from the Secretary and Attorney General, Departments of Health and Human Services and Justice, transmitting the eighth Annual Report on the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control (HCFAC) Program for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered by the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2360. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–241) Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 65. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, adversely; (Rept. 109–243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RENZI, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. POE, Mr. GUTENBERG, Mr. GARY G. MEYERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTERS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. McCOTTER):

H.R. 3938. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Homeland Security, and Government Reform, 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. AKIN (for himself and Mr. WILKIE):

H.R. 3939. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish Veterans Business Outreach Centers and Technical Monitoring Assistance Commissions; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PHELPS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 3940. A bill to extend implementation of the Medicare prescription drug program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DRURY):

H.R. 3941. A bill to establish a Federal Office of Steroids Testing Enforcement and Prevention to establish and enforce standards for the testing for the illegal use in professional sport of anabolic steroids, prescription anabolic substances, and other controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFIASIO, Mr. SMITH, Mr. WILSON of Washington, D.C., Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 3942. A bill to establish a Federal Office of Propanolamine to schedule V of the schedule of the Controlled Substances Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3943. A bill to establish a Federal Office of Propanolamine to schedule V of the schedule of the Controlled Substances Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 3948. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the deductible and change the method of determining the mileage reimbursement rate for the beneficiary travel program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PASCHKE):

H.R. 3949. A bill to protect volunteer firefighters and emergency medical services personnel from being denied insurance coverage by reason of termination or demotion in their places of employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DELAURIE (for herself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3951. A bill to require compensation for jury service to be excluded in determining for purposes of the supplemental security income program under title XVI of the Social Security Act, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 3952. A bill to provide emergency health care relief for survivors of Hurricane Katrina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, the Budget, Government Reform, and 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 Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. ROS-LeHTEN):

H.R. 3953. A bill to authorize 4 permanent and 1 temporary additional judgeships for the middle district of Florida, and 3 additional permanent judgeships for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. SCHAPPF, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TASSCHER, Ms. MATSEL, Mr. VAN HOLLLEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LASSON of Connecticut, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KOLDER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Social Security Act to protect Social Security cost-of-living adjustments (COLA); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3955. A bill to amend the Controlled Substance Act to provide for the transfer of ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, and phenylpropanolamine to schedule V of the schedule of the Controlled Substances Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RICHARDSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 3956. A bill to provide for the testing of the illegal use in professional sport of anabolic steroids, prescription anabolic substances, and other controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KUHL of New York:
H. R. 3966. A bill to provide for a drug discount program for individuals without prescription drug coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:
H. R. 3965. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the interment or memorialized in national cemeteries of persons convicted of committing State capital crimes and to extend the new markets credit tax to; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELANCON:
H. R. 3961. A bill to provide disaster relief and incentives for economic recovery for Louisiana residents and businesses affected by Hurricane Katrina; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, Resources, and Small Business, 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. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. EMANUE, Mr. STARK, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. PARMAR):
H. R. 3959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent corporate exploitation of presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:
H. R. 3960. A bill to amend chapters 95 and 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. RENZI (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. HAYWORTH):
H. R. 3961. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to pay for services rendered by subcontractors under a General Services Administration Indefinite Deliver/Indefinite Quantity Contract issued for work to be completed at the Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan:
H. R. 3962. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for employees and contractors of health centers under section 330 of such Act who provide health services in emergency areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEN, Mrs. HERVEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ACKERMAN):
H. R. 3963. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the authorization of appropriations for Long Island Sound; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):
H. R. 3964. A bill to prohibit anticompetitive provisions in gasoline dealer franchise agreements that dictate the wholesale source of gasoline; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:
H. R. 3965. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the interment or memorialized in national cemeteries of persons convicted of committing State capital crimes and to extend the new markets credit tax to; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):
H. R. 3966. A bill to facilitate Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability regarding reduction of other spending to offset costs of responding to recent natural disasters; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. PITTS (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. BURGMAN, Mr. RYNHOlD, and Mr. ROYCE):
H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution commending the people of Mongolia for building strong, democratic institutions, and commending the people of Mongolia for the holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, expressing the support of the United States for efforts by the United States to continue to strengthen its partnership with that country; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):
H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to a moratorium on the payment of principal or interest on certain mortgage loans, and conveying to the President that no other housing assistance will be provided to residents of a Federal disaster area; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. MEKES of New York, Mr. HODCLE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GHELALA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FURCHTCHM, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSK, Ms. LEE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HINCHY, and Mr. ACKERMAN):
H. Res. 477. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Islamic holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RUSH:
H. Res. 473. A resolution condemning the racist remarks of William Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. ROYCE):
H. Res. 475. A resolution expressing disapproval of further payments by the Government of the United States to the Government of Uzbekistan relating to facilities at the Karshi-Khanabad airbase and urging the United Nations Security Council to refer the situation of Uzbek President Islam Karimov and the massacre at Andijan of May 13, 2005, to the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RUSH:
H. Res. 476. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Brooklyn Dodgers victory over the New York Yankees in the World Series; to the Committee on Government Reform.
Mr. G. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, of Florida, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MEEKS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

REPETITION, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, 72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, Illinois, relative to a resolution dated June 21, 2005, condemning the use of torture as well upon anyone being held by, or under the per-
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O Lord, You have made this day for Yourself and for us. It is Your day, and we share its meaning. Remind us that You use our minds, hands, and feet to do Your work in our world.

Help us to bring aid and comfort to those who have been battered by the forces of nature. May we see in their trials opportunities to serve You.

Give the Members of this body the wisdom to use this day for Your glory. May they use their talents to strengthen our Nation and world. Empower them to strive for integrity, faith, love, and peace.

Entwine our lives with Your purposes so that our land will be blessed by Your providence.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of Calendar No. 317, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr., of Maryland to be Chief Justice of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will begin the final remarks regarding the nomination of Judge John Roberts to serve as Chief Justice of the United States. Beginning at 10:30 this morning, the time until the vote has been allocated for closing comments by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The vote on the confirmation of Judge Roberts will begin at 11:30.

I remind all Senators to be at their desks at the outset of this historic vote. Senators should come to the Chamber around 11:20 for the 11:30 vote.

Following the confirmation vote on Judge Roberts, the Senate will take up the Defense appropriations bill. Senators should expect additional votes on the Defense bill, as well as votes on Friday.

The vote we cast today is one of the most consequential of our careers. With the confirmation of John Roberts, the Supreme Court will embark upon a new era in its history—the Roberts era. For many years to come, long after many of us will have left public service, the Roberts Court will be deliberating on some of the most difficult and fundamental questions of U.S. law. As all Supreme Courts that have come before, their decisions will affect the lives of all Americans.

When the President announced his nomination of Judge Roberts in July, we pledged to conduct a full, thorough, and fair review of Judge Roberts’ credentials and qualifications. We also pledged we would conduct those deliberations in a timely and expeditious manner so the Supreme Court could begin its term on October 3 at full strength. We have delivered on both promises.

I thank Chairman ARLEN SPECTER for his leadership and handling of the hearings process, and I also want to thank my colleagues for moving forward so the Supreme Court can do its important work for the American people.

I expect a strong bipartisan vote in support for Judge Roberts later this morning. As has been said by Members on both sides of the aisle, Judge Roberts is an exceptional candidate who possesses the keen intelligence, the exemplary character, and sterling credentials to serve as Chief Justice of the highest Court in the land. I look forward to confirming him to lead the Supreme Court of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, the Senator from New York, is here. He wants to speak briefly. I know the time is divided for the next hour. I ask unanimous consent that he follow my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is equally divided.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, Senator LOTT has been scheduled to speak. When he comes, we will be alternating back and forth.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator seek recognition now?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will probably speak 8 or 9 minutes. My colleague wanted to speak for about 4 or 5 minutes, and I did not intend to speak for the previous agreement. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized following order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would take an amendment to the previously agreed-to order.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States is the ultimate arbiter of our Constitution and, as such, it is the final protector of individual rights and liberties in this great Nation. So when we vote to confirm a justice for a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court, we have an awesome responsibility to get it right. And when we vote for the Chief Justice of the United States, we have an even greater responsibility, because the stakes are even higher.

The Chief Justice sets the tone for the Court and, through leadership, influences Court decisions in ways both subtle and direct. Indeed, during the course of his confirmation hearings, Judge Roberts expressly acknowledged the important role that a Chief Justice can play in persuading his fellow justices to come along to his way of thinking about particular cases.

By sharing my discussion with him of the Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education, I mentioned that the decision was a unanimous one. Judge Roberts responded:

Yes. That represented a lot of work by Chief Justice Earl Warren because my understanding of the history is that it initially was not. And he spent—it was re-argued. He spent a considerable amount of time talking to his colleagues and bringing around to the point where they ended up with unanimous court.

On another day, when I again mentioned Brown and the indispensable role played by Chief Justice Warren, Judge Roberts said:

Well, Senator, my point with respect to Chief Justice Warren was that he appreciated the impact that the decision in Brown would have. And he appreciated that the impact would be far more beneficial and favorable and far more effectively implemented with the unanimous court, the Court speaking with a single voice.

The issue was significant enough that he spent the extra time in the reargument of the case to devote his energies to convincing the other justices—and, obviously, there’s no arm-twisting or anything of that; it’s the type of collegial discussion that judges and justices need to have in order to achieve an appreciation of its impact on real people and real lives.

I have thought long and hard about the exchanges I had with Judge Roberts, and I have read and re-read the transcript and the record. And try as I might, I cannot find the evidence to conclude that John Roberts understands the real world impact of court decisions on civil rights and equal rights in this country. And I cannot find the evidence to conclude that a Chief Justice John Roberts would be the kind of inspirational leader who would use his powers of persuasion to bring all the Court along on America’s continued march toward equal opportunity for all. The White House has refused to release documents and information from his years in the Reagan administration and in the first Bush administration that might indicate otherwise, but without those records we have no way of knowing.

Both in committee and on the floor, some have argued that those of us who oppose John Roberts’ nomination are trying to force a nominee to adopt our “partisan” positions, to support our “causes,” to yield to our “special interest” agendas.

But it is toward a freer, fairer Nation where “justice for all” is a reality—not just a pledge in the Constitution—is not a personal “cause” or a “special interest” or a “partisan” philosophy or ideology or agenda.

For more than half a century, our Nation’s progress toward a just society has been a shared goal of both Democrats and Republicans. Since Republican Senate Leader Everett Dirksen led his party in supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1964, equal rights for all has been a consensus cause, not a “partisan cause.” Since Congress adopted the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and began the process of spreading true democracy to all Americans, it has been a national special interest goal. Filling the Founders’ ideals of equality and justice for all is not just a personal ideology, it is America’s ideology. Surely, in the 21st century, anyone who leaves the slightest doubt as to whether he shares it fully, openly and enthusiastically should not be confirmed to any office, let alone the highest judicial office in the land.

Our doubts about John Roberts’ commitment to continuing our national progress toward justice was, quite appropriately, a major issue in the committee hearings. The fundamental question was whether his record and his answers suggested that he would be an obstacle to that progress, by treating cases before the Supreme Court in a narrow legalistic way that resists and undermines the extraordinary gains of the past.

For all his brilliance and polish, he gave us insufficient evidence to think that Judge Roberts of today is not the ideological activist he clearly was before. The strong evidence from his own hand and mind, the crucial 3-year gap in evidence because of the Administration’s refusal to release his papers as Deputy Solicitor General, and his grudging and ambiguous answers at the hearing left too many fundamental doubts, and could put the entire Nation at risk in the future.

Some argue that John Roberts was just doing his job and carrying out the policies of the Reagan administration in the early 1980s. But his own writings refute that argument—these were clearly his own views. And he enthusiastically offered as his views. If he didn’t agree with those policies as a lawyer in the Justice Department in 1981 and 1982, he would not have applied for the more political and more sensitive job in the White House Counsel’s office when he left the Justice Department. He knowingly chose to be a voice for their policies, and often advocated even more extreme versions of those policies.

He certainly knew what was expected of him when he chose to become Deputy Solicitor General in 1989. That position was explicitly created to be the political monitor over all Department of Justice litigation. He was eager to advance the ideological views that his well-known mentor, Robert Bork, had been supported. He obviously wasn’t just “following orders”—he was an eager recruit for those causes. That was the evidence he needed to overcome in the hearings, and his effort to do so is unconvincing.

I hope I am proven wrong about John Roberts. I have been proven wrong before on my confirmation votes. I regret my vote to confirm Justice Scalia even though he, too, like John Roberts, was a nice person and a very smart Harvard lawyer. I regret my vote against Justice Souter, although at the time, his record did not persuade me he was in tune with the Nation’s goals and progress.

But as the example of Justice Scalia shows, and contrary to the assertions of my colleagues across the aisle, I have never hesitated to vote for a Republican President’s nominee to the Supreme Court whose commitment to core national goals and values appeared clear at the time. In fact, I have voted for seven of them, more than the number of nominees of Democratic Presidents I have voted for.

Our Senate responsibility to provide advice and consent on the Supreme Court Justices and other nominations is one of our most important functions. The future and the quality of life in this Nation may literally depend on how we exercise it. If we are merely rubberstamps for the President’s nominees, if we put party over principle, then we have failed in that vital responsibility. Even more important, if we go along to get along with the White House, we will be undermining the trust the Founders placed in us, our commitment to the Constitution entrusted to our care. Every thoughtful and reasonable “no” vote is a vote for the balance of powers and for
the Constitution, so we must never hesitate to cast it when our independent consciences tell us to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. President, today John Roberts will be confirmed as the 17th Chief Justice of the United States, so it is a historic day. Not everyone in this Senate will vote for him, and our opinions differ on many things: How much we were consulted, how many documents we received, how fair John Roberts will be, how ideological he will be.

In the end, I decided that while there was a very good chance that Judge Roberts would be a very conservative but mainstream Justice without an ideological agenda, he was not convinced the down side, even a minority downside that he would be a Justice in the mold of Scalia and Thomas, was too great to risk, so I will vote no.

But no matter how we vote, today we all share a fervent hope that Justice Roberts will be a great jurist and serves our Nation well. In the end, I cannot vote for Judge Roberts, but I hope he proves me wrong in my vote and that he takes the goodwill of this body and the American people with him onto the bench; that he is fair; that he looks out for the little guy if the law is on the little guy’s side; that he will be the lawyer’s lawyer, without an ideological agenda; that he sees justice done in the many areas of the law that he will profoundly affect over the next several decades.

However, as the curtain falls on this vote, the curtain is about to rise on the nomination of a replacement for Justice Sandra Day O’Connor. If ever there was a lack of consensus, the time is now. If the President nominates a consensus nominee, he will be embraced, the President will be embraced, and the nominee will be embraced with open arms by people on this side of the aisle. Not only we on this side of the aisle, but the American people hope and pray in these difficult times for a consensus nominee. The ball is in your court, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Murkowski). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I am delighted this morning to rise to speak on the nomination of Judge John Roberts to become Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Before I proceed on my discussion of Judge Roberts, I want to take a moment to commend the President of the United States for his brilliant selection of this outstanding human being, lawyer, judge, and public servant. He would rise up in this Senate and ignore the pressures to move in some other direction, that some other person might be selected for a variety of reasons—good reasons. But the most important thing was for him to select the best man or woman for the job, regardless of anything else. That is what the President did.

When I had an opportunity to comment to White House representatives when they asked my recommendations, I said, frankly, I didn’t have a particular person I recommend. I have faith in this President and I believe he will make the right choice. But second, I urged that he pick the best person, regardless of sex, religion, race, religious background, region of the country, or philosophy. And then I had one or two that I thought, well, maybe you do not want to suggest these people.

I was, frankly, delightfully surprised when the President selected Judge Roberts. I am very pleased with this selection.

I also want to thank Senator Specter of Pennsylvania for conducting these confirmation hearings in such a fair, dignified, and respectful manner. We can only hope that the nature of these hearings will carry over to the next Supreme Court nomination. Every senator has ample opportunity to make statements and ask what were supposed to be questions that quite often became just another speech, but I thought that the overall tone and pace of the committee hearings was very good.

Maybe this nomination and the conduct of these hearings in the Judiciary Committee and the vote today in the Senate will be overwhelming and will bring to a successful and ugly chapter in the history of Federal judicial nominations and confirmations. What we have done to men, women, and minorities over the past 4 years, until May of this year, was one of the nastiest things I have ever witnessed. Good people’s remarks were misinterpreted. I will not even describe how strongly I feel about some of the things that were said and done.

We found a way to change the atmosphere, to move nominees, and now to vote on this nomination. Thank goodness. This is a good opportunity. Let’s continue these future hearings and these nomination considerations in this vein.

We are set to vote later this morning on the nomination of Judge Roberts to be the 17th Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the youngest nominee in probably over 150 years. The vote will place Judge Roberts at the head of the judiciary branch, a job that comes with an immense amount of responsibility and a position for which Judge Roberts is eminently qualified.

Before I met Judge Roberts, I knew him by reputation. I had some mutual friends who had worked with him at the Supreme Court, who had served with him in previous administrations, who had known him in a variety of roles, and to a man or woman they gave glowing reports on his quality and his credentials.

By Supreme Court standards he is still a young man, just 50 years old, but he has compiled an outstanding resume, graduating sum cum laude from Harvard, taking only 3 years. He graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School and served as managing editor of the Harvard Law Review, with clerkships for Judge Henry Friendly and the Associate Justice William Rehnquist.

When I met with him I said, You have an outstanding resume and we will overlook the Harvard thing—which always gets a laugh. And I am only joining—in half.

Judge Roberts embarked upon a distinguished career in public service and served as Associate White House Counsel in the Reagan administration and the Principal Deputy Solicitor General in the George H.W. Bush administration.

I yield the floor.
a young man in a young businessman’s organization was that this is a government of laws, not of men. It is just not so. You can have the best laws in the world, you can have the best system in the world, which we do, but if you have the wrong men and women in place, it does not work.

So we have a little changing of the judiciary that is called for. And these recent decisions I refer to just magnify why this is needed. Judicial activism is a threat to all Americans, regardless of political alliances. The use of judicial activism to advance conservative or liberal political goals is simply wrong.

Judge Roberts’ own testimony illustrates his understanding of the constitutional role of the judiciary and shows his understanding of the issue. He said:

Judges are like umpires. Umpires don’t make the rules, they apply them. They make sure everybody plays by the rules, but it is a limited role.

While Judge Roberts acknowledged this analysis might be an oversimplification, but it shows a welcome respect for the constitutional role of the Judiciary.

When he was asked what type of judge he would like to be known as, Judge Roberts responded “a modest judge,” meaning he has an “appreciation that the role of the judge is limited, that a judge is to decide the cases before them, they are not to legislate, they are not to dictate the laws.”

Judge Roberts vowed to decide each case in a fair-minded, independent, and unbiased fashion and has stated repeatedly that personal ideology has no place in the decision making process of a judge.

Simply put, this is a rock solid judicial philosophy. This is what separates judges from legislators. We as legislators are free to use our personal ideology and make decisions, and boy do we. We are elected and accountable to our constituents for those decisions if we go too far, in their opinion, one way or the other.

Judge Roberts addressed the role of personal ideology in the judiciary during his hearings by saying:

[Judges are not individuals promoting their own particular views, but they are supposed to be doing their best to interpret the law, to interpret the Constitution, according to the rule of law, not their own preferences, not their personal beliefs, not their personal convictions.

During his hearings, Judge Roberts was asked to answer several questions on issues that potentially could come before him if confirmed to the Supreme Court. He handled those questions exactly as he should have. It is a well-established standard that nominees should not answer questions that might bias them on future cases. I commend Judge Roberts for his handling of that sometimes difficult situation with steadfastness, with intelligence, and sometimes even with a sense of humor.

This nomination has served as a fantastic example of how the Ginsburg standard should be applied. Judicial nominees should have a fair and respectful hearing. They should not be expected to prejudge issues or cases. Judges must remain impartial and should not be asked to commit to a certain way of thinking with confirmation votes. Judge Roberts, like Justice Ginsburg and all the other sitting judges, rightly refused to prejudge cases or issues likely to come before the Supreme Court.

During this process, Judge Roberts’ record was reviewed more closely than any other person in the history of judicial nominees. Senators had access to unprecedented 76,000 pages of documents from his time spent in public service and 327 cases decided by him on the DC Circuit. In addition, he was questioned for nearly 20 hours by the Judiciary Committee before receiving bipartisan support and a vote of 13 to 5. Through all of this intense scrutiny Judge Roberts and his record remain consistent.

Being placed under the microscope like this is not for the fainthearted. I admire how he handled this entire process with grace and poise.

Nobody should be surprised that when first the Court vacancy President Bush nominated a judicial conservative for that position. He said he would, I expected him to, and so he did. I expect him to do it again. In fact, you are talking about a lifetime appointment, so why would you expect anything less?

I reserve judgement until Judge Roberts expresses his views on critical issues now.

I recognized that these memos were written a long time ago, which is why I am left to wonder about Judge Roberts’ positions on critical questions regarding our Constitution and a person’s way of life. I hope that Judge Roberts shares my understanding that the Constitution provides robust protections guaranteeing the equality of all Americans. I hope that Judge Roberts’ view of the Constitution is not as narrow as I have been led to believe.

However, neither the White House nor Judge Roberts has convinced me. On the contrary, they have given me reasons for alarm. Because, the White House failed to respond to requests for Roberts’ more recent work at the Solicitor General’s office, the memoranda Judge Roberts wrote as a young lawyer in government service are all I have to go on. These memos raise serious concerns for me about Judge Roberts’ commitment to protecting fundamental rights. Judge Roberts expressed views on civil rights, the Voting Rights Act, and the right to privacy convey a view of the Constitution that I simply do not agree with.

I recognize that these memos were written a long time ago, which is why I am left to wonder about Judge Roberts’ judicial philosophy. These memos concerned me not only for the ideas they conveyed, but also the language that Judge Roberts chose to express his ideas. Phrases such as “illegal immigration,” “Indian giveaway,” and “supposed right to privacy” convey an unacceptable lack of respect for the people whose rights and freedoms Judge Roberts is a talented lawyer and Constitutional scholar. I do not believe that these qualities alone are sufficient for leading the highest court in the land.

I approached this nomination as I do all nominations: with an open mind. I take my role of advice and consent on nominations seriously. That is why I joined a group of my colleagues in the Senate to respectfully ask the President to make available documents from Roberts’ time at the Solicitor General’s office. These documents could have provided valuable insight into how Roberts views important Constitutional questions, and I am disappointed that the White House did not fulfill this request. The White House owes not only the Senate, but also the American people, access to this information.

And so I am left to wonder about Judge Roberts’ positions on critical questions regarding our Constitution and a person’s way of life. I hope that Judge Roberts shares my understanding that the Constitution provides robust protections guaranteeing the equality of all Americans. I hope that Judge Roberts’ view of the Constitution is not as narrow as I have been led to believe.
Roberts would be entrusted to protect. It disappointed me that, when asked whether he regretted his flippant tone, Judge Roberts not only deflected responsibility but also failed to articulate any semblance of regret for these hostile words.

For these reasons, I cannot vote for this nominee. This was not an easy decision for me. I have great respect for my many friends—both inside and outside this body—who have come to a different conclusion. I hope the President will use his next nomination to appoint a justice whom all Senators can agree upon, and if doubts arise the White House will choose to resolve rather than to exacerbate them.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, among the great responsibilities and privileges of being a Member of the U.S. Senate is assessing the qualifications and voting on the confirmation of members of the U.S. Supreme Court. Reflecting on this vote, one gets a sense of the weight of the responsibility—we will be voting on a replacement for only the 17th Chief Justice in the history of our great country.

But this vote is not unique because of its infrequency but because of its place in our system of government. The Supreme Court is the final voice in the land on the meaning of the words of the Constitution as they apply to the extent of the rights guaranteed to individuals by the document. It is the final word on the demarcation of power between the legislative and executive branch of government and it is the voice on defining the power reserved for the Federal Government and the governments of the individual States.

As a member of the legislative branch of our national government who was in a former life a State Governor, I am acutely aware of the importance of these lines and the consequences when they are breached. As a Member of the Senate, I do not welcome decisions overturning legislative acts that I support but I frequently work with my colleagues to keep efforts to meddle in state affairs. As a Governor attempting to guide my State, I had to labor through the burdens placed in my way by an intrusive Federal Government.

The judicial branch of our government, most notably the Supreme Court, has been designated by the Constitution as the branch to maintain these divisions of power and law making. So it is a great privilege and responsibility to have a role in confirming people who will occupy a place on the court. In this case, confirming the person that will lead that court.

After hearing Judge Roberts during 3 days of hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, I am convinced the power that comes with the vote of a Supreme Court Justice will be in wise and capable hands. First, throughout this strenuous session, Judge Roberts demonstrated intelligence, patience and temperament were on full display and were nothing short of extraordinary.

But it was that which he had to say that satisfies me and secures my vote for his confirmation.

He made a convincing case through his words and his demeanor that he will approach his responsibility with humility, which means approaching cases with an open mind and carefully studying the words of Congress or the precedents of the Court on constitutional questions. As Judge Roberts said and I agree, “a certain humility should characterize the judicial role. Judges are servants of the law, not the other way around.”

Also, as Judge Roberts repeatedly reminded his inquirers, he is not a politician. In that statement, I am comforted. I commend him on his willingness to remind my colleagues that he was not before Congress to compromise or give hints on how he might vote on a hypothetical case in exchange for confirmation votes. Rather, he confirmed repeatedly that the Constitution and the rule of law are his guides.

Judge Roberts made the case that he recognizes that the authority on the division of power between the branches of government and the authority on the division of power in our federalist system of government are contained in the Constitution.

It is a positive thing that we are going to confirm a decent person for the Court, but that should not be our guiding principle. Our vote should not be on whether a judge will approach cases as a father or a son, on the side of the weak or the strong or with the intent to expand rights or protections. That subjects judicial decision making to subjective standards, compromises impartiality and removes the blinders from justice. Some have argued that this is to dodge a question. Rather, it is an indication that one recognizes that the obligation of the judge is to follow the Constitution rather than his own interests.

At one point during the proceedings, the Judge was proded to comment on a case in which he participated to decide the extent of benefits available under a health plan. To limit or expand the benefits provided under a statute is the job of a legislature, not a judge. Judge Roberts agrees with this important principal. As he stated, “As far as a Judge is concerned, they have to decide questions according to the rule of law, not their own preferences, not their policy views, not their personal preferences, but according to the rule of law.”

If the support of a majority of a State or national legislature can be won, a statute can be changed and this concern addressed. I suspect that many of my colleagues, particularly those who will vote against this nomination, have come to rely on the judiciary to advance changes that have no support in legislatures. Hence, their frustration with the judges’ role. The judiciary has the well-defined views of the role of the judiciary and the role of the legislature and they do not appear to be blurred. He has not shown a willingness to approach case guided by a point of view or a subjective standard—that is what is to motivate legislators as they debate on the campaign trail and the floors of Congress and statehouses across the country.

But as Judge Roberts again put it so well, “If the people who framed our Constitution were jealous of their freedom and liberty, they would not have sat around and said, ‘Let’s take all the hard issues and give them over to the judges.’ That would have been the farthest thing from their mind.”

As did the Founders, I do not believe State and national legislative bodies are incapable of settling tough and contentious issues. I do not believe it is benevolent or admirable for judges to remove questions from the public realm because they are divisive. Roberts has shown the modesty and respect for the role of the court and an legislature to refrain from that path. Judge Roberts has made it clear that he finds no place for reflection on the public attitudes and legal documents of foreign lands in the consideration of constitutional questions. They do not offer any guidance as to the wide scope of our own responsibilities.

During his testimony, Judge Roberts displayed a respect for Constitution and the rule of law as the principles that should guide him when ruling on a case. His view of the role of the judiciary is very consistent with that of my own.

Finally, I believe President Bush has executed his duties in a responsible manner that will serve our Nation well. He interviewed many distinguished and qualified attorneys as judges in the country to serve on our Nation’s highest court. After responsible consultation with members of the Senate and careful and thoughtful deliberation, President Bush returned to the Senate the decision of John Roberts, who I have learned, his qualifications to lead the Supreme Court and Federal judiciary are as unquestioned as they are impressive.

President Bush was reelected with over 62 million votes, the highest received by a presidential candidate. He is the first candidate in 16 years to win a majority of the popular vote, something not achieved by his predecessor, who incidentally won easy confirmation of both of his appointments to the high court.

President Bush resoundingly won the right to nominate someone who he views as fit to serve on the Supreme Court and he won the right to have that nominee considered fairly and impartially. The President also asked for the thoughts and advice of Members of this body as to the pending nomination. When it came time to exercise his responsibility as President, he did so by nominating someone with an impeccable and extraordinary qualifications. In the execution of his duties, President Bush exceeded any standard to which he should be held.
Nonetheless, I suspect that this nomination and the subsequent nomination will not be treated in the manner that President Clinton’s nominees were treated, when they received 96 votes. But it should as should the next nominee.

Judge Roberts is an outstanding nomination. He will get my support and he deserves the overwhelming support of this body.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of John Roberts’ nomination for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The debate that the Senate will have this week is truly historic. In our Nation’s history there have only been 16 previous Chief Justices. The opportunity to vote on a nomination for Chief Justice is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and should be undertaken with recognition of its importance. The importance of this vote simply cannot be overstated.

I believe that our Nation is best served when we confirm individuals who appreciate that the role of a judge is not to make laws but to uphold the Constitution. We need judges who understand that their oath requires them to follow the Constitution and to apply the law in an impartial fashion. Judges do not serve in the legislative branch. They should not make the law. As Senators, that is our job.

Under our Constitution, judges are appointed to interpret the law. They should apply the law without prejudice. Judges must be open to the legal arguments presented by each of the parties before them. They must fully and fairly analyze the facts and faithfully apply the law.

I have carefully considered John Roberts’ record and his qualifications. I believe that his record reflects a proper understanding of the role of judges. I met with him and discussed face-to-face his views on the role of Supreme Court judges. Judge Roberts possesses the highest intellect and integrity. He has also demonstrated that he is fair-minded. He possesses the necessary experience, as an attorney for the government, in private practice and as a judge, to serve on the high court. By any objective measure, John Roberts is qualified to sit on the bench, and he deserves to be confirmed.

Judge Roberts, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee and in his writings, has presented himself as a man with a clear view of the role of a Supreme Court Justice: to interpret the law and to uphold the Constitution. His answers to specific questions have been necessarily and appropriately limited as we must trust, as we have with past nominees to the Court, that Judge Roberts is presenting himself and his views honestly. I believe he has, and for the sake of our country, I hope so.

Today, throughout the judicial branch, judicial activism is impedimental to the vigorous and restricting freedoms the American people should expect to enjoy as envisioned by our Nation’s founders. Recent and significant rulings have established standards created not by elected Members of Congress but by activist judges. These rulings have infringed on Americans’ rights to exercise their religious beliefs; to recite the Pledge of Allegiance; and to own property without fear that the Government might seize that property for economic gain.

More now than ever we need justices who will stand against this type of judicial activism, adhere to the proper role of upholding the Constitution, and leave the law to the people of the United States. John Roberts is representing himself as someone who believes in a return to what our founders intended and we hope his portrayal of his views is honest and true.

Historically, the Senate has confirmed a nominee when the nominee is found to be well qualified. John Roberts certainly meets this criterion. Historically, the Senate has based confirmation on a nominee’s record, writings and testimonials. There is ample documentation on which my colleagues can make a decision with respect to John Roberts’ nomination. And the documentation supports confirmation.

Judge Roberts deserves to be confirmed, and America deserves a Chief Justice like John Roberts.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will vote in favor of the nomination of Judge Roberts to be the Chief Justice of the United States. This has not been an easy decision, but I believe it is the correct one. Judge Roberts’ impeccable legal credentials, his reputation and record as a fair-minded person, and his commitment to modesty and respect for precedent have persuaded me that he will not bring an ideological agenda to the position of Chief Justice of the United States and that he should be confirmed.

Chief Justice Rehnquist. His attitude seems to be if the Court is not headed inexorably in the direction it turned in the Lopez and Morrison cases limiting Congress’s power. His approving references to Roe v. Wade and his said about what the Court might do with an ideological agenda to reverse precedents with huge proportions, and a grave disappointment, if he ultimately does attempt to go down that road.

I was also impressed that Judge Roberts does not seem inclined to try to rein in Congress’s power under the commerce clause. He repeatedly called attention to the Court’s recent decision in Gonzales v. Raich stating that the Court is not headed inexorably in the direction it turned in the Lopez and Morrison cases limiting Congress’s power. His approving references to Roe suggests to me that he will take a more moderate stance on these issues than his mentor, Chief Justice Rehnquist. His attitude seems to be if Congress does its job right, he will not stand in the way as a judge. That is, of course, cold comfort if the Court creates new hoops for Congress to jump through and restrictions that Congress can pay attention to what the Court says is
needed to justify legislation only if the Court gives clear advance notice of those requirements.

Judge Roberts also seemed to reject a return to the Lochner era, when a majority of the Court invoked the due process clauses of the Constitution to strike down child labor and other laws it disagreed with, and the courts openly acted as a super-legislature, rejecting congressional enactments based on their own political and philosophical leanings. Judge Roberts disparaged the Lochner decision, saying, ‘‘[y]ou can read that opinion today and it’s quite clear that they’re not interpreting the law, they’re making the law.’’ That is a marked contrast to many in the so-called ‘‘Geas- tination in Exile’’ movement, including recently confirmed DC Circuit Judge Janice Rogers Brown.

Judge Roberts’ determination to be a humble and modest judge should lead him to reject efforts to undermine Congress’s power to address social and economic problems through national legislation. I view that as a significant commitment he has made to the Congress and to the country.

Another important issue involves not so much respect for settled precedent, but rather questions that will arise in the future with respect to the application of the Bill of Rights in a time of war. The Supreme Court has already dealt with a series of cases arising from the Bush administration’s conduct of the fight against terrorism, and will undoubtedly face many more during the next Chief Justice’s term. Indeed, how we measure justices address these issues may well define them and the Court in history.

For me, Judge Roberts’ discussion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which has been such an issue in the Bush era, was a defining moment in the hearing. His answers showed a gut-level understanding of the potential dangers of a court that operates entirely in secret, with no adversarial process. His instincts as a lawyer, our judicial system and its protections to yield the correct result under the rule of law, seemed to take over, and he seemed genuinely disturbed by the idea of a court without the usual protections of an open, adversarial process. Here is what was said about the FISA Court to Senator DeWine:

I’ll be very candid. When I first learned about the FISA Court, I was surprised. It’s not what I think of when I think of a court. We think of a place where we can go, we can watch the lawyers argue and it’s subject to the glare of publicity and the judge’s decision to the public and they can examine them. That’s what we think of as a court.

This is a very different and unusual institution, as he first reaction. I appreciate the reasons that it operates the way it does, but it does seem to me that the departures from the normal judicial model that are involved there put a premium on the individuals involved.

Judge Roberts’ comments, and that he went out of his way to express sur- prise at the fact that this secret court even exists, suggests to me that he would address issues related to FISA, such as government secrecy and challenges to civil liberties, with an appropriately skeptical mindset.

I want to make sure Judge Roberts refused to give a fuller answer about his view of the Supreme Court’s decision in the Hamdi case, and I have concerns about his decision as an appeals court judge in the Hamdan case regarding military commissions. But Judge Roberts did tell me that he believes: ‘‘The Bill of Rights doesn’t change during times of war. The Bill of Rights doesn’t change in times of crisis.’’ I was pleased to hear him recognize this fundamental principle.

I do not want to minimize the concerns that have been expressed by those who oppose the nomination. I share some of them. Many of my misgivings about this nomination stem from Judge Roberts’ refusal to answer many of my questions. Not only that, he refused to acknowledge that many of the positions he took as a member of the Reagan administration were misguided or in some cases even flat-out wrong.

I do not have the one person who cannot express an opinion on virtually anything the Supreme Court has done is the person whom the American public most needs to hear from. No one on the committee asked him for a comment on even one set of issues. We certainly recognize that it is possible his views might change once he is on the Court and hears the arguments and discusses the issues with his colleagues. All of those caveats would have been perfectly appropriate. But why shouldn’t the committee and the public have some idea of where he stands, or at least what his instincts are, on recent controversial decisions?

Although in some areas he was more forthright, Judge Roberts did not answer questions that he could and should have—unfortunately with the full support of committee members who want to smooth his confirmation—and I think that is disrespectful of the Senate’s constitutional role. In addition, the administration’s refusal to respond to a reasonable, limited request for documents from the time Judge Roberts served in the Solicitor General’s office did a real disservice to the confirmation of his nominee. My voting in favor of Judge Roberts does not endorse this refusal. In fact, if not for Judge Roberts’ singular qualifications, I may have felt compelled to oppose his nomination on those grounds alone. Future nominees who refuse to answer reasonable questions or whose documents the administration—any administration—refuses to provide should not count on my approval.

Also troubling was Judge Roberts’ approach to the memos he wrote as a young Reagan administration lawyer. His writings from his early service in government were those of a very smart man who was at times a little too sure of himself and too dismissive of other viewpoints. I wanted to see if the Judge Roberts of 2005 had grown from the John Roberts of 1985, whose strong views often suggested a rigid ideolog- ical approach to the law, however. I wanted to see the possibility of a seasoned, wise, and just John Roberts on the Supreme Court, not just a more polished, shrewder version of his younger self.

Unfortunately, he refused to disavow any of those memos, many of which laid out disturbing opinions on a variety of issues, from voting rights, to habeas corpus, to affirmative action. He refused to acknowledge that some of his tone and word choice in that era demonstrated a lack of sensitivity to minorities and women, and to the challenges they face. Instead, he took refuge in the argument that he was simply doing his job, so we are not now supposed to infer anything about his beliefs or motivations based on the memos he wrote in 1982.

I found these arguments unpersuasive, particularly since several of those memos indicate that those were, in fact, his own personal views. And again, I do not understand why he felt he needed to defend these 20-year-old memos. Maybe it was pride. Maybe it was a political strategy dictated by a White House that so rarely admits error. But take voting rights—it should have been easy for Judge Roberts to say that in reviewing the memos he was wrong about the dangers of the effects test, and that the 1982 amendments to the Voting Rights Act that he opposed have been good for the country. Instead, he said he wasn’t an expert on the Voting Rights Act and insisted on the correctness of his posi- tion. That troubles me.

The John Roberts of 2005 did not have to embrace the John Roberts of 1985, but in some cases he did, all too readily. On the other hand, I am not sure that the John Roberts of 1985 would have told Senator Feinstein with respect to affirmative action that: ‘‘A measured effort that can withstand strict scrutiny is . . . a very positive approach.’’ His answers to questions on affirmative action, seemed to me, on balance, to be an encouraging sign that he will not undo the Court’s current approach.

Finally, I was unhappy with Judge Roberts’ failure to recuse himself in the Hamdan v. Rumsfeld case. Once he realized he was being seriously considered for a Supreme Court nomination. It is also hard to believe, as Judge Roberts testified, that he does not remember precisely when the possibility of an ethics violation first came to his atten- tion. Judge Roberts sat on a court of appeals panel that heard the appeal of a district court ruling that, if upheld, would have been a huge setback for the administration’s position on military commissions and the detainees at Guantanamo. Based on oral argument just 6 days after inter- viewing for a Supreme Court appointment with the Attorney General of the
United States, who also was a major participant in the underlying legal judgment of the administration that was challenged in the case. I am troubled that Judge Roberts apparently didn’t recognize at the time that there was an ethical issue.

I give great weight to ethical considerations in judicial nominations. For example, when Judge Charles Pickering solicited letters of recommendation for his court of appeals nomination, Judge Pickering practically begged him in the district court. I found that very significant, especially in combination with his actions in a cross burning case where improper ex parte contacts were alleged. But while the issue raised about Judge Roberts is serious, I do not see such a pattern with Judge Roberts, who has a long record and reputation for ethical behavior. Nor is there evidence of the egregious, almost aggressive unethical behavior that was present in the nomination of Judge Pickering.

I hope that Judge Roberts now understands the concerns that I and a number of respected legal ethicists have about his participation in the Hamdan case. It is not too late for him to recuse himself and allow a new panel to hear the case.

At the end of the day, I had to ask myself: What kind of Justice does this man aspire to be? An ideologue? A lawyer’s lawyer? A great Supreme Court Justice? A Justice who moved comfortably from the top legal positions in the Department of Justice to a judicial position in which he was more than willing to challenge executive power? A Chief Justice who will go down in history as the leader of a sharp ideological turn to the right, or a consensus builder who is committed to the Court and its role as guarantor of basic freedoms?

I have talked to a number of people who know John Roberts or to people who know people who know John Roberts. Those I have heard from directly or indirectly have seen him develop since 1985 into one of the foremost Supreme Court advocates in the Nation, whose skills and judgment are respected by lawyers from across the ideological spectrum. They don’t see him as a champion of one cause, as a narrow ideologue who wants to impose his views on the country. They see him as open-minded, respectful, thoughtful, de-

...
years. I cannot in good conscience cast a vote for the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court based on conjecture.

My concerns about Judge Roberts’ legal philosophy run deepest in the area of privacy, civil rights, and federalism.

One of my most important liberties is the right of individuals to privacy, which includes a woman’s right to choose. During his hearings, Judge Roberts acknowledged that the due process clause of the Constitution encompasses the right to privacy. He also stated that he believed that the right to privacy encompasses the right of married couples to access contraception as established by the Court in Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965). However, beyond these broad, generalized statements supporting the constitutional underpinnings of the right to privacy and the holding in Griswold, Judge Roberts failed to explain how he would apply this right in a case.

When pressed with questions on the landmark 1973 decision, Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113, which extended the right to privacy recognized in Griswold to encompass a woman’s right to choose, Judge Roberts refused to state his present position on the questions or responded with generalizations about precedent. Judge Roberts made it clear that his analysis on this issue starts with the holding in the 1992 Supreme Court case, Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833, which held that the right to choose may be restricted so long as State statutes do not have the purpose or effect of imposing an “undue burden” on a woman’s right. In using this as his starting point, Judge Roberts leaves open the strong possibility that he may vote, perhaps as early as the upcoming Supreme Court term, to further restrict a woman’s right to choose.

I cannot overlook the similarity between Judge Roberts’ responses to questions about a woman’s right to choose and the answers given by Justice Clarence Thomas during his confirmation hearings. Like Judge Roberts, Justice Thomas acknowledged a right to privacy in the Constitution. Justice Thomas also expressed support for the decision in Griswold. However, once he was confirmed to the Supreme Court, Justice Thomas argued vehemently against the existence of a general right to privacy and evaded questions for the reversal of Roe v. Wade, describing the decision as “grotesquely wrong.”

We simply cannot allow this to happen again. And we should not have to. We should not be in a position to find ourselves in a position to find where we have to guess if Judge Roberts will attempt to overrule Roe v. Wade or to further restrict the constitutional right of all women to choose.

In addition to my concerns about the right to privacy, I have serious concerns about Judge Roberts’ views on civil rights. His record is extremely limited, but what little evidence we have reveals Judge Roberts’ repeated attempts to roll back legal protections afforded to minorities and to those less fortunate.

In the area of affirmative action, Judge Roberts refused to state his present position on the first wave of affirmative action programs. Roberts sought to overturn established precedent supporting affirmative action programs and, in 1981, he fought to abolish race- and gender-conscious remedies for discrimination. This position was contrary to the Supreme Court’s ruling in United Steelworkers of America v. Weber, 443 U.S. 193 (1979), which upheld affirmative action in employment. During his confirmation hearings, Judge Roberts refused to state his present position on this issue.

Judge Roberts also has a detailed record of opposing a broad interpretation of the Voting Rights Act, which is considered one of the most powerful civil rights laws ever enacted. While working in the Justice Department during the Reagan administration, Judge Roberts urged the administration to oppose a bill that allowed discrimination under section 2 of the act. Through a series of decisions, the Supreme Court has held that the discriminatory effects, and not just the discriminatory intent, of State voting restrictions. Congress enacted the bill over the administration’s objections. Judge Roberts’ approach, had it been adopted, would have made it tremendously difficult to overturn discriminatory voting laws. Again, during his confirmation hearings, Judge Roberts refused to state his present position on this issue.

Judge Roberts’ record in the area of access to education is also troubling. In prior writings, Judge Roberts expressed opposition to the Supreme Court decision in Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982), wherein the Court ruled that the Constitution mandates that all children, including the children of undocumented immigrants, have the same access to education. Again, during his confirmation hearings, Judge Roberts refused to state his present position on this issue.

Additionally, memoranda written by Judge Roberts during his tenure at the Department of Justice raise concerns about his eagerness to deny the Supreme Court the power to decide questions of constitutional validity and subsequent remedies. In one writing, Judge Roberts argued that Congress had the power to strip courts of the power to desegregate schools through busing in the wake of Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). During his hearings, Judge Roberts neither stated his present view on this issue nor distanced himself from his prior writings.

Had Judge Roberts’ views prevailed on these civil rights issues and other similar issues during his tenure in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, we would today live in a far different world. It would be a world with fewer protections for minorities, women, and people with disabilities.

I am also concerned about Judge Roberts’ views on the power of the Federal Government to pass legislation under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Although Judge Roberts allowed in a footnote that there could be alternative grounds on which the full DC Circuit might uphold the constitutionality of the Endangered Species Act. Although Judge Roberts allowed in a footnote that there could be alternative grounds on which the full DC Circuit might uphold the constitutionality of the Act, his opinion demonstrates a narrow view of Congress’s power to legislate under the commerce clause.

I am also concerned that, based upon this critical view of Federal power, Judge Roberts may vote to limit Congress’s authority to enact laws that help all American citizens. In the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the role of the Federal Government in protecting all Americans, and particularly those less fortunate, has never been clearer. Congress must have the power to assist those in need, and to help citizens during times of natural and manmade disaster.

I am mindful of Judge Roberts’ frequent statements that he would approach the law with modesty and restraint. However, we have never learned the reference point for this modesty and restraint. The starting point in this inquiry is as important as the ending point, for either can dictate the result. It is difficult to tell from Judge Roberts’ testimony and writings whether, in exercising restraint, Judge Roberts would be deferring to the original understanding of the Constitution, or something else entirely. Without this information, we are unable to meaningfully understand Judge Roberts’ judicial philosophy.

If he begins at the point where Justices Scalia and Thomas do, Judge Roberts would view judicial restraint and modesty as adherence to a static, narrow, antiquated, and inaccurate originalist view of the Constitution that fails to acknowledge the realities of modern America. This form of “modesty” and “restraint,” followed by Justices Scalia and Thomas, quite openly seeks to overrule the accomplishments of much of our Supreme Court jurisprudence during the past 200 years. Justices Scalia and Thomas believe that they exercise judicial restraint when they attempt to overturn Supreme Court precedent such as Roe v. Wade on the ground that the incommensurate decision with their own originalist understanding of the Constitution. Although they may call this modesty and restraint, this view of the Constitution is
neither modest nor restrained; rather, it is a form of judicial activism as aggresive as any the Court has ever seen. I have carefully weighed my concerns in light of my constitutional duty as a U.S. Senator. And I have concluded that, fundamentally, I cannot vote yes without being confident that Judge Roberts will not vote to roll back the protections and rights our Nation fought so hard to attain.

I adamantly maintain that we must never become cynical or political that we fail to do what is best for the citizens of our Nation. And that means that we must place the value of an independent judiciary above the partisan politics of the day. That also means that we must not be afraid to stand up to the President and vote against a nominee who puts us in a position of guessing about his constitutional and legal philosophy.

We must never forget that our Supreme Court depends, first and foremost, on the Justices who hear arguments and issue rulings each and every day. As all Americans know, the Supreme Court is the highest Court in the United States. This is the Court that issues its decisions on many of the most important issues of our time, ones that touch the lives of all Americans. Therefore, it is essential that we know the views of each and every person whom we approve for a lifetime appointment to our highest Court.

There is no question that Judge John Roberts will get an up-or-down vote in the full Senate. However, that does not mean that he will get my vote. I will only vote to confirm Justices who will uphold established precedent and understand that the Constitution is about protecting rights, not about restricting them.

The stakes are simply too high to guess about the future of our fundamental protections.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to support the nomination of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Roberts is a man of integrity whose reputation is irrefutable. He has been widely praised for his affable and humble personality as well as his intellect and integrity. Judge Roberts is already greatly respected by his colleagues and current Supreme Court Justices known as a leading advocate before that Court.

I believe that Judge Roberts is eminently qualified for this position. He earned both his bachelor’s degree and his law degree from Harvard University. In fact, after earning his bachelor’s degree summa cum laude, he managed to earn his law degree magna cum laude while serving as the editor of the Harvard Law Review. Following graduation, Judge Roberts earned a clerkship on the Supreme Court for the late Chief Justice William Rehnquist.

Since that time, Judge Roberts has had a long and distinguished career of service to this country, including serving as an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor General. Most recently, he served as a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, widely considered the second most powerful court in the Nation. During his service on the court, he has been consistent and fair.

Judge Roberts is a private practice attorney representing the full range of clients before the Supreme Court. He has argued before the Supreme Court 39 times, an impressive record even if you do not consider the fact that he prevailed 25 of those cases. In fact, Judge Roberts is widely considered by his colleagues to be one of the most accomplished attorneys to argue before the Supreme Court.

For some time I have been concerned that our judiciary was being overwhelmed by activist judges who attempted to legislate from the bench. They appear to make decisions based upon political philosophy and twist the Constitution to fit their ideological goals.

We do not need judges who will make their own laws and interpret the Constitution based on one political philosophy or another. Rather, we must insist upon a fair and judicious tone—judges who rule without the influence of ideology or personal opinion.

After 20 hours of testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I believe that Judge Roberts understands and respects the Constitution and the law without prejudice and with the utmost respect for the rule of law.

I commend President Bush for his continued efforts to put judges in place who respect the rule of law. I believe that Judge Roberts is a shining example of this type of jurist, and there is no doubt in my mind that he should be confirmed as our country’s 17th Chief Justice, and I am proud to support his nomination.

Mr. STABENOW. Mr. President, this is a historic time in our Nation’s history. For the first time in more than a decade, we have not just one but two vacancies on the United States Supreme Court. Sandra Day O’Connor, the first woman justice and often the critical deciding vote, is retiring, and Chief Justice Rehnquist, who served on the Court for more than 33 years, passed away after a courageous battle with cancer.

The two nominees who will receive these lifetime appointments will dramatically impact the direction of the Court for decades to come and will shape decisions that will affect the rights and freedoms of all Americans.

Furthermore, the new Chief Justice will play a unique and critical role. He will lead the Court. The new Chief Justice will set the initial agenda of what cases should be considered, and assign the justice who will write the majority opinion when he or she is a part of the majority. He will be the most powerful judge in the country.

We all understand that the U.S. Senate has a constitutional obligation to advise and consent” on all Federal judicial nominees. Unlike other nominations that come before the Senate, judicial nominations are lifetime appointments. These are not decisions that will affect our courts for 3 or 4 years but for 30 or 40 years, making it even more important for the Senate to act carefully and responsibly.

I am one of the newer Members of this chamber. In fact, I rank 74th in seniority. I don’t have the 20 year voting history on Supreme Court nominees that some of my colleagues do. I didn’t vote on the nominations of Justices Scalia, Ginsburg, O’Connor or Thomas.

But I bring a different kind of history to this Chamber. I am the first woman United States Senator in history from the State of Michigan. My office is next door to the Sewell Belmont house, where Alice Paul and Lucy Burns planned their suffrage marches and fought to get women the right to vote.

I can see it from my window and every day I am reminded of what the women before me went through so that I could speak on the Senate floor today. I feel the same responsibility to fight against discrimination and for equal rights, for the women that will come after me.

I take this responsibility very seriously and have closely studied Judge Roberts’ writings and testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearings. I commend Senators SPECTER and LEAHY for conducting the hearings in a civil and bipartisan manner.

The Judiciary Committee hearings were the only opportunity for Americans to hear directly from Judge Roberts on issues and concerns that impact their daily lives, and to find out what a “Roberts Court” might look like. Unfortunately, Judge Roberts refused to answer many of the questions that are on the minds of most Americans.

However, the American people are being asked to hire Judge Roberts for this lifetime job without knowing the answers to most of the interview questions. This problem is exacerbated by the White House’s refusal to share even a limited number of documents from Judge Roberts’ time as Deputy Solicitor General.

The Constitution grants all Americans the same rights and freedoms under the law. These are the sacred, bedrock values upon which the United States of America was founded. And we count on the Supreme Court to protect these constitutional rights at all times, whether they are popular or not.

Unfortunately, Judge Roberts refused to answer most substantive questions.
about how he would protect our fundamental constitutional rights. Because of his failure to answer questions on the major legal issues of our time in a forthright manner, I feel compelled to base my decision on his writings and opinions.

When you closely examine these documents, you see a forceful and instinctive opposition toward protecting the fundamental rights of all Americans. In case after case, Judge Roberts argued that the Constitution did not protect the rights of the disabled, minorities and people with disabilities from discrimination. He also argued that the Constitution does not firmly establish the right of privacy for all Americans.

In all of his memos, writings and briefs, Judge Roberts took the view that the Constitution only protects Americans in the most narrow and technical ways, and does not convey to us fundamental rights, liberties and freedoms. Because of these views, after much deliberation, I have concluded that Judge Roberts is the wrong choice for a lifetime appointment as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Roberts is certainly an intelligent man with a record of public service. But his tone does not eliminate his ability to lead the entire third branch of our government. I believe that his writings reveal a philosophy that underpins our most cherished and fundamental rights, liberties and freedoms as Americans, and for that reason, I will be voting no on his nomination.

The Supreme Court decides cases that have a broad impact on American jobs and the economy. Manufacturing is the backbone of Michigan’s economy, and these court decisions will affect the livelihood of the families, workers and businesses I represent. We in Michigan need to know whether Judge Roberts will stand with us and with our families or be on the side of major special interests who were his clients in the private sector.

Right now, we are feeling the full impact of price-gouging and oil company monopolies at the gas pumps. But Americans don’t know what Judge Roberts’ views are of antitrust and consumer protection laws that punish these illegal corporate practices. How will he rule on cases dealing with insider-trading, anti-competitive business behavior and other kinds of corporate fraud to prevent another Enron? We don’t know what is his support for basic consumer protections like patients’ rights to receive a second doctor’s opinion if their HMO tries to deny them treatment. Judge Roberts fought against these patients’ right when he represented HMOs in private practice and Americans are entitled to know where he stands on this issue.

Americans need to know where Judge Roberts stands on worker protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act. And we need to know that Judge Roberts’ rule to protect their pensions and retirement benefits? We don’t have the answers to these basic questions.

The foundation of our democracy is the belief that all people are created equal and that every American deserves an equal opportunity for a good education, good job, and a good life. The Supreme Court will be deciding cases that have an enormous impact on our lives and our children’s lives and our grandchildren’s lives. And Judge Roberts’ opinion matters.

They will affect whether or not we have admissions policies that promote diversity at our Nation’s universities and policies that help minority-owned and women-owned businesses compete for government contracts. They will determine how well our antidiscrimination laws are enforced to protect all Americans from housing discrimination, abusive environments, sexual harassment, discriminatory hiring policies, and sexism in education and collegiate sports under title IX.

And they will determine whether our most fundamental democratic right—the right to vote—is protected.

As Chief Justice, Judge Roberts would decide in case after case, whether these principals of equal opportunity and equal protection should be upheld and whether these laws should be enforced.

The constitutional right to privacy is one of the most fundamental rights we have as Americans. At its core, it is about the role that our personal views play in the most personal of family decisions. It is about a woman’s right to make her own reproductive choices and a couple’s right to use contraception.

But it is also about keeping medical records private to prevent them from being used against Americans in their jobs or when they are trying to get health insurance. It is about a parent’s right to send their child to the school of their choice. And it is about the role of government in right-to-die cases, as the nation witnessed in the Terry Schiavo case.

Our constitutional right to privacy is a complicated and often politically charged area of the law. It is extremely important that a Supreme Court nominee approach this issue as a fair and independent-minded jurist who will uphold settled law, and not approach it with a politically motivated agenda.

And if the Senate Judiciary Committee judged that a right to privacy exists, he refused to explain what he believes that right actually encompasses. Like Justice Thomas in his testimony before the committee, Judge Roberts refused to say whether he believed the right to privacy extended beyond a married couple’s right to contraception. Senator SCHUMER asked Judge Roberts whether he agreed that there is a “general” right to privacy provided in the Constitution. Roberts’ response was, "I wouldn’t use the phrase 'general,' because I don’t know what that means." He repeatedly refused to answer whether the right to privacy protects a woman’s right to make her own reproductive choices, and like many women across the country, I was very disappointed that he was evasive in answering this important privacy question.

And if Judge Roberts will approach and decide these questions of law will have a profound impact on not just our lives but on the lives of our children and grandchildren.
I had hoped that the hearings would give us insight into his legal reasoning and judicial philosophy on all of these important issues. And I strongly believe that the American people deserve these answers. This isn’t a decision that should be based on guesswork or a leap of faith.

So all we have to go on are Judge Roberts’ own writings over the past 25 years. Based on this record, I cannot in good conscience cast my vote for John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, Judge Roberts came before the Senate Judiciary Committee earlier this month as a very well respected judge with a sterling academic record and a remarkable legal career. He left the Judiciary Committee with respect for Judge Roberts, his legal talent, and his personal views about the law.

Chief Justice of the United States

I will vote my hopes and not my fears.

In considering my decision, I was troubled by parts of Judge Roberts’ record, but I was impressed by the man himself. I will support him as a Chief Justice who will keep an open mind and reject ideological extremism and simplistic approaches to interpreting the Constitution. I will vote my hopes and not my fears.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Judge John G. Roberts, Jr., to be Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

In Judge Roberts the Nation is presented with a nominee who possesses an extraordinary intellect, a modest temperament, and a steady hand. I see in him the will and the ability to seek common ground among the Justices of the Court on important national issues. And I believe he possesses sufficient humility, as a man and as a judge, to be mindful of the powerful impact his decisions have on the lives of average Americans.

Four days of intensive hearings allowed all of us, and much of America, to come to know something of John Roberts and to observe and assess what we don’t know.

None of us can fully fathom the matters that will be determined, and the people who will be affected, by a judge with lifetime tenure on the highest Court of the land. John Roberts today and in the years when Roberts was deputy Solicitor General was made available.

The Constitution grants the Senate the power and responsibility to advise and consent on the President’s judicial nominations. And there is no more important judicial nomination than Chief Justice of the United States.

The President and Congress share responsibility for the makeup of the third branch. The President nominates a candidate to be a Federal judge, and the Senate is required to give its advice and consent for that nominee to be placed on the bench.

To evaluate a nominee, Congress must be informed about that nominee. We are not supposed to consent first and be informed later.

In the case of Judge Roberts, we cannot make an informed judgment because we have no evasive at his hearing. During his confirmation hearing, Judge Roberts declined to answer questions more than 90 times. The Senate and the American people deserve to know more about an individual who will lead our Nation’s judiciary for decades to come.

Despite numerous efforts by members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Bush administration was not forthcoming. Not a single document from the years when Roberts was deputy Solicitor General was made available.

To be deprived of important information left me unable to give informed consent. The Constitution requires the
Senate to advise and consent on these lifetime appointments, not to consent first and advise later.

However, there are some things we do know about John Roberts. We know that as an Associate Justice of the Reagan and first Bush administrations, his writings on many issues relating to women's rights were disturbing for those concerned about such matters. In an official memo to the Attorney General, Roberts wrote about the "so-called right to privacy." In the Supreme Court case Rust v. Sullivan, Roberts co-authored a brief that declared the "right to privacy" should be overturned. At his hearings, Mr. Roberts refused to clarify whether he still would vote to overturn Roe v. Wade.

Roberts also wrote of a "perceived" gender bias in the workplace. A "perceived" bias? I know that Roberts admitted in his confirmation hearings that there has been discrimination against women in the past. He had to say that. But did he really once believe such a bias was merely "perceived," and could he still believe that today?

Let me tell my colleague, about gender bias that was not perceived. When my father died at an early age, my mother was left a young widow. I watched her struggle to make her way in the workplace where she never got the same opportunities for advancement as men. She was very successful as an insurance sales person, but she was told that later in life she would be unable to continue her employment. Her manager told her, "You know, we don't hire women for these jobs," and thus she was terminated.

The views of John Roberts portray a judge who could also undermine important protections for the environment and minorities. In his 2 years as a judge on the Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, for instance, Mr. Roberts did not support congressional powers to use the commerce clause of our Constitution to pass clean air and clean water regulations.

While working for President Reagan, Roberts opposed a bill in Congress that would have strengthened the protections of the Voting Rights Act. Memos from the 1980s also show that Roberts supported the Reagan administration's opposition to measures initiated to redress past racial discrimination.

John Roberts has said that when writing for the Reagan administration, he was merely a staff attorney, just doing his job, advocating the position of his client. He claims that these memos do not necessarily reflect his views. Yet, when the Judiciary Committee gave him ample opportunities to clarify exactly which memos expressed his views and which ones did not, he declined to answer.

So, even though Mr. Roberts had ample opportunity to answer the questions of the Judiciary Committee, we are still uncertain what he really believes.

I believe the risk is too great to support the confirmation of a Chief Justice to the United States Supreme Court, the highest-ranking leader in the judicial branch of our Government. The fact that he is an intelligent and experienced fellow isn't enough. That is important, but there needs to be assurance the people of New Jersey that he would preserve and protect their rights. I don't know some things that I need to know and some of the things that I need to be satisfied about, I will be opposed to his confirmation.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, Judge John Roberts is indeed an outstanding justice of the United States. He is one of our Nation's top legal minds, and as the American public has learned, he is a man of great intelligence and skill who will serve our country with the same integrity that has been the hallmark of his professional career.

In fact, it is hard to think of anyone who is more qualified to lead this Nation than Judge Roberts. He has graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law, where he was managing editor of the Harvard Law Review, Roberts clerked for then-Associate Justice Rehnquist and has since earned much respect and is deeply admired for 25 years. He went on to work in various legal capacities in the Reagan administration and later went into private practice. He is the best-qualified person to serve as the next Chief Justice of the United States. He is one of our Nation's top legal minds, and as the American public has learned, he is a man of great intelligence and skill who will serve our country with the same integrity that has been the hallmark of his professional career.

In his distinguished career, including his tenure as a government lawyer, Roberts argued a remarkable 39 cases before the Supreme Court. The issues at the heart of these cases have spanned the legal spectrum—from healthcare law to Indian law, environmental law to labor law, and many, many other areas of the law as well.

In his Senate confirmation hearings last week, John Roberts reinforced his commitment to the rule of law, not to his political beliefs. He emphasized that he is committed to the rule of law, not to his political beliefs. He emphasized that he is committed to the rule of law, not to his personal preferences or views. He emphasized his belief that judges are not politicians or legislators. He's not at the extremes. Judge Roberts was that kind of judge. He's not at the center. Potter Stewart did before her, that the court brought a voice of moderation and balance to an increasingly polarized body. She wrote opinions that surprised and outraged both the right and the left; proof positive that she was not grinding a particular political ax or was beholden to one unending judicial philosophy. She judged and considered both sides of a case and the law caregivers who have risen above the normal day-to-day politics of this institution. But still, there are some of you who have reservations about who will vote on specific cases in the future. Others of you may also be swayed by the passions of partisans.

But none have questioned Judge Roberts' qualifications for this position. None have questioned his intellectual ability. And none have questioned his qualifications. These are the traditional measures that the Senate has looked to when evaluating a judicial nomination of this importance. I would ask that my fellow Senators look to these time-tested standards and vote to confirm Judge Roberts as Chief Justice of the United States.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I will vote for the nomination of John Roberts to be the next Chief Justice of the United States. He is intelligent with an impressive educational background; extensive experience arguing before the Supreme Court; and distinguished public service experience at the highest levels of government. Based on his resume, he has the qualifications to be Chief Justice.

But a nominee's resume alone is not automatic grounds for confirmation to any office. The Senate has a duty to delve more deeply beyond a nominee's paper record. So while Judge Roberts' credentials are clearly impressive, I share the concerns of those who have raised questions about the qualifications of Judge Roberts for a seat on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

In his distinguished career, including his tenure as a government lawyer, Roberts argued a remarkable 39 cases before the Supreme Court. The issues at the heart of these cases have spanned the legal spectrum—from healthcare law to Indian law, environmental law to labor law, and many, many other areas of the law as well.

In his Senate confirmation hearings last week, John Roberts reinforced his commitment to the rule of law, not to his political beliefs. He emphasized that he is committed to the rule of law, not to his personal preferences or views. He emphasized his belief that judges are not politicians or legislators. He's not at the extremes. Judge Roberts was that kind of judge. He's not at the center. Potter Stewart did before her, that the court brought a voice of moderation and balance to an increasingly polarized body. She wrote opinions that surprised and outraged both the right and the left; proof positive that she was not grinding a particular political ax or was beholden to one unending judicial philosophy. She judged and considered both sides of a case and the law caregivers who have risen above the
option.” Fortunately, a group of my colleagues and I were able to reach agreement to avoid this outcome; we were called the Gang of 14. Judge Roberts’s nomination was going to be the first major test of this agreement.

When I was given the opportunity to meet with Judge Roberts, he was able to relieve some of my concerns, enough that I knew we would not have to consider a filibuster. He struck me in two ways. First, he described his judicial philosophy as modest; modesty is not something that gets used to describe public figures in Washington, DC, that often. He saw the role of a judge as being limited. As he said in his opening remarks before his hearing: “I come before the committee with no agenda. I have no platform. Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things in exchange for votes. I have no agenda, but I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind.” He further said that the security of a judge’s role is confined to interpreting law and not making it.

The second thing that impressed me in our meeting was his appreciation that for many in this country the Supreme Court serves as the last place where they have to ensure that their rights are not taken away. Earlier this year, as my colleagues will remember the Senate finally went on record apologizing for lynching. James Allen’s book “Without Sanctuary” was described in vivid black and white photos and prose the acts of barbarism that were used to terrorize African Americans in our Nation’s not too distant past.

I showed this book to Judge Roberts and he was visibly moved. He told me that he never wanted to forget that the courts were there to protect the powerless. Lynching victims did not get due process of law, even though many of the mobs had law enforcement officers in their midst and often acted to avenge some perceived crime. Those victims did not get a jury trial with the right to face their accusers as called for under the Constitution.

I came away from this meeting believing he will treat all people who come before the Court with respect. That every argument would receive fair consideration because for the party making that argument a tremendous amount could be at stake.

I am aware of the criticism of Judge Roberts’s earlier writings both those we have seen and several we have not. Some of the things he wrote while a young lawyer in the Reagan White House and Justice Departments indicated that he was hostile to civil rights, women’s rights, the Voting Rights Act, and the right of privacy. While he was in the Solicitor General’s office he wrote a brief suggesting that Roe v. Wade be overruled.

In thinking about these writings and what they mean for who he is now, I was reminded of something that Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: “The character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done.” I chose to look at Judge Roberts’s earlier writings in the same light. When Judge Roberts wrote those things he was a young lawyer who came to the Reagan Administration fresh from a prestigious clerkship with then Associate Justice William Rehnquist. He was a young conservative working at the highest levels of power in our country for a conservative icon, President Reagan. In those positions he was an advocate for the administration and the President’s agenda at the time. His most recent experience in private practice has changed his views on the role of the court, the law, and the needs of individuals. He pointed out to me that he has represented a wide range of clients in his private practice: large and small businesses, indigent defendants, and State governments. Each one, he said, deserved a careful analysis of their position and how the law would apply to their case. He took a similar approach to his current work on the Court of appeals.

I believe that Judge Roberts has taken to heart another observation by Oliver Wendell Holmes and that is, “to have one’s own first principles is the mark of a civilized man.” Judge Roberts, I am sure would look back on his earlier writings and understand that he must revisit them in light of the new responsibilities he is about to undertake.

In the weeks leading up to the confirmation hearings, there was a great deal of discussion and criticism of the administration for not turning over memoranda Judge Roberts wrote while he was Deputy Solicitor General at the Department of Justice. I was disappointed that the administration was not more forthcoming with these documents. I hope in the future we can reach an accommodation of some kind so that the public will have complete information on a nominee. But the fact that we do not have these memos is not enough to keep this highly qualified nominee from becoming our next Chief Justice.

I want to congratulate Chairman Specter and Ranking Member Leahy for the quality of the hearings they held for this nominee. The questioning was tough, but fair, and the committee performed its work with dignity. The hearing record gave us plenty of information to go on in making our decisions about this nominee. The qualities that every member of the Judiciary Committee saw in Judge Roberts, I saw firsthand in our meeting.

John Roberts is an excellent nominee who will be a fine Chief Justice. I encourage President Bush to send us a similarly qualified, modest, fair nominee to replace Justice O’Connor. The White House reached out to many Senators before naming Judge Roberts and I hope the Senate will continue to build on that approach for this next nominee. I fully expect the President to nominate a conservative to fill Justice O’Connor’s seat, but I also expect that nominee to be fair. Judge Roberts has set a very high bar. I hope the next nominee meets that standard.

The President Office. The majority whip, Mr. McConnell, Madam President, Senators cast many important votes—votes to strengthen our highway system, or to implement a comprehensive energy strategy, for example—but it is more important and more historic than both. We do so, however, when we vote on whether to confirm a nominee to be Chief Justice of the United States.

There have been 9,869 Members of the House of Representatives. 1,884 Senators, and 43 Presidents of the United States, but only 16 Chief Justices. On average, each Chief Justice serves for well over a decade. Our last Chief Justice served for 19 years, a little short of two decades. The occupant of the “centenarian” seat on the Court often has had a profound impact on the shape and substance of our legal system. But despite such profound effects, the position of Chief Justice actually got off to a rather inauspicious start.

The Constitution of the United States mentions the position of Chief Justice only once. Interestingly, it does not do so in Article III, which establishes the judicial branch of our Government. Rather, the Constitution refers to the position of Chief Justice, almost in passing, only in Article I, which sets forth the powers of the legislative branch.

There, in section 3, clause 6, it discusses the Senate’s procedures for a trial of an impeached President, stating that “When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside.” That is the sum and substance of his constitutional authority.

The Judiciary Act of 1789, which established the Federal court system, did not add much to the Chief Justice’s responsibilities. It specified merely that “the supreme court of the United States shall consist of a chief justice and five associate justices.”

It is not surprising, then, that the position of Chief Justice initially was not viewed as particularly important. Indeed, the first Chief Justice, John Jay, left completely disillusioned, believing that neither the Court nor the position would ever amount to very much.

It took George Washington four tries to find John Jay’s successor. Prominent people repeatedly turned him down. They were turning down George Washington’s offers to make them the Chief Justice of the United States.

With such humble constitutional roots for the office, its prestige, and independence of the Supreme Court and the Federal court system in general often has been tied to the particular personal qualities of those who have served as Chief Justice.

John Marshall was our first great Chief Justice. His twin legacies were to increase respect for the Court and, relatedly, its power as well. He worked to
establish clear, unanimous opinions for the Court, and his opinion in Marbury v. Madison forever cemented the Court as a coequal branch of Government.

Marshall’s successes were viewed, then as now, as a function of his formidable personal qualities. He is said to have had a clear mind and a thoroughly engaging personality.” Thomas Jefferson, for example, tried, in vain, to break his influence on the Court. In writing to James Madison, his successor, about Supreme Court appointments Jefferson said:

[It will be difficult to find a character of firmness to preserve his independence on the same bench with Marshall.]


I find myself agreeing with the columnist George Will, who wrote recently in one of his columns:

Marshall is the most important American never to have been President.

William Howard Taft and Charles Evans Hughes also used their individual talents to become great Chief Justices. Taft, the only Chief Justice to serve also as President, which was prior to that, had a singular determination to modernize the Federal courts. He used his energy and his political acumen to convince Congress to establish what is now the Judicial Conference of the United States to administer the Federal courts; enact the Judiciary Act of 1925, which allowed the Court to decide the cases it would hear; and, before he left office, to give the Court its first, and current, permanent home—a stone’s throw from where we stand today, across the East Lawn of the Capitol.

A fellow Justice called Charles Evans Hughes “the greatest in a great line of Chief Justices.” He was known for his leadership in running the Court and for constantly working to enhance the public’s confidence in the Court. His successes were at least partly due to his keen appreciation of the limits of that position; what Charles Evans Hughes had to say:

The Chief Justice as the head of the Court has an outstanding position, but in a small body of able men with equal authority in the making of decisions, it is evident that his actual influence will depend on the strength of his character and the demonstration of his ability in the intimate relations of the judges.

Hughes was famous for the efficient, skillful, and courteous way in which he presided at oral argument, ran the Court’s conferences, and assigned opinions, calling the latter his “most delicate task.” But his greatest service may have been in spearheading public opposition to FDR’s court-packing plan.

Our last great Chief Justice, William Rehnquist, may be said to have possessed the best qualities of Marshall, Taft, and Hughes. He had an exceptional mind, an engaging personality, boundless energy, and a courteous and professional manner. These qualities helped him revolutionize Federal jurisprudence, administer the Supreme Court and the court system very efficiently, and interact constructively with those of us here in Congress.

Of course, we will soon vote on the nomination of his successor. Judge John Roberts, a product of the Ivy League’s bitersweet turns, served as a young and able law clerk to then-Associate Justice Rehnquist. In meeting with him, and watching his confirmation hearings, I believe Judge Roberts possesses many of the great Chief Justices: an impressive legal acumen, a sterling reputation for integrity, and an outstanding judicial temperament.

But I want to focus on one quality in particular: that is, his devotion to the role of law.

We use that term all the time, but the question is, what does it mean? I focus on the rule of law because of the positions my colleagues have taken during the last few cloture votes. One distinguished Member of this body said on the floor that he needed to find out “whose side” John Roberts “is on.” Another asked Judge Roberts whether, as a general proposition, he will be on the side of the liberal or the “little guy.” Still another insisted that the position to which Judge Roberts is nominated is akin to an elected official; in other words, an elected politician. Comments such as these are based on a misunderstanding of the role of a judge.

Many of the Founders were politicians, and they, of course, recognized that politics may favor certain constituencies. Judges, however, are not supposed to be on any group’s “side.” They are not supposed to favor one party’s “little guy” at the expense of another political party’s “big guy.” In short, judges are anti-politicians; at least they should be.

In giving life tenure to Federal judges, the Founders did not want them—did not want them—to exercise the powers of politicians, to whom they had denied life tenure. None of us are given life tenure by reason.

As Alexander Hamilton wrote in Federalist No. 78:

It can be of no weight to say that the courts . . . may substitute their own pleasure to the constitutional intentions of the legislature. . . . The Courts must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of judgment—

“Will instead of judgment”

the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body.

In other words, judges must only interpret the law, not write it in order to favor one group over another. Judge Roberts understands the role of a judge is that, and he is committed to adhering to it. Here is what he had to say. This was Judge Roberts at his hearing:

Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things to influence votes. I have no agenda, but I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind . . . and I will decide every case based according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability.

“Without fear or favor, to the best of my ability.”

To put it more simply, he knows if the law favors the “little guy,” then the “little guy” will win. If the law favors the “big guy,” then the “big guy” will win. It is as simple and principled as that.

I do not know—none of us do—the mark a Chief Justice Roberts will leave on the Court. With his many fine qualities, he may be a great administrator. He may lead the great reform of our court system. He may revolutionize some area of law. But he will be a successful leader. And I suspect that whatever else, with his total devotion to the rule of law, he will instill in our legal system a renewed appreciation for the role of judges in our Republic and, thereby, keep the Court on the path the Founders intended.

So today, I, like my colleagues, am mindful of the gravity and the privilege of this vote to confirm our 17th Chief Justice. I do not doubt Judge Roberts’ conviction that Judge John Roberts meets the measure of his great predecessors, and will lead the Court with judgment, skill, and integrity as befits the third branch of Government—the branch that protects our liberties by insisting that ours is a country of laws and not of men.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as we come to the conclusion of these confirmation proceedings, I commend Senators on both sides of the aisle for taking the time and making the effort to actively participate in this process. Few duties and few votes are as enduring and as consequential as deciding on a nomination for the premier jurist of our Federal court system. We have had 43 Presidents in our Nation’s history. We have only had 10 Chief Justices of the United States. In fact, only slightly under two dozen Members of the Senate have ever voted on the question of a Chief Justice.

We have had full and fair hearings. We have had a constructive debate.

This process has been a credit to the Senate and the Judiciary Committee. I commend especially Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania, our chairman, and all of the members of the committee on both sides and their staffs for the detailed, sometimes scrupulous, preparation for a Supreme Court nomination requires.

I am sure people understand when I refer to the committee’s Democratic
staff. They worked for 2 months. They labored dutifully. They gave up their weekends and their evenings, and with professionalism they helped Senators in our review of this important nomination. I particularly thank Bruce Cohen, Edward Pagano, Andrew Nelson, Chris Katterle Fine, Daniel Triggs, David Carle, Ed Barron, Elizabeth Martin, Erica Chabot, Erica Santo Pietro, Helaine Greenfield, Jennie Pasquarella, Jeremy Paris, Jessica Bashford, Joe Sexton, Josh Harris, Julie Joe, Katryna Neale, Katy Hutchison, Kristine Lucas, Kyra Harris, Lisa Anderson, Margaret Gage, Marit DeLozier, Mary Kate Meyer, Matt Nelson, Matt Oresman, Matt Vorkstis, Nate Burris, Noah Bookbinder, Sam Schneider, Sripriya Narasimhan, Susan Davies, Tara Magner, Tracy Schmaler, Valerie Frias and William Bittinger. And their experience was duplicated by the hard-working Republican staff.

Tara Magner, Tracy Schmaler, Valerie Frias and William Bittinger. And their experience was duplicated by the hard-working Republican staff.

As a minority party, I speak about our vital role in our system that is often less visible, but is crucial just the same. The minority sharpens the Senate’s and the public’s focus on issues that come before the Senate or sometimes on unattended issues that deserve the Senate’s attention.

In these proceedings, we have helped sharpen the Senate’s focus on issues that matter most in the decision before us, that of confirming a new Chief Justice of the United States.

I especially commend my fellow Democrats for taking this responsibility so dutifully. They waited to hear the evidence and to learn the particulars about this nomination. They did not rush to judgment. They did not speak out until after the hearings. Individual Senators now have weighed the evidence, and they have come to their individual conclusions.

On the aisle, there will not be a lockstep vote. I appreciate the thoughtful remarks by those who decided to vote in favor of confirmation and by those who decide to vote against the nomination. I respect the decisions of Senators who have come to different conclusions on this nomination. I know for many, including myself, it was a difficult decision. I have said that each Senator must carefully weigh this matter and decide for herself or himself.

We are each of us, 1 vote out of 100, but those 100 votes are entrusted with protecting the rights of 280 million of our fellow citizens. We stand in the shoes of 280 million Americans in this Chamber. What a somber and humbling responsibility we have in casting this vote.

I was glad to hear the Republican leader say earlier this week that a judge must jettison politics in order to do his or her job. I appreciated that she was careful to point out that a judge must jettison politics in order to do his or her job. And I, along with the Republican and Democratic leaders, will steer the Court so it will serve as an appropriate check on potential excesses of Presidential power, not just today but tomorrow. I hope that he will, and I trust that he will.

As we close the debate on this nomination and move to a vote, we do so knowing we will soon be considering another Supreme Court nominee in the Senate. Last week, Chairman SPECTER and I, along with the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Senate, met with the President. I urged him to follow a timeline and to consult with us. I urged him to share with us his intentions and seek our advice on the next nomination before he acts.

There could and should have been consultation with the Senate on the nomination of someone to serve as the 17th Chief Justice of the United States. I am sorry there was not, but there could and should be meaningful consultation on the person to be named to succeed Justice O’Connor, who has so often been the decisive vote of the Supreme Court.

The stakes for all Americans and for the Nation’s well-being are high as the President contemplates his second pick for a Justice on the Nation’s highest Court, a choice that will fill a swing vote and could steer the Court’s direction long after the President is gone and long after most of us are gone.

The President does have this opportunity to work with us to unite the country, to be a uniter, to unite us around a nominee to succeed Justice O’Connor. Now more than ever, with Americans fighting and dying in Iraq every day, with hundreds of thousands...
Beyond, I believe it is a matter of real urgency that when we come to the designation of the Chief Justice of the United States, or any Supreme Court nominee, that politics stop. We say in foreign policy that partisanship should stop at the water’s edge, and I extend that same principle to the process of the selection of the Chief Justice of the United States. So the pillars of the Senate immediately outside the Chamber are lined up directly with the pillars of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In that intervening few blocks on the green, on the Capitol complex, that partisanship should stop at the Senate pillars as they extend across the way to the Supreme Court pillars.

In the confirmation of a Supreme Court nominee, there is a unique confluence of the three branches of Government on our separation of powers, with the President exercising the executive authority to nominate, the Senate on the confirmation process, and then the seating of the new Justice in the Court. It’s a matter of vital concern that it be nonpartisan.

Twelve days ago, on September 17, at the Constitution Center in Philadelphia, the 218th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution was celebrated. Today is an historic day, with Judge Roberts, by all conventional wisdom, slated to become the 17th Chief Justice of the United States. On only 16 occasions in the past have we had a new Chief Justice of our Nation.

I believe Judge Roberts comes to this position uniquely qualified, with an academic record of superior standing, magna cum laude, summa cum laude, Harvard College and Harvard Law School, a distinguished career clerk ing first with Circuit Judge Henry Friendly, a very distinguished judge in the Court of Appeals; then clerked for then Associate Justice Rehnquist; then as an assistant to Attorney General William French Smith; later as associate White House counsel in the Reagan administration; a distinguished practice in the law firm of Hogan & Hartson; then 39 cases argued before the Supreme Court of the United States. So he has a phenomenal record.

His answers to the questioning before the committee, which I think was very intense, very directed, appropriately tough, was that he saw the Constitution as a document for the ages relating to discrimination in employment.

Judge Roberts as Chief Justice has the capacity to fully understand the balance of power between the Congress and the Court and to move away from the denigrating comments that the Court made in Alabama v. Garrett that in declaring an act unconstitutional they had a superior “method of reasoning” or that in establishing the flabby test, flabby the words of Justice Scalia, on invoking the test of proportionality and congruence in the 1997 case of Boerne, where Justice Scalia accurately noted in his dissent in the 5-to-4 case, that it was a flabby test that allowed judicial legislation and that the Court was setting itself up as the taskmaster of the Congress to see that the Congress had done its homework.

The new Chief Justice will have his work cut out in trying to bring a consensus on the reduction of the proliferation of opinions with so many concurrences coming out of the Court. Yesterday’s Washington Post had a headline: “Civil Rights Bill Grounds in Senate and a Recitation of Frustration among so-called Demo- cratic political activists who do not think their elected leaders put up a serious enough fight as to Judge Roberts. Having been there for every minute of the Roberts proceeding in my capacity as chairman to preside, it was a searching, probing inquiry into Judge Roberts’ background, and his approach to the Court.

When they say there was not a sufficient fight, there were very senior Senators, very experienced, leading the opposition. Who can challenge the tenacity of Senator KENNEDY, Senator Brown; Senator DURBIN, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator DURBIN putting up that battle?

In the final analysis, we have had many experienced Senators who have come forward to join Senators LEAHY, KOWL, and PENGOLD on the committee, and Senators of standing and distinction—Senator BYRD, who has been in this body since his election in 1958, Senator LEVIN, 27 years in this body, Senator DODD, 25 years, Senator Lugar, 30 years, the 18 Senators—where there is the showing of that kind of bipartisanship.

It is my hope we will carry forward the spirit of bipartisanship which was demonstrated in the last two confirmations. The proceedings were confirmed in 1994 with an 87-to-9 vote, with 31 Republicans joining 56 Democrats, so it did not make any difference to 31 Republicans that Justice Breyer was nominated by President Clinton, who was a Democrat.

The year before, Justice Ginsburg was confirmed 96 to 3, with 41 Republicans voting for her nomination. Before that, Justice Souter was confirmed 90 to 9, with 45 Democrats joining 54 Republicans. Nine Democrats did vote “no” against Justice Souter, perhaps influenced by the posters that he would wreck Roe v. Wade. We know he was in the joint opinion in Casey v. Planned Parenthood.

That the votes were unanimous as to Justice John Paul Stevens and Justice Scalia, 98 to 0, and Justice O’Connor was confirmed 99 to 0.

While the votes among the Democrats will not be as strong as the 41 Republicans who voted for President Clinton’s nomination of Justice Ginsburg, we have a sufficient indication of a strong bipartisan vote so that I think it is not unduly optimistic to look for a future where we will have partisanship stopping at the Senate columns.

We face another nomination imminently. There have been discussions as to what our sequence and timing will be. We have shown, with the cooperation of Senator LEAHY and the Senate Democratic leader, Senator REID, as we negotiated this timetable—and we had some angst in the negotiations but we worked in a cooperative way so that on September 29 we have met the timetable which we anticipated, although nobody was bound to it. There could have been delaying tactics, but Senator REID, Senator LEAHY, and the Judiciary Committee, with Democrats as
It is my hope we will have a nominee who will come forward to replace Justice O’Connor who will be in the mold of Judge Roberts. In a sense, Judge Roberts is the Chief Justice of the Rehnquist. Perhaps the ideology is not so important with that replacement, but it is my hope we will have someone who in the mold of Judge Roberts will stand up to the job, looking for the interpretations of due process and equal protection as Judge Roberts did in an expansive way, and looking for societal interests in that broad interpretation.

I am pleased to be a participant in this historic occasion, and again I salute my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the dignified proceeding and meeting our timetable, in coming forward to this confirmation vote at 11:30 this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ensign). Under the previous order, the time from 11 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. will be under the control of the Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I announced on this floor last week, I intend to oppose the nomination of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. In my meetings with John Roberts, I found him to be a very nice person. I like him. I respect his legal skills. I respect much of the work he has done in his career. For example, the memo on the personal side of the Lake Tahoe takings case several years ago was remarkably good. He decided the law did not look too good to him, so he figured the way to win the case was to argue to the Court the facts, and he did that and he won the case. So I admire his legal skills, as I think everyone in this body does. But at the end of the day, I have had many unanswered questions about the nominee, and because of that, I cannot justify a vote confirming him to this lifetime position.

Each one of the 100 Senators applies his or her own standard in carrying out the advice and consent clause of the Constitution. That is a constitutional role that we have. I know that elections have consequences, and I agree that Presidents are entitled to a measure of deference in appointing judicial nominees. After all, the Senate has confirmed well over 200 of President Bush and President Clinton’s nominees. But deference to the President can only go so far. Our Founding Fathers gave the Senate the central role in the nominations process, and that role is especially important in placing someone on the Supreme Court.

If confirmed by the Senate, John Roberts will serve as Chief Justice of the United States and leader of the third branch of the Federal Government for decades to come. He will possess enormous legal authority. In my view, we should only vote to confirm this nominee if he has persuaded us he will protect the freedoms that all Americans hold dear. This is a close question for me, but I will resolve my doubts in favor of the American people, whose rights would be in jeopardy if John Roberts turns out to be the wrong person for the job. As I have indicated, I was impressed with Judge Roberts the first time I met him. This was a day or two after he was nominated. I knew that he had been a thoughtful member of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals for the last 2 years. But he was several years older than me. I began to reassess my initial view. Most notably, I was disturbed by memos that surfaced from John Roberts’ years of service in the Reagan administration. These documents raised serious questions about the nominee’s approach to the rights of women and civil rights.

In the statement that I gave last week, I gave some specific examples of the memos that concerned me. I also explained that I was prepared to look past these memos if the nominee distanced himself from these views at his Judiciary Committee hearings. He did not. I was so disappointed when he took the disingenuous stance that the views expressed in these memos were merely the views of his client, the Reagan administration. Anyone who has read the memos can see that their author was expressing his own personal views.

When I saw Senator SCHUMER throw him the proverbial softball in these hearings, I waited with anticipation for the answer that I knew would come. This brilliant man, John Roberts, certainly could see what Senator SCHUMER was attempting to do. He was attempting to have John Roberts say: Well, I was younger then. It was a poor choice of words. If I offended anyone, I am sorry. I know it was insensitive. I could have made the same point in a different manner.

But he didn’t say that. For example, the softball that was thrown to him by Senator SCHUMER was words to the effect: In a memo you wrote that President Reagan was going to have a meeting in just a short period of time with some illegal amigos, Hispanics—that was insensitive. It was untrue. And it was wrong. And he should have acknowledged that and he did not.

That affected me. It gave me an insight into who John Roberts is. My conclusion was these Reagan-era memos were heightened when the White House rejected a reasonable request by the committee Democrats for documents written by the nominee when he served as Deputy Solicitor General in the first Bush administration. The claim of attorney-client privilege to shield these documents was unpersuasive. This was stonewalling, plain and simple.

In the absence of these documents, it was equally important for the nominee to answer fully questions from the committee members at his hearing. He didn’t do that. Of course a judicial nominee should decline to answer questions regarding specific cases that will come before the Court to which the witness has been nominated. We all know that. But Judge Roberts refused to answer many questions certainly more remote than that, including questions seeking his views of long-settled precedents.

Finally, I was swayed by the testimony of civil rights and women’s rights leaders against this confirmation. As we processed the evidence of public life, we have an opportunity to meet lots of people. That is one of the pluses of this wonderful job, the great honor that the people of the State of Nevada have bestowed upon me. During my public service, I have had the opportunity to serve in Congress with some people whom I consider heroes. One of those is a man by the name of JOHN LEWIS. JOHN LEWIS was part of the civil rights movement, and he has scars to prove it. He has a history of the civil rights movement. Any time they show films of the beatings that took place in the Southern part of the United States of people trying to change America, JOHN LEWIS is one of the people you will see on the ground being kicked and stomped on while punches are thrown. He still has those scars.

But those scars are on the outside, not the inside. This man is one of the most kind, gentle people I have ever met, someone who is very sensitive to the civil rights we all enjoy. Congressman JOHN LEWIS is an icon and, as I have said, a personal hero of mine. When John Lewis says that John Roberts is on the wrong side of history and should not be confirmed, his view carries great weight with me.

So I weigh John Roberts’ fine résumé and his 2 years of mainstream judicial service against the Reagan-era memos, the nominee’s unsavory history, testimony, and the administration’s failure to produce relevant documents. I have to reluctantly conclude the scales tipped against confirmation.

Some have accused Republicans of treating this nominee unfairly. Nothing could be further from the truth. There are volumes written about the uncivil atmosphere in Washington, about how things could be better in the Senate. All those people who write that, let them take a look at how this proceeding transpired in the Senate and I hope on the face of America. It was not easy to get to this point. In 20 minutes, we will have a vote on the Chief Justice of the United States. But people should understand that the Judiciary Committee conducted itself in an exemplary fashion, led by ARLEN SPECTER and PAT LEAHY. No better example in Government could be shown. The hearings and the full breadth of everything that took place with this confirmation process is exemplary.

People have strong feelings, not only in that committee but in the Senate. There are many Republicans for mischief. But because of the strong leadership of two distinguished Senators—one from the tiny State of...
Vermont and one from the very heavily populated State of Pennsylvania—it all worked out. They trusted each other and the members of the Judiciary Committee trusted them, and after a few weeks of this process, which went on for months, by the way, every Member of the Senate has had to work out what this is all about, this little document, to be a civil proceeding, and it was. It has been. I commend and applaud the dignity of these hearings.

Each Democrat considered the nomination on the merits and approached the vote with consideration. They were not told how to vote, not by me, not by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, not by the senior Member of the Senate, Senator Byrd. They will vote their conscience.

Democrats have not employed any procedural tactics that we might have otherwise considered. As Senator Specter and Senator Leahy have said to the President himself—I have been there when they said it—we want the next Chief Justice to be a man of character and principle. He can be the second best person in the world, but if he is not a man of character and principle, he will not do. There are things that are more important than his qualifications. He has to be a person of character and principle. That is what we demand. That is what we are asking for.

We have reached different conclusions on this, but we remain friends and respectful to each other throughout. His praise of Senator Specter and of myself means so much to me. But I think, more importantly, what he has done means so much to the Senate. Senator Specter has achieved both sides of the aisle to make sure that we were going to have a hearing for the Chief Justice of the United States that reflected what was best in this country.

When I finished my speech, spoke directly to Judge John Roberts, and I will do so again: Please, remember there are 280 million Americans. Be a Chief Justice for all of us.

I yield the floor. 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. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the duty before us today to provide advice and consent on John Roberts’ nomination as Chief Justice of the United States is perhaps the most significant responsibility we will undertake as elected leaders elected to lead us by the Constitution and an obligation the American people have entrusted us to fulfill.

In this Chamber today, we are seated at the drafting table of history. We are prepared to write a new chapter in the history of our Nation. Our words and our actions will be judged not only by the American people today but by the eyes of history forever.

As we prepare to pick up the pen to write these words that will shape the course of our highest Court, I ask that we think hard about the words we will write. I ask that we think hard about the question we must answer: Is Judge Roberts qualified to lead the highest Court in the land? I believe the answer to this question is yes.

Judge Roberts possesses the qualities Americans expect in the Chief Justice of its highest Court and the qualifications that America deserves. Without a doubt, he is the brightest of the bright. His understanding of constitutional law is unquestionable. Judge Roberts has proven through his tenure on the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals and in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee that he is committed to upholding the rule of law and the Constitution. He has demonstrated that he won’t let personal opinions sway his fairminded approach. He will check political views at the door to the Court, for he respects the role of the judiciary and recognizes the importance of separation of powers. As he so eloquently stated before the committee: “Judges are like umpires. Umpires don’t make the rules, they apply them . . . They make sure everybody plays by the rules, but it is a limited role.”

Judge Roberts will be a great umpire on the High Court. He will be fair and openminded. He will stand on principle and lead by example. He will be respectful of the other branches and litigants who come before the Court. And above all, he will be a faithful steward of the Constitution.

This is what we know about John Roberts: In the last few weeks, he has provided us information and answered our questions. John Roberts has fulfilled his obligation to the Senate.

Now it is time to fulfill our obligation to the American people. It is time for each Member to answer, Is John Roberts the right person for the job of Chief Justice of the United States? It is my belief that the answer is yes. It is my belief that the chapter we write should begin with his name. It is my hope that today Members will join me in writing the words; that Members who join me in writing “yes” for John Roberts’ nomination as our Nation’s 17th Chief Justice.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr., of Maryland, to be the Chief Justice of the United States?

Under Resolution 480, the standing orders of the Senate, during the yeas and nays vote of the Senate, each Senator shall vote from the assigned desk of the Senator.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Alexander  
Allen  
Baucus  
Brownback  
Byrd  
Carper  
Chafee  
Chambliss  
Collins  
Conrad  
Corburn  
Cochran  
Collins  
Cummins  
Craio  
Crapo  
DeMint  
Dodd  
Akaka  
Bayh  
Byrd  
Boxer  
Cantwell  
Clinton  

NAYS—22

Mikulski  
Feinstein  
Durbin  
Lincoln  
Lieberman  
Levin  
Bennett  
Baucus  
Allen  
Alexander  
Akin  
Bolling  
Bingaman  
Burst  
Brownback  
Bunning  
Burr  
Byrd  
Carper  
Chafee  
Chambliss  
Collins  
Conrad  
Corburn  
Cochran  
Collins  
Cummins  
Craio  
Crapo  
DeMint  
Dodd  
Akaka  
Bayh  
Byrd  
Boxer  
Cantwell  
Clinton  

Martinez  
McDade  
McConnell  
Markowski  
Muray  
Hain  
Feingold  
Frist  
Graham  
Grassley  
Gregg  
Hagel  
Hatch  
Hatch  
Inhofe  
Jackson  
Jeffords  
Johnson  
Kohl  
Kyl  
Landrieu  
Leahy  
Levin  
Lieberman  
Lincoln  
Lott  
Lugar  
Craig  
DeMint  
Dodd  
Cantor  
Feingold  
Santorum  
Sessions  
Shelby  
Smith  
Snowe  
Specter  
Stevens  
Sumsa  
Talent  
Thomas  
Thune  
Vitter  
Voynovich  
Warner  
Wyden
The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. FRIST. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay the motion on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FRIST. I ask that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

Mr. FRIST. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The chair will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAQ

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise once again today to comment on the deeply disturbing consequences of the President’s misguided policies in Iraq.

I have spoken before about my grave concern that the administration’s Iraq policies are actually strengthening the hand of our enemies, fueling the insurgency’s recruitment of foreign fighters, and unifying elements of the insurgency that might otherwise turn on each other.

But today I want to focus on a different and equally alarming issue, which is that the Bush administration’s policies in Iraq are making America weaker. None of us should stand by and allow this to continue.

It is shocking to me this Senate has not found the time and the energy to take up the Defense authorization bill and give that bill the full debate and attention it deserves. Our men and women in uniform and our military families continue to make real sacrifices every day in service to this country. They perform their duties with skill and honor, sometimes in the most difficult of circumstances. But the Senate has not performed its duties, and the state of the U.S. military desperately needs our attention.

The administration’s policies in Iraq are breaking the U.S. Army. As soldiers confront the prospect of a third tour in the extremely difficult theater of Iraq, it would be understandable if they began to wonder why all of the sacrifices made by our country in wartime seems to be falling on their shoulders. It would be understandable if they and their brothers and sisters in the Marine Corps began to feel some skepticism about whether essential resources, such as adequately armored vehicles, will be there when they need them. It would be understandable if they came to greet information about deployment decisions with nervousness—because reliable information has been hard to come by for our military families in recent years. And it would be understandable if they asked themselves whether their numbers will be great enough—great enough to hold hard-pressed battalions together properly vetted translators will be available to help them distinguish friend from foe.

At some point, the sense of solidarity and commitment that helps maintain strong retention rates can give way to a sense of frustration with the status quo. I fear we may be very close to that tipping point today. It is possible we may not see the men and women of the Army continue to volunteer for more of the same. It is not reasonable to expect that current retention problems will improve rather than worsen. We should not bet our national security on that kind of wishful thinking.

Make no mistake, our military readiness is increasingly suffering. According to a recent RAND study, the Army has been stretched so thin that active-duty soldiers are now spending 1 of every 2 years abroad, leaving little of the Army left in any appropriate condition to respond to crises that may emerge elsewhere in the world. In an era in which we confront a globally networked enemy, and at a time when nuclear weapons proliferation is an urgent threat, continuing on our present course is irresponsible at best.

We are not just wearing out the troops; we are also wasting equipment much faster than it is being replaced or refurbished. Days ago, the chief of the National Guard, GEN H. Hal Thinnes, testifying before our Senate staffers that the National Guard had approximately 75 percent of the equipment it needed on 9/11, 2001. Today, the National Guard has only 34 percent of the equipment it needs. The response to Hurricane Katrina exposed some of the dangerous gaps in the Guard’s communications systems.

What we are asking of the Army is not sustainable, and the burden and the toll it is taking on our military families is unacceptable. This cannot go on.

Many of my colleagues, often led by Senator REED of Rhode Island, have taken stock of where we stand and have joined to support efforts to expand the size of our standing Army. But this effort, which I support, is a solution for the long term, because it depends on new recruits to address our problems. We cannot suddenly increase the numbers of experienced soldiers so essential to providing leadership in the field. It takes years to grow a new crop of leaders and reduce the resign rate of Army lieutenants and captains lose last year to its highest rate since the attacks of September 11, 2001. We are heading toward crisis right now.

Growing the all-volunteer Army can only happen if qualified new recruits sign up for duty. But all indications suggest that at the end of this month the Army will fall short—thousands short—of its annual recruiting goal. Barring some sudden and dramatic change, the Army National Guard and Army Reserve too will miss their annual targets by about 20 percent, missing their targets by year by year by year in terms of recruitment.

GEN Peter Schoomaker, the Army’s Chief of Staff, told Congress recently that 2006 “may be the toughest recruiting environment ever.”

Too often, too many of us are reluctant to criticize the administration’s policies in Iraq for fear that anything other than staying the course set by the President will somehow appear weak. But the President’s course is misguided, and it is doing grave damage to our extraordinary and globally admired all-volunteer U.S. Army. To stand by—to stand by—while this damage is done is not patriotic. It is not supportive. It is not tough on terrorism, nor is it strong on national security. Because our men and women in uniform, and because I am committed to working with all of my colleagues to make this country more secure, I am convinced we must change our course.

As some of my colleagues know, I have introduced a resolution calling for the President to provide a public report clarifying the mission the United States military is being asked to accomplish in Iraq, and laying out a plan and a timeframe for accomplishing that mission and subsequently bringing our troops home. It is in our interest to provide some clarity about our intentions and restore confidence at home and abroad that U.S. troops will not be in Iraq indefinitely. I have tried by jump-start this discussion by proposing a date for U.S. troop withdrawal: December 31, 2006.

We need to start working with a realistic set of plans and benchmarks if we are to gain control of our Iraq policy, instead of simply letting it dominate our security strategy and drain vital resources for an unlimited amount of time.

So this brings me to another facet of this administration’s misguided approach to Iraq, another front on which our great country is growing weaker rather than stronger as a result of the administration’s policy choices, and that is the tremendously serious fiscal consequences of the President’s decision to put the entire Iraq war on our national tab. How much longer can the elected representatives of the American people in this Congress allow the President to rack up over $1 billion a week in new debts? This war is draining $5.6 billion every month from our economy—funds that might be used to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina recover, or to help
address the skyrocketing health care costs facing businesses and families, or to help pay down the enormous debt this Government has already piled up.

Not only are we weakening our economic future today, this costly war is under-mining our Nation today, this costly war is under-mining our military and with our economy, looms on the horizon that we are training in terrorism, and building new, transnational networks among our enemies. Meanwhile, the costs of staying this course indefinitively, the consequences of weakening America’s economy, looms more ominously before us with each passing week. There is no leadership in simply hoping for the best. We must insist on an Iraq policy that makes sense.

I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD. I am very proud to be on his resolution which finally would hold this President and his administration accountable for the disastrous situation we find ourselves in in Iraq, a situation that has led to nearly 2,000 dead, countless wounded, young people and so not young without limbs, without their full brain capacity. It is a stunning failure.

Finally, in the Senate, we have a resolution that simply says to this administration: Do tell us, what is your plan? When are we getting out? Give us the milestones. I know you said you have a plan. I have a couple of questions I wanted to ask my friend. As my friend was talking, I wrote down the various missions that we have heard from the administration that we were supposed to have in Iraq. The first one was weapons of mass destruction. Remember when Secretary Rumsfeld said: I know where they are; I could point to where they are. No, there weren’t any. Then they said: We have to get Saddam. He is a tyrant. We all agreed, he is a tyrant. Saddam is gone for all intents and purposes. That was the second mission. Then they said: We are going to rebuild Iraq, a disastrous situation over which Secretary Rice is in charge. I haven’t seen much rebuilding. I have seen a lot of no-bid contracts. Then they said: We have to have an election. That is the next mission. They had an election. After that, everything fell apart. Then they said: We need to bring security. We are going to train the Iraqi forces. The President, the House, and I agree with that. We want to see them trained—it seems to be taking forever especially when we have the President saying: We will stay there as long as it takes. What kind of message is that to the Iraqis?

We had a briefing yesterday. We can’t discuss the details of that briefing, but it seemed to me there were yet other missions laid out.

I ask my friend, does he see the situation the way I do: An ever-changing mission in Iraq, setting the bar higher and higher with no end in sight is where we are at the present time?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator from California. She accurately described the way in which we got in this situation. I called it on the Senate floor, in October 2002, shifting justifications. The one we began with, the one that sold the American people was that somehow there was a connection between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. Most of the American people apparently believed it because the President told them so at the time of the invasion. That would have been the ultimate justification because everybody assumed the Iraq invasion had something to do with that.

Ever since that myth has been exploded, the administration has been trying any way, scampering any way they can to come up with other justifications—the obviously failed attempt to suggest the imminent threat of weapons of mass destruction from Saddam Hussein. Most of the people supported the Iraq war. They came to my town meetings and said: Why is this happening? Why were we given false pretenses to get into the war, and why is it that there isn’t a serious plan to finish the war? Because of the failures of the administration to handle this war in any sensible way, the very people who supported the war are starting to say: Let’s just leave.

So the President presents us with a false choice. He says: We have to stay the course. And if you don’t believe in staying the course, then you must be for cutting and running. He is causing the movement in America to simply lose confidence because of his failure of leadership.

What our resolution does—and I thank the Senator from California for her cosponsorship—is modest. It just says: Mr. President, within 30 days, we give us a plan that lays out the best way you want, without being bound to it, what is the plan, what is the mission, what are the benchmarks we have to achieve, by what time do you think we can achieve those benchmarks, and at what point and through what stages do you think we can begin and then complete the withdrawal of our American troops.
I say to my friend through the Chair, I think her comments and her question are right on the point. I yield for another question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague for correcting me on that. I missed that yes, out of the five or six missions I named, I left out the very important one that he corrected me on, which is that there was a link between Saddam and al-Qaeda and, in fact, there was al-Qaeda all over Iraq.

The Senator and I sit on the Foreign Relations Committee. I think he remembers this document that I put into the RECORD, because I remember he very much wanted it, which showed that about a month after September 11 when we were so viciously attacked by bin Laden—who, by the way, we were going to get dead or alive, and we need to do that—the fact is, the State Department in its own document said there wasn’t one al-Qaeda cell, not one, in Iraq, more cells in America than in Iraq, according to our own State Department. We have put that in the RECORD.

Now, of course, it is a haven for terrorism because of this failed policy, this failed policy, this policy that is utter chaos with no end in sight, unless the Senate and the administration look at what my friend put forward, which is finally saying to the President: You need a mission, a mission that can be accomplished, and we need to end this in an orderly fashion. I wanted to ask my friend one more point, and then I will leave the Chamber. That is about the National Guard. Right now, there are fires raging in my home State, sadly. We have them every year at this time. It is heartwrenching. We need all the help we can get. We always get all the help we ask for. We have never had a problem. The National Guard is called out when it gets really out of control.

Is my friend aware that the best equipment that the National Guard had at its disposal is in Iraq, not here at home? And when the people were crying out for help, not only were so many of the National Guard over in Iraq, my understanding is—and my friend can correct me—approximately 40 percent of our troops over there are National Guard. That is my information. Not only that, the best equipment of the National Guard is over in Iraq. Does our people deserve better than that so when they experience disasters, our National Guard can respond?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. The Senator has very nicely returned to the main point of what I was trying to illustrate today. We certainly agree on the problems of how we got into this war and our very troubled feelings about that and also the myriad of problems with the way the war is being conducted. But what the Senator from California has done is returned us to the main point I wanted to make today: This strategy is weakening America. I am not talking about some general sense. We are talking specifically about our military. We are talking specifically about our National Guard.

Yes, I know about this in Wisconsin. We have some 10,000 Guard and Reserve. The vast majority of them have been called up for action overseas. There are serious concerns that have been reported—which, by the way, were beginning prior to 9/11—about equipment. It is to the point where my National Guard people ask me to ask the Secretary of Defense, Are we going to replenish these things for our National Guard? What is the guarantee? I received a rather weak answer, as I recall. The equipment needs are only at 34 percent for the National Guard—a dramatic decline in the last 4 years. Since 9/11, we have allowed the situation to become much worse in terms of equipment. The National Guard, whether it be for use in a foreign conflict or whether it be used to handle a terrorist situation domestically or whether it be used to help deal with one of the natural disasters that obviously can and do occur.

I appreciate the Senator heightening this point. This isn’t about opposing a war. This is about mistakes being made by an administration in terms of forgetting the main point of fighting terrorism, and forgetting about the need for our military to be strong both internationally and to be able to help, as the National Guard must, domestically.

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

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

AVIAN FLU PANDEMIC

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I come to the floor at this time to discuss a matter of grave national security. If recent Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita have taught us anything, it is that we have to do a dramatically better job of preparing for diseases before they strike so we are not left picking up the pieces afterward.

I am very gravely concerned that the United States is totally unprepared for an outbreak—and a subsequent international epidemic—of avian flu. We have had two disasters in the last 4 years—9/11 and 9/12—and 2 Saturdays later. And the Federal Government was totally unprepared for both, despite clear warnings. Similarly, we have been warned in no uncertain terms about avian flu, but our preparations so far have been grossly inadequate.

I think I got my first briefing on this about a year ago from CDC in Atlanta. I have been following it closely in our Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. As it has unfolded over the last several months, it is clear that it is not a question of if avian flu is going to reach us, it is a question of when—not if, just when.

As many of my colleagues know, avian flu—or as it is called in the technical jargon, H5N1—has been known to pass first in bird species. It was passed first in bird species. It was passed from bird to bird, chicken to chicken, and that type of thing. It has then gotten into migratory waterfowl, which has spread from countries such as Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Hong Kong. And they have now found it as far away as Russia and as far north as the northern regions of Russia. It is just a matter of time before it gets here.
We have known this passed from bird to bird. We now know it has passed from birds to mammals, certain types of cats, particular tigers. We also know now it has passed from birds to humans. We have some cases. Now we have a few cases that have been reported of passing from human to human.

So the virus is mutating. It is getting smarter. It knows that it has now gone from bird to bird, bird to mammal, and bird to human, and now from human to human.

Experts in virology at the Department of Health and Human Services and others tell us that it is only a matter of time until the virus mutates from human to human, and then it becomes widespread. When that happens, we are in deep trouble.

An outbreak in China, Vietnam or Cambodia could trigger, within a couple of weeks, a worldwide outbreak, facilitated by air traffic and the mass movement of people across borders. And the data so far shows that of the 150 cases of the human avian flu—H5N1—that we know of, 54 have died. Almost 50 percent of the people infected have died.

The current prevalent form of the flu virus is a nightmare scenario—a kind of 21st century Black Death.

It is not hard to picture that could happen within a few months’ period of time.

Again, as I say, many experts say it is not a matter of if, it is when. We have to ask tough questions.

Where do our preparedness efforts stand? What could we be doing better?

At some future time—I have it on charts, but I didn’t have time to put it together—I will have charts to show what happened with the last great flu pandemic that hit the world in 1918 and 1919. Understand this: 500 million people were infected worldwide. This was almost one-fourth—20 million to 40 million deaths worldwide. There were over 500 deaths in the United States.

In one month alone, October 1918, 196 people died in the United States from this influenza.

I have been told by experts that this H5N1 and how it manifests itself mirrors the influenza of 1918 and 1919.

Where do our efforts stand, and what can we be doing better?

First, where do we stand?

The Centers for Disease Control, under the great leadership of Dr. Gerberding, is doing a fine job working in cooperation with the World Health Organization and governments in affected regions to detect the disease and to help to stop its spread. Surveillance can alert us to an outbreak and governments can then take measures to isolate the disease so that widespread infection does not occur.

Again, we know how to do this. The CDC knows how to do this. They have great success with surveillance, isolation, and quarantine during the SARS outbreak, and they managed to control its spread. We never got SARS in the United States because we were able to isolate it and quarantine it in other countries.

We also learned valuable lessons from this SARS episode. We need to be doing a better job of surveillance. We have had some problems with some countries having a very good public health infrastructure. They may not report illnesses and deaths as do we or some other places.

But we have CDC personnel on the ground in these countries. They know what to do. But they are woefully inadequate in funds. They don’t have the funds needed to conduct adequate surveillance in these countries such as Cambodia, Thailand, Vietnam, Russia, and places such as that. They need some more support for surveillance. I will get into that in a little bit.

In order for us to get the necessary vaccines for this disease, it is going to take a few months.

The best thing we can be about in the initial stages, is surveillance, finding out where it is outbreaking, control it, isolate it, and quarantine it.

As I said, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention know how do that. There are other things we can do and do better. The World Health Organization is encouraging the purchase of antiviruses, medicines that help mitigate the infectious disease once you have already gotten it. Unfortunately, the United States only has enough antiviral medication for 1 percent of our population. That is not enough. We need to invest approximately $3 billion to build an adequate stockpile of antiviral medications. That would get us enough for about 50 percent of the population.

The experts tell us that we ought to be prepared for that kind of an infectious rate in the United States; that it could be up to 50 percent or more of our people in the United States affected by this—150 cases.

If we stay where we are, and we only have 1 percent or 10 percent, then you raise the question: Who gets it? How is it distributed?

We need to reassure our people that we have enough of these antivirals. These antivirals have a long shelf life—7 to 10 years, and maybe even more.

It is not as if we are buying something that is going to disintegrate right away. These antivirals have a long shelf life.

In addition, the President’s budget cut $120 million from State and public health agencies. These are the agencies that will be on the front lines of both surveillance and disease prevention should an outbreak occur. We have to restore this funding. But that is not adequate.

In the future, our public health infrastructure would be stretched to the limits by an outbreak of avian influenza.

We need to invest in more public health professionals, epidemiologists, physicians, laboratory technicians, and others.

As I said, if we have an outbreak and it gets to the United States, the first thing we want to do is have good surveillance, isolation, and quarantine. That costs money.

Lastly, we also must take measures to increase our Nation’s vaccine capacity. Currently, there were only one flu vaccine manufacturing facility in the United States.

I have wondered about that. Why is that so?

At some meetings with the drug industry and others, I have learned that vaccine production is not very profitable compared to other types of drug development and manufacturing. Plus, they do not know if there is going to be a market for it.

This is a classic point of market failure—where the market really can’t respond to a future need.

This is where the Government must step in to provide incentives for more manufacturers to build facilities in the United States.

Many will remember what happened during the last flu season, when overseas manufacturing facilities were shut down for safety reasons. Because we had no manufacturing capacity domestically, there were vaccine shortages. We should learn from this lesson. We cannot afford this problem when faced with the threat of avian influenza. So the Federal Government can and must do more to improve domestic vaccine capacity.

What does that mean? That means we are going to have to have some kind of guarantee that if you make this vaccine, we guarantee we will buy so many millions of doses of this vaccine.

Why is that important?

For this strain of the avian flu—in technological terms, H5N1—the virus that we have isolated in people who have contracted it in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Hong Kong, the National Institutes of Health and the National Institutes of Health, under Dr. Fauci, has been developing a vaccine. The initial reports that came out in July were that this vaccine has great promise. However, what we don’t know is will the virus that mutates and comes to this country be H5N1 or will it be H5N3 or H5N5? We don’t know. Therefore, if a manufacturer were to manufacture all these doses of vaccine for H5N1, that may not work for the kind of viruses we might get later on.

I am told it might work for some; it might slow it down a little bit.

That is why we need to have incentives for vaccine manufacturers in this country so they know if they manufacture the vaccine, it will be purchased. We may not use it all. We may have to develop new vaccine that may or may not work on the road. But at least we will have these vaccines in case H5N1 is the virus that gets here because we know that virus. That is why we have to have them.

Some may ask, Why wasn’t this done before? Perhaps we should have done...
Mr. PRESIDENT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I yield the floor.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. I am happy to defer to Senator Stevens if he has something he would like to say.

Mr. STEVENS. We are still in mourning business, are we?

Mr. PRESIDENT. The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. Recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. I will wait for the Senator’s statement.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I will try to be brief. I just want to offer my strong support for the amendment Senator Harkin is going to propose and state why I think this is such an important issue.

Let me first say, that I am generally on the view that we should not be taking unrelated amendments to the defense bills.

The money in this legislation is badly needed by our men and women in uniform and I do not want to slow this bill down.

But, this amendment dealing with the avian flu pandemic is so important to our public health security—and our national security—so important to the lives of millions of people around the world, that it simply cannot wait. In fact, it is almost as urgent as the announcement that Dr. Julie Gerberding, the Director of the CDC, said that an avian flu outbreak is "the most important threat that we are facing [today]."

In light of these developments, I believe it is worth the U.S. Senate spending just a few hours on this critical issue, even if it is not directly related to the underlying legislation.

Over the last few months, we have heard alarming reports from countries all over Asia—Indonesia, China, Vietnam, Thailand—about deaths from the avian flu.

International health experts say that two of the three conditions for an
avian flu pandemic in Southeast Asia already exist. First, a new strain of the virus, called H5N1, has emerged and humans have little or no immunity. Second, this strain has shown that it can jump between species.

The last concern—the ability for the virus to travel efficiently from human to human—has not been met, and it is the only thing preventing a full blown pandemic. Once this virus mutates and can be transmitted from human to human, because of global trade and travel, we will not be able to contain this disease. We learned this lesson from SARS, which took less than 4 months to get from Asia to Canada, where it caused human and economic devastation.

When I started talking about this issue 7 months ago, many people thought that the avian flu was a mild concern, an Asian problem, an unlikely threat to Americans here in the U.S. As time has passed, research, the nation’s top scientists and experts have focused greater attention on the possibilities of an avian flu pandemic, and they have rapidly come to consensus that it is not a pandemic with us yet, but when? Is it not a question of whether people die but how many? And the main question, the question that keeps me awake at night, is whether the United States will be able to deal with this calamity?

From what we have seen with the lack of readiness and dismal response to Hurricane Katrina, I think that all of us would have to conclude that the answer to this question in this point in time, is no. Whether we are talking about having adequate surveillance capacities in our state and local health departments, having enough doctors and hospital beds and medical equipment for infected individuals, or having a vaccine or treatment that is guaranteed to work, I don’t want to be an alarmist, but here in the U.S., we are in serious trouble.

Several of us here in the Congress—on a bipartisan basis—have taken the first steps needed to address this looming crisis. In April of this year, I introduced the AVIAN Act, S. 969 that would increase our preparedness for avian flu pandemic. Senators LUGAR and DURBIN and several others have co-sponsored this act and I thank them for that. We need to move this bill as quickly as possible.

In May, I and Senators LUGAR, MCCONNELL, and LEAHY already worked with me to include $25 million for avian flu activities as part of the Iraq supplemental. I included an additional $10 million to combat avian flu in the foreign assistance bill. But as Senator HARKIN noted, we need much more and what we received from the administration yesterday. We have to move now on this issue. It has to be moved rapidly. We have to build an infrastructure to create vaccines and to purchase enough antiviral drugs. I strongly urge that on a bipartisan basis we make this one of our top priorities. This is a crisis waiting to happen. If we are not prepared for it now, we will all be extraordinarily sorry.

The only other comment I will make is, I know these are tough with respect to our budget. I am working with my colleagues across the aisle to figure out ways we can come up with the money for Katrina and Iraq. This is a sound investment. If we don’t make this investment now, we will pay much more later.

So I hope the amendment Senator HARKIN is going to offer will get bipartisan support and most important, the utmost consideration from this chamber.

Thank you very much. Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know I welcome the attention of Senators to the problem of the avian virus. In 1997, because of information I discovered concerning what Senator OBAMA just mentioned—the intersection where wild birds come to Alaska from the Chinese mainland and other places in the world, including Russia—we began a series of funds in the agriculture bill to study the process of this virus being transmitted. As Senator OBAMA has mentioned, so far it has always been bird to bird or bird to animal. There has been no transmutation to take it from human to human, or bird to human. It is one of the dangerous problems of the world, no question about it.

When I first heard of Senator HARKIN’s amendment, I said I might—I said I would cosponsor it. As I read it, it is not just about the virus. It is reversing the President’s decision with regard to the biostat’s decision with regard to Taiwan and local public health agencies. It is starting an addition to the domestic preparation and infrastructure. That is, I understand, was part of the briefing some Senators had yesterday and I am informed others will soon get.

There is a BioShield group working in the administration, particularly in the agencies that are dealing with disease control and various other subjects. There will undoubtedly be a presentation by them to the Congress. There has not been such a presentation yet. The briefing the Senators got was for me the confirmation of what those people are doing who are working on that plan.

This is an amendment that sort of short circuits the concept of dealing with it and asks for some of the money they ask for, but I am told the amendment will not distribute the money the way the BioShield proposal will distribute it. It is brought to us as an emergency measure. It may well be that the BioShield people bring us a proposal that is partially funded and partially funded. We do not know yet.

But very clearly we do know there is no current human-to-human transmission that has been known of in the world. For us to say this is the greatest problem we have and is superior to some of the things we are doing, particularly in Iraq or in the war on terror, I think is a totally misplaced comparison, as far as I am concerned. I am just back from Iraq. I have seen some of the dangers over there and have talked to some of the people who have been injured over there. To compare the money we have in this bill to fund them with funding a proposal to deal
with a virus, for something that has not yet become a threat to human beings, I believe is wrong.

The BioShield proposal will be before the Congress, I am told, in this Congress. I want to announce now that I will ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to raise a point of order to this amendment. It is an emergency declaration. It is not the recommendations of the BioShield group who briefed the Senator last night. It is a premature attempt to bring it to the floor on the Defense bill where it does not belong. So I hope the Senate will agree with us and not make this an emergency appropriations at this time.

Now, there is no question in my mind this could well develop into a political argument. I have been on this floor now since 1981 as one of the managers of this bill. I cannot remember a time when we had a political argument on a nongermane amendment to this bill. This is a bill to fund the people in uniform, not the authorization bill where there are amendments from time to time offered which are nongermane. We have had a policy of no nongermane amendments on this bill, I intend to pursue that policy. A nongermane amendment. This is an amendment that is premature in terms of avian flu. Again, I say no one has a greater interest in this avian flu than I do. When I go home on weekends, I go to a restaurant I love, I know I am sitting next to people who have just come back from Russia. We go to Russia daily from my State. We go to China daily from my State. We have pilots who fly planes throughout China, throughout Russia, living right there in the community in which I live. We know there is an avian flu potential over there. The birds that come from over there interest with our birds. We know that. We have been studying that since 1997. Just pure science. I talked to a farmer about avian flu vaccine and when we would be able to get it for Alaska. I was told we will get it in time.

But now I come out here and I have an amendment to be offered when we take the bill that makes it an emergency to appropriate almost $4 billion, and not on the basis of recommendations of the experts but on the basis of some Senators who were briefed yesterday, prematurely, at their request, of studies that are going on at the administration.

Now, I am not one who takes lightly bringing subjects to this bill that do not pertain to protecting people in uniform. We had a similar situation once with regard to anthrax and other studies, and we acted very promptly because that did apply to people in uniform. But this is not something that pertains to the defense of the United States. It could very well be in the future a very vital issue to our Nation and our military, but right now we ought to wait for the scientists to come and tell us what needs to be done, how it needs to be done, where it needs to be done, and who is going to do it. But this is throwing money at a wall. I will oppose that.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 230, H.R. 2863. I further seek consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to as original text for the purposes of further amendment, with no points of order waived by virtue of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. With the understanding I would be able to offer an amendment as soon as the bill is laid down.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, once the bill is before the Senate, it is open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his request?

Mr. STEVENS. I will not consent to that. Under the rules, he is entitled to offer an amendment, I have asked unanimous consent.

Mr. HARKIN. Okay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2863) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment (Strike the part in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.)

H.R. 2863

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLES

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army Reserve on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,839,813,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $20,083,037,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10382, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $2,662,183,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,698,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,698,500,000.
drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 1631 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Services, supplies, and Defense Military Retirement Fund, $472,392,000.

[RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE]

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12120(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16311 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,235,360,000.

[RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY]

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10221, 10352, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12120(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16311 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,359,704,000.

[RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY]

For expenses, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve, $4,142,875,000.

[RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS]

For expenses, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under sections 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12120(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16311 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,123,766,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $3,179,818,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy, and of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $38,325,516,000: Provided, That not more than $25,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Command Initiatives Fund authorized under section 186 of title 10, United States Code, and of which not to exceed $40,000,000 may be used for emergences and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided in this Act for Civil Military programs under this heading, $500,000 shall be available for a grant for Outreach Odyssey, Pennsylvania, to support the Youth Development and Leadership program and Department of Defense STARBASE program: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $5,000,000 is available for contractor support to coordinate a wind test demonstration project on an Air Force installation using wind turbines manufactured in the United States that are new to the United States market and to execute the renewable energy purchasing plan: Provided further, That none of the funds otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: Provided further, That $1,000,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading may be transferred to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of supplies, equipment, and communications, $1,718,607,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of supplies, equipment, and communications, $1,179,929,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,665,373,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE WIDE]

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (including defense laboratories), as authorized by law, $18,325,516,000: Provided, That not more than $25,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Command Initiatives Fund authorized under section 186 of title 10, United States Code, and of which not to exceed $40,000,000 may be used for emergences and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided in this Act for Civil Military programs under this heading, $500,000 shall be available for a grant for Outreach Odyssey, Pennsylvania, to support the Youth Development and Leadership program and Department of Defense STARBASE program: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $5,000,000 is available for contractor support to coordinate a wind test demonstration project on an Air Force installation using wind turbines manufactured in the United States that are new to the United States market and to execute the renewable energy purchasing plan: Provided further, That none of the funds otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: Provided further, That $1,000,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading may be transferred to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD]

For expenses, training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; subsidizing and equipping the Air National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $1,142,875,000.

[OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD]

For expenses, training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; travel and transportation of troops; travel and transportation of the Reserve components of the Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; $4,547,515,000.
the purpose of acquiring four (4) HH-60L medical evacuation variant Blackhawk heli-
copters for the C-1195th Aviation Regiment (Army Reserve): Provided further, That the Sec-
retary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts; oper-
ation and maintenance accounts within this title; procurement accounts; research, develop-
ment, test and evaluation accounts; and to working capital funds: Provided further, That the foun-
dation shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appro-
priation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this para-
graph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official represen-
tation purposes.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND
CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Hu-
manitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid pro-
grams of the Department of Defense (con-
sisting of the programs provided under sec-
tions 401, 402, 404, 2557, and 2561 of title 10,
United States Code), $61,546,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION
ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitat-
ing the elimination and the safe and secure-
cure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapons-
related technology and expertise; for pro-
grams relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demili-
tarization and protection of weapons, weap-
ownership, and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military com-
tacts, $415,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

TITLE III

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, modification, and modernization of air-
craft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and acces-
sories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,299,250,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, of which $150,000,000 shall be available for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

PROCUREMENT OF UNMANNED AND TRACKED
COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, and modification of unmanned and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, includ-
ing ordnance, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,670,949,000, to remain available for obliga-
tion until September 30, 2008, of which $614,800,000 shall be available for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, and modification of ammunition, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,753,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, of which $119,000,000 shall be available for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, and modification of vehicles, including tactical wheeled and tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor ve-
hicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,879,380,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, of which $203,500,000 shall be available for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve: Provided, That $75,000,000 of the funds pro-
vided in this paragraph are available only for prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,491,634,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, of which $577,779,000 shall be available for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, modification, and modernization of mis-
iles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and acces-
sories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $573,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND
MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, produc-
tion, modification, and modernization of am-
munition, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $885,170,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, of which $19,562,000 shall be available for the Navy Re-
serve and Marine Corps Reserve.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construc-
tion, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including conversion at
yard, equipment, plant, appliances, and ma-
chine tools and installation thereof, plant and Government and contractor-owned equip-
ment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for ves-
sels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private
plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be ac-
quired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $19,562,000 shall be available for the Navy Re-
serve and Marine Corps Reserve.

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $564,913,000.

Arleigh Burke Class Submarine, $1,637,698,000.

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $763,786,000.
for obligation until September 30, 2010: $100,000,000.

vided further in the final stage of ship construction: such budgeted work that must be performed after September 30, 2010, for engineering.

structed in shipyards in the United States conversion of any naval vessel to be con-

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, re-
habilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $10,827,174,000 (reduced by $10,000,000), to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,481,862,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007. Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $22,664,868,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $2,728,130,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $4,874,285,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $10,827,174,000 (reduced by $10,000,000), to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $13,737,214,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007. Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,917,888,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $13,827,174,000 (reduced by $10,000,000), to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.
For National Defense Sealift Fund pro-
jects, programs, and activities, and for ex-
penses of the National Defense Reserve
Fleet, as provided in title 10 of the United
States Code: $208,687,000, of which $38,687,000
 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment, and $209,687,000 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for,
in connection with the readiness and training of the Reserve components serving
in, such amounts may be transferred back to
the appropriation or fund to which trans-
ferred:

That the appropriation provided in this Act shall be used for pub-
licity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress:

For drug interdiction and counter-drug
activities, Defense:

That the proposed transfer may not be used unless for higher
priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than
those for which it was originally appropriated and in no case
where the item for which funds are requested has been
denied by the Congress:

That the Secretary of Defense shall notify
the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other au-
thority in this Act. Provided further, That no
part of the funds in this Act shall be avail-
able to prepare or present a request to the
Committees on Appropriations for re-
programming of funds, unless for higher
priority items, based on unforeseen military
requirements, than those for which it was or-
iginally appropriated and in no case where the
item for which funds are requested has been
denied by the Congress:

That a request for multiple
reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section that is made prior to
June 30, 2006, that transfers among military personal prop-
poses of the limitation on the amount of
funds that may be transferred under this sec-
tion.

For drug interdiction and counter-drug
activities, Defense:

That transfers may be made between
funds that may be transferred under this sec-
tion.

That in amounts equal to the amounts
appropriated to working capital funds in this
Act, no obligations may be made against a
lateral of the Inspector General:

That the limita-
tions of this provision shall not apply to for-
ign national employees of the Department of
Defense in the Republic of Turkey:

For expenses and activities of the Office
of the Inspector General in carrying out the
provisions of the Inspector General Act of
1978, as amended, $230,687,000, of which
$208,687,000 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment, and $209,687,000 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment.

For expenses to be used by the Inspector
General to carry out audits of the Secretary of
Defense funded by this Act:

That the Secretary of Defense shall notify
the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other au-
thority in this Act. Provided further, That no
part of the funds in this Act shall be avail-
able to prepare or present a request to the
Committees on Appropriations for re-
programming of funds, unless for higher
priority items, based on unforeseen military
requirements, than those for which it was or-
iginally appropriated and in no case where the
item for which funds are requested has been
denied by the Congress:

That a request for multiple
reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section that is made prior to
June 30, 2006, that transfers among military personal prop-
poses of the limitation on the amount of
funds that may be transferred under this sec-
tion.

For expenses associated with counter-drug
activities, Defense:

That transfers may be made between
funds that may be transferred under this sec-
tion.

That in amounts equal to the amounts
appropriated to working capital funds in this
Act, no obligations may be made against a
lateral of the Inspector General:

That the limita-
tions of this provision shall not apply to for-
ign national employees of the Department of
Defense in the Republic of Turkey:

For expenses and activities of the Office
of the Inspector General in carrying out the
provisions of the Inspector General Act of
1978, as amended, $230,687,000, of which
$208,687,000 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment, and $209,687,000 shall be for Operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is
available for any one fiscal year for the
purchase of military equipment.

For expenses to be used by the Inspector
General to carry out audits of the Secretary of
Defense funded by this Act:

That the Secretary of Defense shall notify
the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other au-
thority in this Act. Provided further, That no
part of the funds in this Act shall be avail-
able to prepare or present a request to the
Committees on Appropriations for re-
programming of funds, unless for higher
priority items, based on unforeseen military
requirements, than those for which it was or-
iginally appropriated and in no case where the
item for which funds are requested has been
denied by the Congress:

That a request for multiple
reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section that is made prior to
June 30, 2006, that transfers among military personal prop-
poses of the limitation on the amount of
funds that may be transferred under this sec-
tion.
SEC. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance in session in advance to the congressionally-mandated bodies. Provided, That the value of the multyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: Provided further, That no multiyear contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That the execution of any multiyear authority shall require the use of nonideological defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government’s liability: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multyear procurement contracts for any system or component thereof if the value of the multyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: Provided further, That no multiyear contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That the execution of any multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: Provided further, That none of the funds provided may be used for a multyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may not be used for multyear procurement contract as follows:

SEC. 8009. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated for the purpose of this section manufactured under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the

A. 1 percent of the most efficient organization’s personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees under section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 102–158, 2 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inch and 5 inch under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: Provided, That for the purpose of this section manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the
United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided further, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available, the Department of Defense may seek to acquire capability for national security purposes on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carabine, M-14 rifles, .30 caliber rifles, .30 carbine rifles, M-11 pistols, M-536, as amended, or M-1911 pistols.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8019. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1944: Provided, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9) shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed such incentive payments under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and includes the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: Provided further, That notwithstanding 41 U.S.C. 430, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for commercial (non-defense) purposes, and shall be applicable to any subcontract or supplier defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9): Provided further, That businesses certified as 8(a) by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 8(a)(15) of Public Law 85-536, as amended, shall have the same status as other program participants under section 602 of Public Law 100-410, 102 Stat. 3825 (Business Opportunity Development Program) with respect to purposes of contracting with agencies of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8020. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8022. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 230(j)(c) of title 31, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8023. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to acquire for national security purposes any contract and any subcontract at any tier that makes subcontract awards to any subcontractor or supplier defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9) or a small business owned and controlled by a nonprofit membership corporation, a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a part of a nonprofit membership corporation, consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant, at rates not to exceed $30,000 per year.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or weapon system except with the written concurrence of the Secretary of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That these procurement restrictions shall not apply to any supply contract for Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet the Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8025. (a) None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to produce, develop, maintain, repair or operate aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between the Department responsible for the maintenance activities and private firms: Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8026. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for the Department of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an international agreement to which the United States is a party, has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country. (f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2006 may be expended for FFRDCs, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

SEC. 8027. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire for national security purposes any contract and any subcontract at any tier that makes subcontract awards to any subcontractor or supplier defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9) or a small business owned and controlled by a nonprofit membership corporation, a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a part of a nonprofit membership corporation, consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant, at rates not to exceed $30,000 per year.

SEC. 8028. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to acquire capability for national security purposes on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet the Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8029. Other non-profit entities.
for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes”, approved March 5, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 104 et seq.).

SEC. 8031. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year, and at the end of each fiscal year hereafter, as a result of energy costs paid by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8032. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available during the current fiscal year and hereafter for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense” may be obligated for the Young Marine Corps.

INCLUDINg TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 8033. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Fund established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2867 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8034. (a) In GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may convey, at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota, any military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) PROCESSING OF REQUESTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the requirements of the Buy American Act. For purposes of such requirements, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the work.

SEC. 8035. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall be available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve Forces Development Program remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Intelligence Financial Management Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That any funds appropriated to the Intelligence Community Intelligence Community Resource Reserve Fund, or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the National Security Act of 1947, shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

SEC. 8036. Existing law provided in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8037. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” which may be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, and other Federal funds made available in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the National Security Act of 1947, that is in support of tribal personnel or programs, shall be available for contracts related to improvements of housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

SEC. 8038. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8039. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” which may be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, and other Federal funds made available in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the National Security Act of 1947, that is in support of tribal personnel or programs, shall be available for contracts related to improvements of housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

SEC. 8040. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term “Buy American Act” means the act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes”, approved March 5, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 104 et seq.).

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a “Made in America” inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the Secretary of Defense may procure, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriations, purchase only American-made equipment and products. The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the merits, except (1) a contract for the purchase of a specified item of commercial equipment of a kind not otherwise procurable, or (2) a contract awarded in accordance with the Buy American Act.

INVESTMENT ITEMS

SEC. 8042. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency;

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee’s place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate the circumstances in which such a waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8043. The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, may use funds made available in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” to make grants and supplement other Federal funds made available in this Act or any prior or subsequent Act, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been certified by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8044. Of the funds appropriated in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the National Security Act of 1947, that is in support of tribal personnel or programs, shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the merits, except as provided in subsection (a) and (b).

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior or subsequent Act, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been certified by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense, shall be considered to be authorized by law.
SEC. 8047. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Miliary Departments, the Departments of Defense and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against an appropriation for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combats intelligence and Related Activities agencies, Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Joint Military Intelligence Program, and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities programs, provided: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8048. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically appropriated for that purpose.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically appropriated for that purpose.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 8049. Appropriations available under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” for the current fiscal year and hereafter for increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of availability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings, and to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by the domestic source of, and of, domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis notifying the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available or that it is necessary to procure bearings on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of “commercial items”, as defined by section 421 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8051. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8052. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each contract awarded by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year for construction or service performed in whole or in part in a State as defined in section 381(d) of title 10, United States Code which is not contiguous with another State and has an unemployment rate in excess of the national average rate of unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall include a provision requiring the contractor to employ, for the purpose of performing that portion of the contract in such State that is not contiguous with another State, individuals who are residents of such State and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be able to acquire promptly the necessary skills: Provided, That the Department of Defense may waive the requirements of this section, on a case-by-case basis, in the interest of national security.

SEC. 8053. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense or an agency, department or independent agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8054. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other provision of appropriation law, except as specifically appropriated, for the transfer of defense articles and services, to any other department or agency of the United States, except as specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or other employee benefit paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8056. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriated funds, as the appropriation was transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account or account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation account of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note) Provided, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and reassigned to the expired or closed account.

SEC. 8057. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriated funds, as the appropriation was transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account or account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation account of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note) Provided, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and reassigned to the expired or closed account.

SEC. 8058. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment and associated training Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish a method of assessing the use of such equipment and associated training Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish a method of assessing the use of such equipment and associated training Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish a method of assessing the use of such equipment and associated training Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the purpose of carrying out the Armed Forces Reserveainment Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the
project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8059. [1] Using funds available by this Act of the United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, and cost-effectiveness standards and requirements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany in the United States, shall be made by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, pursuant to section 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 42, and 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, and 6506 of title 10, United States Code, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8060. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory, or otherwise waived, to the United States Defense installations.

SEC. 8061. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of a FA-22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

SEC. 8062. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restrictions on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country pursuant to the AIA, military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official business.

SEC. 8063. (a) Subsection (a) applies with respect to:

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered onto on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and
(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the options are exercised for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation on the purchase of items that are identical materials or identical items from foreign sources, the cost of which is less than 50 percent of the cost of the purchase of identical materials or identical items from non-foreign sources.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop, procure, or otherwise waive, to the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, pursuant to section 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 42, and 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, and 6506 of title 10, United States Code, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act to the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8066. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under title IV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, and the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certify to the congressional defense committees that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), that the Chief Information Officer may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

SEC. 8067. The Secretary of Defense shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).

SEC. 8068. [2] The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).

(1) During the current fiscal year, a major automated information system may not be released to the public unless funds appropriated or made available by this Act have been used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8069. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory, or otherwise waived, to the United States Defense installations, provided further, That in the City of New Haven, Connecticut, air base, furnished heat may be obtained from United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations.

SEC. 8070. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory, or otherwise waived, to the United States Defense installations.

SEC. 8071. The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restrictions on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country pursuant to the AIA, military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8072. The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restrictions on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country pursuant to the AIA, military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8073. The Secretary of Defense shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).

(1) The term ‘Chief Information Officer’ means the senior official of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3506 of title 41, United States Code.


SEC. 8075. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory, or otherwise waived, to the United States Defense installations.

SEC. 8076. The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restrictions on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country pursuant to the AIA, military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8077. The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restrictions on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country pursuant to the AIA, military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8078. The Secretary of Defense shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).


United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursement basis: Provided, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

[SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to transfer or appropriate to any nongovernmental entity or organization not an arm of the Federal Government, as defined in 32 U.S.C. 7403(a)(2) as well as the following:

(a) The requirements of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(A) shall apply.
(b) The limitations of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(B) shall not apply.

[SEC. 8084. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2006 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006.

[SEC. 8085. None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate a new start program without prior written notification to the Office of Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

[SEC. 8086. The amounts appropriated in title II of this Act are hereby reduced by the Arrow missile defense program: Provided, That of this amount, $15,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of producing Arrow missile components in the United States and $14,900,000 shall be available for the purpose of producing Arrow missile components and missiles in Israel to meet Israel’s defense requirements, consistent with each nation’s laws, regulations and procedures: Provided further, That the funds available for this purpose for the procurement of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and ammunition and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer of funds shall not be authorized in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]
SEC. 8091. For purposes of section 153(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion" shall be considered for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy appropriations in any prior fiscal year, until such time as the appropriate account shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8092. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2007 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code shall include separate budget justification for United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Maintenance and Operations, and the Procurement accounts: Provided, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each major weapon system, class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, trained strength, Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall exhibit OP-5 and OP-32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8093. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, or evaluation, procurement, or deployment of nuclear armed interceptrs of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8094. Of the amounts provided in title II of this Act under the heading, "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", $20,000,000 is available for the Regional Defense Counter-terrorism Fellowship Program, to fund the education and training of foreign military officers, military civilian officials, and other foreign security officials, to include American military officers and civilian officials whose participation directly contributes to the education and training of foreign students.

SEC. 8095. The funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: Provided, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No.

SEC. 8096. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: Provided, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No.

SEC. 8097. (a) From within amounts made available in title II of this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", the Secretary of the Navy shall make a grant in the amount of $2,000,000, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the City of Twentynine Palms, California, for the widening of off-base Adobe Road, which is used by members of the Marine Corps stationed at Camp Pendleton.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 8098. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the temporary active duty for the period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 8099. The Secretary of the Navy may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of making necessary changes resulting from inflations, market fluctuations, or rate adjustments for any ship construction program appropriated in any law: Provided, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed $100,000,000 under the authority provided by this section: Provided further, That the funding transferred shall be available for any purpose necessary for the benefit of the public.

SEC. 8100. (a) The total amount appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act may not be used to meet the minimum requirements for non-overseas contingency operations: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall affect the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the following accounts for the purpose of providing a sustainable level of readiness to the United States Armed Forces to meet the requirements of the United States Code, in the amounts specified:

(1) "Other Procurement, Army", $9,000,000.

(2) "Other Procurement, Navy", $112,500,000.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionately to each budget activity, activity group, subactivity group, and each program, project, and activity within each applicable appropriation account.

SEC. 8101. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, a reduction of $176,500,000 is hereby taken from the following accounts in the specified amounts:

(1) "Missile Procurement, Army", $9,000,000.

(2) "Other Procurement, Army", $112,500,000.
the Secretary of the Navy shall provide a report to the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations which describes the application of these research and development programs, projects or activities within these accounts.

INCLUSIVE TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 8102. (a) THREE-YEAR EXTENSION.—During the current fiscal year and each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, the Secretary of Defense may transfer not more than $20,000,000 of unobligated balances remaining in the expiring RDT&E, Army, appropriation account that is in its last fiscal year of availability for the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, appropriation account to be used only for the continuation of the Army Venture Capital Fund demonstration program.

(b) EXPIRING RDT&E, ARMY, ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this section, for any fiscal year, the expiring RDT&E, Army, account, is the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, appropriation account that is then in its last fiscal year of availability for obligation before the account closes under section 1552 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) ARMY VENTURE CAPITAL FUND DEMONSTRATION.—For purposes of this section, the Army Venture Capital Fund demonstration program is the program under which funds were initially provided in section 8150 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A, section 107–117, 112 Stat. 2281), and extended and revised in section 8155 of Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107–248; 116 Stat. 1562).

(d) PROVISIONS.—The provisions in section 8155 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107–248; 116 Stat. 1562), shall apply with respect to amounts transferred under this section in the same manner as to amounts transferred under that section.

TITLE IX

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

MILITARY PERSONNEL

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Army”, $3,877,400,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Navy”, $326,000,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”, $697,800,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Air Force”, $892,800,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Army”, $138,755,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Navy”, $1,907,800,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps”, $3,559,900,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

MILITARY PERSONNEL

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Military Personnel, Army”, $23,388,450,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $1,806,800,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,827,150,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $63,200,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Iraq Freedom Fund”, $655,427,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading shall be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation: Provided further, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

PROCUREMENT

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Weapons and Related Equipment, Army”, $455,427,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading shall be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation: Provided further, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

AMMUNITION

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $15,900,000, to
remain available until September 30, 2008:
Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY**

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $1,501,270,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

For an additional amount for “Weapons Procurement, Navy”, $81,696,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $130,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $103,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS**

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, $3,655,000,000: Provided, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

**TRANSFER OF FUNDS**

SEC. 9003. Upon his determination that such action is in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may transfer between appropriations up to $2,500,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section; Provided further, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance under this Act; and Provided further, That the amounts transferred under this Act are in addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act.

**LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS**

SEC. 9004. Funds appropriated in this title shall be used only for the purposes stated in subsection (a) of this section.

**SECONDARY ACTIVITIES**

SEC. 9005. None of the funds provided in this title may be used to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal years 2005 or 2006 appropriating or reprogramming funds for the Department of Defense or for research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 9006. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to train, equip and provide related assistance only to military or national security forces of Iraq and Afghanistan to enhance their capability to combat terrorism and to support United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: Provided, That such assistance may include the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and funding: Provided further, That the authority to provide assistance under this section is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Congress not less than 15 days before providing assistance under the authority of this section.

SEC. 9007. (a) FISCAL YEAR 2006 AUTHORITY.—During the current fiscal year, from funds made available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance pursuant to title IX, not to exceed $500,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense to provide funds—

1. for the Commanders’ Emergency Responder Program established by the Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority for the purpose of enabling United States military commanders in Iraq to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements with a special focus on responsibility by carrying out programs that will immediately assist the Iraqi people; and

2. for a similar program to assist the people of Afghanistan.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source and funding of these programs and the benefits provided to the people of Afghanistan.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized for the Commanders’ Emergency Responder Program by this section may not be used to provide goods, services, or funds to national armies, national guard forces, border security forces, civil defense forces, infrastructure protection forces, highway patrol units, police, special police, or intelligence or other security forces.

(d) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the United States Central Command detailed guidance concerning the types of activities...
for which United States military commanders in Iraq may use funds under the Commanders’ Emergency Response Program to respond to urgent relief and reconstruction projects in that part of the terror region, for which such funds may be expended. The Secretary shall simultaneously provide a copy of that guidance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 9006. During the current fiscal year, funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistics, and such cooperation for supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. Congress, consistent with international and United States law, reaffirms that torture of prisoners of war and detainees is illegal and does not reflect the policies of the United States Government or the values of the people of the United States.

SEC. 9010. The reporting requirements of section 108 of the Reserve Forces Protection Act of 1990, as amended (10 U.S.C. 208), regarding the military operations of the Armed Forces and the reconstruction activities of the Department of Defense in Iraq and Afghanistan shall apply to the funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 9011. The Secretary of Defense may present to the Armed Forces, in the calendar year 2006, a United States flag, to any member of an Active or Reserve component under the Secretary’s jurisdiction who, as determined by the Secretary, participates in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom.

SEC. 9012. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT CONCERNING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND TOLERANCE AT UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the expression of personal religious faith is welcome in the United States military;
(2) the military must be a place where there is room for religious expression for all faiths; and
(3) the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of Defense Inspector General have the responsibility of investigating issues of religious tolerance at the Air Force Academy.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the recommendations developed pursuant to paragraph (1).

SEC. 9013. RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,099,587,000.

SEC. 9014. MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,671,875,000.

SEC. 9015. MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,908,750,000.

SEC. 9016. MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,099,587,000.

SEC. 9017. MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,908,750,000.

SEC. 9018. MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,671,875,000.

SEC. 9019. MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,099,587,000.

SEC. 9020. MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,671,875,000.

SEC. 9021. MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,908,750,000.

SEC. 9022. MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,099,587,000.

SEC. 9023. MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–97, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,671,875,000.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, and not to exceed $6,005,000 can be used for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $30,317,964,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $2,789,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law, and not to exceed $8,089,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $30,891,386,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE
(including transfer of funds)
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $18,517,218,000: Provided, That any amount appropriated for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code, and of which not to exceed $32,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, including training, organizing, and administering, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,239,295,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,239,295,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,474,286,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
For expenses, training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personal services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Armored, Military, and Air Armored Divisions, Assistant Chief of Staff for the Army National Guard, including the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, $4,428,119,000: Provided, That $10,000,000 shall be available for the operations and development of training and technology in the Joint Interagency Training Center-East and the affiliated Center for National Response at the Memorial Tunnel and for providing homeland defense/security and traditional training for the Department of Defense, other federal agencies, and state and local first responder personnel at the Joint Interagency Training Center-East.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD
For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair and modification of aircraft; issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in conformity with the policies and regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $4,681,291,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES
For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $11,236,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY
(including transfer of funds)
For the Department of the Army, $407,865,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY
(including transfer of funds)
For the Department of the Navy, $305,275,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE
(including transfer of funds)
For the Department of the Air Force, $406,461,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(including transfer of funds)
For the Department of Defense, $28,167,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES
(including transfer of funds)
For the Department of the Army, $271,921,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided,
That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris, and layaway or other expenses necessary for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the appropriated funds are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC ACTIVITIES

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $61,546,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION AND DEMILITARIZATION

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of military and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contracts, $415,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That the amount of funds provided under this heading shall be used for the dismantling and disposal of nuclear submarines, submarine reactor components, and security enhancements for transport and storage of nuclear warheads in the Russian Far East.

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,359,465,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modernization of ammunition, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,708,680,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $4,426,531,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $4,426,531,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modernization of ammunition, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $832,791,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the design, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

- Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $613,000,000;
- NSSN, $1,637,698,000;
- NSSN (AP), $763,706,000;
- SSBN, $286,516,000;
- CVN Refuelings, $1,493,563,000;
- CVN Refuelings (AP), $20,000,000;
- SSBN Submarine Refuelings, $230,193,000;
- SSBN Submarine Refuelings (AP), $62,348,000;
- DD(X) (AP), $765,392,000;
- DDG-51 Destroyer, $29,773,000;
- LHD-3, $197,769,000;
- LPD-17, $1,344,741,000;
- LPD-18, $150,447,000;
- LCAC Landing Craft Air Cushion, $110,583,000;
- Prior year shipbuilding costs, $517,523,000;
- Seawolf, $46,055,000; and
- For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $399,387,000; in all: $8,677,887,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010: Provided, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2010, for engineering services, tests, evaluation, and other such budgeted obligations:
- For the purchase of 9 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $255,000 per vehicle; communications and electronic equipment; other ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $110,583,000; to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of weapons, ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,562,480,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.
For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, and national security space systems, $996,111,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE
For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of defense equipment, structures, and acquisitions, and for expenses necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $21,859,010,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,154,940,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND
For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $579,554,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES
For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $422,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT
For acquisition of any of the following manufactured in the United States or manufactured abroad, if neither is available in the United States: 40-millimeter and larger Gatling guns; ground electronic and control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment, and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and land acquired for the parking of up to 2 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $255,000 per vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; $5,054,745,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
For defense research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, and acquisition of facilities and equipment, for the operation of facilities and equipment of the Navy, $3,209,592,000, to remain available until obligation of previously appropriated funds.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $15,557,904,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007.

DEFENSE PROGRAMS
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM
For expenses not otherwise provided for, for programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, $20,237,962,000, of which $19,345,087,000 shall be for Operation and Maintenance, and $892,875,000 shall be for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, to remain available until September 30, 2007, and of which up to $10,157,427,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which up to $1,519,000,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008.

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense, including medical care and supplies, $15,557,904,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.
available for obligation until September 30, 2007, shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS

DESTRUCTION, ARM

For expenses authorized and provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions, to include construction of facilities, in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materiel that are not in the chemical stockpile, $1,450,000,000 of which $1,241,514,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance; $116,527,000 shall be for Procurement to remain available until September 30, 2008; $36,000,000 shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation, of which $57,926,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program, to remain available until September 30, 2007; and no less than $119,300,000 may be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, of which $36,800,000 shall be for activities on military installations and $82,500,000 shall be to assist State and local governments.

DRUG INTERDICT AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventories, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8008. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear procurement contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent obligation in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent obligation in excess of $20,000,000; or (3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor will not be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventories, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.
and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 402 of title 10, United States Code: Provided, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar activities in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: Provided further, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at military medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8010. (a) During fiscal year 2006, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength limitation in effect during fiscal year 2005. (b) The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as any supporting documentation and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations in this Act.

SEC. 8011. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to initiate a new installation overseas within 30-day advance notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 8012. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8013. The funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the purchase of defense equipment from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment. Provided, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: Provided further, That this subsection applies only to the Armed Forces of the Army.

SEC. 8014. (a) LIMITATION ON CONVERSION TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert any performance of a contractor function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by more than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on a result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by a contractor;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that exceeds the amount that the Department of Defense is credited toward completion of a service (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for treatment or medical services provided when a patient is referred when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred.

SEC. 8018. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, a reduction of $50,000,000 is hereinafter rescinded. Provided, That the Other Procurement, Army: Account; Provided, That thirty days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall provide a report to the House Committee on Appropriations that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8021. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $8,000,000 is appropriated for incentive payments authorized by section 404 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a prime contractor or subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 404 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That not withstanding section 430 of title 41, United States Code if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided, That when the United States Code if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided, That when the
Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items for Defense, or in part by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code or a small business owned and controlled by an employee of individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code:

Provided further, That, during the current fiscal year and hereafter, businesses certified as 8(a) by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 8(a)(15) of Public Law 85-536, as amended, shall have the same status as other program participants under section 602 of Public Law 85-536 (1958), and therefore be considered to be authorized by law.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for fiscal year 2007 contains a provision stating that adequate domestic supplies are not available to the department from sources available in the United States. It reserves the power of the Appropriations Committees to transfer funds to complete construction of certain facilities when funds are not available in the United States for such purpose.

SEC. 8027. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $31,109,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which $51,600,000 is hereby reduced by $8,491,000. The Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary’s blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the purchase of items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by labor unions designated as closed shops, for the purposes of contracting with agencies of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8029. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A-198 if the study being performed exceeds a period of 24 months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or 30 months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8030. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8031. Appropriations in this Act shall be available only for items and services which are necessary to carry out the purpose of the appropriation.

SEC. 8032. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $12,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2300(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait. Provided, That in receipt of such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations for the purposes specified in section 2300(c) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8033. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year and at the end of each fiscal year thereafter, as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2685 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term ‘Buy American Act’ means title III of the Act entitled ‘An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 291 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

SEC. 8035. Appropriations in this Act shall be used to study, demonstrate, or implement any plans privatizing, divesting or transferring of any Civil Works missions, functions, or responsibilities for the United States Army Corps of Engineers to other government agencies or to the private sector.

SEC. 8036. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the congressional defense committees under section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

(a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be available to establish a new Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items for Defense, or in part by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code or a small business owned and controlled by an employee of individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code:

Provided further, That, during the current fiscal year and hereafter, businesses certified as 8(a) by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 8(a)(15) of Public Law 85-536, as amended, shall have the same status as other program participants under section 602 of Public Law 85-536 (1958), and therefore be considered to be authorized by law.

Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act unless the Office of Management and Budget certifies that effective competition is not feasible.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department from sources available in the United States for the purchase of items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by labor unions designated as closed shops, for the purposes of contracting with agencies of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8038. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms. Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer contracts to an entity other than the Department of Defense, or Defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to the Department of Defense or Defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to the department, and at the end of each fiscal year thereafter, as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense, shall remain available for obligations for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2685 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8039. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the congressional defense committees under section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

SEC. 8040. The term ‘Buy American Act’ means title III of the Act entitled ‘An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 291 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

SEC. 8041. Appropriations in this Act shall be used to study, demonstrate, or implement any plans privatizing, divesting or transferring of any Civil Works missions, functions, or responsibilities for the United States Army Corps of Engineers to other government agencies or to the private sector.

SEC. 8042. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the congressional defense committees under section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

SEC. 8043. Appropriations in this Act shall be used to study, demonstrate, or implement any plans privatizing, divesting or transferring of any Civil Works missions, functions, or responsibilities for the United States Army Corps of Engineers to other government agencies or to the private sector.

SEC. 8044. Appropriations in this Act shall be used to study, demonstrate, or implement any plans privatizing, divesting or transferring of any Civil Works missions, functions, or responsibilities for the United States Army Corps of Engineers to other government agencies or to the private sector.
of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.}

SEC. 8042. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, during the current fiscal year, military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) PROCESSING OF REQUESTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, during the current fiscal year, military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the fiscal requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats.

SEC. 8043. Of the funds appropriated in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

(b) the purpose of the contract is to explore an investment item would be chargeable during the fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense Business Operations Fund, with respect to the acquisition of equipment that is in support of a field operating agency.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) to the extent needed to support the Secretary's determination, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the fiscal requirements of the department.

(2) the purpose of the contract is to provide foreign assistance in support of a field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats.

SEC. 8044. Of the funds appropriated in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development which shall remain available until September 30, 2007, to the extent that the funds are available in a timely fashion.

(b) The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of any new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in spending for any field operating agency, any funds appropriated in this Act, shall be under State command and control: Provided, That any funds appropriated in the Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in exercising such funds, makes available in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency to the extent that the funds are available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8045. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in exercising such funds, makes available in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency to the extent that the funds are available in a timely fashion.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in spending for any field operating agency, any funds appropriated in the Act, shall be under State command and control: Provided, That any funds appropriated in the Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in exercising such funds, makes available in this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency to the extent that the funds are available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an investment item would be chargeable during the fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense Business Operations Fund, with respect to the acquisition of equipment that is in support of a field operating agency.

(c) The purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in support of a field operating agency.

SEC. 8047. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act shall be made available for—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a field operating agency to a Department of Defense headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the fiscal requirements of the department.
the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionately to each budget activity, program, project, and each program, project, and activity within each applicable appropriation account.

SEC. 8066. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8067. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated to realign or relocate (except for transportation and interdiction and counter-drug activities) the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for which the period of availability of the funds provided in this Act is less than 12 months.

SEC. 8068. During the current fiscal year, no more than $20,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Navy” may be transferred to all other appropriation accounts for the Department of the Navy.

SEC. 8070. The appropriation of $10,000,000 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000, for the purchase of a supercomputer for the National Security Agency is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to limit excess cash on hand.

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability of the expired or closed account.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall transfer to any other appropriation account any amount charged to an expired or closed account that was not properly chargeable to the expired or closed account.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be transferred to any other appropriation account for the Department of the Army or for any other department or agency of the United States for any purposes other than as specifically provided in such appropriation law:

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated to realign or relocate the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for which the period of availability of the funds provided in this Act is less than 12 months.

SEC. 8066. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8067. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated to realign or relocate (except for transportation and interdiction and counter-drug activities) the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for which the period of availability of the funds provided in this Act is less than 12 months.

SEC. 8068. During the current fiscal year, no more than $20,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Navy” may be transferred to all other appropriation accounts for the Department of the Navy.

SEC. 8070. The appropriation of $10,000,000 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000, for the purchase of a supercomputer for the National Security Agency is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to limit excess cash on hand.

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability of the expired or closed account.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall transfer to any other appropriation account any amount charged to an expired or closed account that was not properly chargeable to the expired or closed account.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be transferred to any other appropriation account for the Department of the Army or for any other department or agency of the United States for any purposes other than as specifically provided in such appropriation law:

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated to realign or relocate the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for which the period of availability of the funds provided in this Act is less than 12 months.
not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8070. Notwithstanding section 1210(b) of title 19, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard Service on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of Title 32 may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8071. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Service for any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall provide the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8072. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2609 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany. Provided further, That in the Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States, and Provided further, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal sources and other sources included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8073. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8074. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8075. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country any rule or requirement of Department of Defense policy that the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option provides for a cash payment to the United States, by the foreign country or by the United States, that is substantially greater than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11(g)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as in effect on January 1, 1974, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that such a limitation is necessary to maintain national security requirements: Provided, That, in any instance in which the Secretary of Defense determines that such a limitation is necessary to maintain national security requirements, the Secretary shall submit to the President a written statement that specifies the limitation and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall make a public disclosure of such a limitation on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8076. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to solicit, include in a training program involving the use of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the security forces of such country have engaged in human rights violations, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) REPORTING.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

SEC. 8077. (a) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

(b) The Secretary of Defense in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental and medical equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian Health Service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(h)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(h)(2)(B))).

(c) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8078. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to support any training program involving the use of human rights information relating to human rights violations that is classified as top secret.

SEC. 8079. (a) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental and medical equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian Health Service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(h)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(h)(2)(B))).

(b) In carrying out this provision, the Secretary of Defense shall give the Indian Health Service the priority given to the Department of Defense and its twelve special screening programs in distribution of surplus dental and medical supplies and equipment.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop, lease or procure the T-ARE class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines and propulsors are manufactured in the United States by a domestic entity: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy waives this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and in consultation with the Senate that adequate domestic competition for the Department of Defense requirements is not present.

SEC. 8081. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy that is developed on or directly furnished to the Department of Defense until the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) certifies, with the Department of Defense and in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, that the Department of the Navy has received credible information from the Department of Defense that the Department of Defense has determined that the Department of the Navy has been provided with financial or other information that is inconsistent with the Department of Defense's determination of the provision of technical data and software for use or dissemination to a foreign entity.

SEC. 8082. During the current fiscal year, funds attributable to the use of the Government travel card, refunds attributable to the use of the Government Purchase Card and refunds attributable to official Government travel arranged by Government Contracted Travel Management Centers may be credited to operation and maintenance, and research, development, test and evaluation, and modernization accounts of the Department which are current when the refunds are received.

SEC. 8083. (a) Registering Financial Management Information Systems With DOD Chief Information Officer.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential financial management information technology system or system element, or component of such system, including a system funded by the defense working capital fund that is not registered with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense. A system shall be considered to be registered with the Chief Information Officer if the Secretary of the Department of Defense certifies, with the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State, that the system, including any system acquired or obtained by exchange, is included in the list of financial management information systems maintained by the Chief Information Officer.

(b) Certifications as to Compliance With Financial Management Modernization Plan.—(1) During the current fiscal year, a financial management automated information system, a financial management information system supporting financial and non-financial systems, or a system improvement of more than $1,000,000 may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or funding for development, production, or operation within, the Department of Defense until the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) certifies, with the respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed and managed in accordance with the Department’s Financial Management Modernization Plan. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely certification of certifications under paragraph (1).

(c) Certifications as to Compliance With Clinger-Cohen Act.—(1) During the current fiscal year, a major automated information system may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or funding for development, production, or operation within, the Department of Defense until the Chief Information Officer certifies, with the respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed and managed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). The Chief Information Officer may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely certification of certifications under paragraph (1).
notification of certifications under paragraph (1). Each such notification shall include, at a minimum, the funding baseline and milestone schedule for each system covered by such a certification, and shall set forth the following steps that have been taken with respect to the system:
(A) Business process reengineering.
(B) Analysis of alternatives.
(C) An economic analysis that includes a calculation of the return on investment.
(D) Assurance measures.
(E) An information assurance strategy consistent with the Department’s Global Information Grid.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:
(1) The term "Chief Information Officer" means the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3596 of title 44, United States Code.
(2) The term "information technology system" has the meaning given the term "information technology" in section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

SEC. 8084. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to support another department or agency of the United States if such support is more than four times in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis. Provided, That this limitation shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing such requested support pursuant to such authority: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8085. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nonmilitary entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-five-crate and a United States military nomenclature designation of "armor piercing (AP)"; "armor piercing incendiary (API)"; or "armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (APIT)"; except to an entity performing demilitarization services on behalf of the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) recovered through the defense processing system or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacturer of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8086. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in 32 U.S.C. 508(d), or any other youth, social, or fraternal non-profit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8087. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine and other alcoholic beverages for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine and such alcoholic beverages be sold in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 8088. Up to $2,500,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", $147,100,000 shall be available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects described in further detail in the Classified Annex accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth therein: Provided further, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided further, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulations and procedures consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8089. Section 8166 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (10 U.S.C. 2461 note) shall continue in effect to the extent of the funds made available by this section: Provided, That any modifications necessary to conform with and to be available for the purpose of the appropriation of such funds shall be made consistent with the Department’s laws, regulations and procedures.

SEC. 8090. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", $147,100,000 shall be available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects described in further detail in the Classified Annex accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth therein: Provided further, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided further, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulations and procedures consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8091. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (10 U.S.C. 2401 note) shall continue in effect to the extent of the funds made available by this section: Provided, That any modifications necessary to conform with and to be available for the purpose of the appropriation of such funds shall be made consistent with the Department’s laws, regulations and procedures.

SEC. 8092. Amounts appropriated in title II of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111; 10 U.S.C. 213 note) shall continue in effect to the extent of the funds made available by this section: Provided, That any modifications necessary to conform with and to be available for the purpose of the appropriation of such funds shall be made consistent with the Department’s laws, regulations and procedures.

SEC. 8093. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", $70,000,000 shall be available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects described in further detail in the Classified Annex accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth therein: Provided further, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided further, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulations and procedures consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8094. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", $25,700,000 shall be available for the purposes of (A) the Arrow missile defense program: Provided, That of this amount, $70,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of producing Arrow missile components and missiles in Israel to meet Israel’s defense requirements, consistent with each nation’s laws, regulations and procedures, and $10,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of the initiation of a joint feasibility study and risk reduction activities designated the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) Research and Development Program. That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8095. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", $157,523,000 shall be available until September 30, 2006, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That upon entering into a contract for the construction of any ship for the Navy, funds shall transfer such funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and to be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred: To:
New SSN, $72,000,000.
SEC. 8096. The Secretary of the Navy may settle, or compromise, and pay any and all admiralty claims under section 7622 of title 10, United States Code, arising out of the collision involving the U.S.S. GREENVILLE and the EHIME MARU, in any amount and without regard to the monetary limitations in subsections (a) and (b) of section 7622 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a compromise of such claims: Provided, That such payments shall be made from funds available to the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance.
SEC. 8097. Of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command administrative and operational control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: Provided, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 2004, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

SEC. 8098. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may exercise the authorities contained in section 8332 of title 38, United States Code, for occupancies listed in section 7403(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code as well as the following:
Pharmacists, Audiologists, and Dental Hygienists.

(A) The requirements of section 7403(g)(1)(A) of title 38, United States Code shall apply,
In addition the Army will deliver NLOS-C systems by the end of calendar year 2008. These systems shall be in addition to those systems necessary for developmental and operational testing. Provided further, That the Army shall ensure that budgetary and programming plans will provide for no fewer than seven (7) Striker Brigade Combat Teams.

SEC. 8104. Of the funds made available in this Act, $1,900,000 shall be available to maintain an attrition reserve force of 18 B–52 aircraft, of which $1,900,000 shall be participated from “Military Personnel, Air Force”; $44,300,000 shall be participated from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” and $27,900,000 shall be available from “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”; Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that 94 B– 52 aircraft, including 18 attrition reserve aircraft, during fiscal year 2006: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall include in the Air Force budget request for fiscal year 2007 amounts sufficient to maintain a B–52 force totaling 94 aircraft.

SEC. 8105. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized, using funds available under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, to complete a phased repair project, which repairs may include upgrades and additions, to the Operations Support Center managed by the Air Force in Alaska: Provided, That the total cost of such phased projects shall not exceed $32,000,000.

SEC. 8106. In amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $12,850,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available until September 30, 2006: Provided, That, the Secretary of Defense shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $850,000 to the Fort Des Moines Memorial Park and Education Center; $1,000,000 to the American Civil War Center at Historic Tredegar; $3,000,000 to the Museum of Flight, American Heroes Collection; $1,000,000 to the National Guard Youth Foundation; $2,000,000 to the United Services Organization; $2,000,000 to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission; and $1,000,000 to the Iraq Cultural Heritage Assistance Project.

SEC. 8107. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any currently available Department of the Navy appropriation to any eligible Navy appropriation for the purpose of funding shipbuilding cost increases for any ship construction program, to be merged with and to be available for the same purpose within the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided, That all transfers under this section shall be subject to the notification requirements applicable to transfers under section 806 of this Act.

SEC. 8108. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2007 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1103 of 31, United States Code shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces’ participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel, Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: Provided, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, the Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include the amounts requested in OP–26 and OP–32 as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8109. Of the amounts provided in title II of this Act under the heading, “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $3,300,000 is available for the Regional Defense Counter-terrorism Fellowship Program, to fund the education and training of foreign military officers, security officials, and other foreign security officials, to include United States military officers and civilians whose participation directly contributes to the education and training of those foreign military officers and security officials.

SEC. 8110. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disseminate the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: Provided, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been handled in accordance with protections during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: Provided, That information pertaining to United States persons shall be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8112. None of the amounts specified as follows: $100,000,000 to the National Security Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be authorized, using funds available under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, to complete a phased repair project, which repairs may include upgrades and additions, to the Operations Support Center managed by the Air Force in Alaska: Provided, That the total cost of such phased projects shall not exceed $32,000,000.

SEC. 8113. Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make the following transfer of funds: Provided, That funds so transferred shall be available for the same purpose and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the amounts shall be transferred between the following appropriations:


SSGN, $3,300,000.

SEC. 8114. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated for a calendar year for any program or activity specifically authorized in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

SEC. 8115. (a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, conduct a study on improving the response of the Federal Government to disasters:

1. The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) consider mechanisms for coordinating and expediting disaster response efforts;
(2) examine the role of the Department of Defense in participating in disaster response efforts, including by providing planning, logistics, and relief and reconstruction assistance; (c) The reduction of the number of officers of the United States military operations, notwith- standing any other provision of law: Provided, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the ac-counting officers of the United States, and 15 days after notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL WAR-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military Personnel, Army
For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Army”, $5,009,420,000.

Military Personnel, Navy
For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Navy”, $1,800,000.

Military Personnel, Marine Corps
For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”, $455,420,000.

Military Personnel, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Air Force”, $372,480,000.

Reserve Personnel, Army
For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Army”, $121,500,000.

Reserve Personnel, Navy
For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Navy”, $10,000,000.

Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps
For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps”, $5,300,000.

National Guard Personnel, Army
For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, $232,300,000.

National Guard Personnel, Air Force
For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, $5,300,000.

Operation and Maintenance

Operation and Maintenance, Army
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, $21,915,547,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Navy
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $1,900,400,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,275,800,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $2,014,900,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $980,000,000, of which up to $195,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for payments to re-imburse Pakistan, Jordan, and other key foreign nations, for logistical, military, and other support provided, or to be provided, to United States military operations, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days after notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, $5,700,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, $9,400,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, $27,950,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, $7,000,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, $301,300,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $17,400,000.

Iraq Freedom Fund
(Including Transfer of Funds)
For an additional amount for “Iraq Freedom Fund”, $4,100,000,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 2006, only to support operations in Iraq or Afghanistan and classified activities: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; the Defense Health Program; and working capital funds: Provided further, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $2,850,000,000 shall only be for classified programs, described in further detail in the classified annex accompanying this Act: Provided further, That $750,000,000 shall be available for the Joint IED Defeat Task Force: Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in law: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation.

Procurement

Aircraft Procurement, Army
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, $338,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Missile Procurement, Army
For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, $80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, $910,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

Procurement of Ammunition, Army
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $335,780,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Other Procurement, Army
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $3,916,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Aircraft Procurement, Navy
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, $151,537,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Weapons Procurement, Navy
For an additional amount for “Weapons Procurement, Navy”, $56,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, $48,865,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Other Procurement, Navy
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Navy”, $116,048,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Procurement, Marine Corps
For an additional amount for “Procurement, Marine Corps”, $2,303,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

Aircraft Procurement, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $119,658,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Missile Procurement, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Air Force”, $17,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Other Procurement, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $1,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Procurement, Defense-Wide
For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $132,075,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $72,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, $17,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $2,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

Revolving and Management Funds

Defence Working Capital Funds
For an additional amount for “Defence Working Capital Funds”, $2,716,400,000.
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DRUG INTERDICT AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense”, $27,620,000:

GENERAL PROVISIONS, TITLE IX

SEC. 9001. Appropriations provided in this title are available for obligation until September 30, 2006, unless otherwise so provided in this title.

SEC. 9002. In making any other provision of law or of this Act, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 9003. Upon his determination that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may transfer between appropriations up to $2,500,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: Provided further, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9004. Funds appropriated in this title, or made available for transfer pursuant to this title, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

SEC. 9005. None of the funds provided in this title may be used to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal years 2005 and 2006 or provided pursuant to section 2002 of the Defense Appropriations Act, 2006.

SEC. 9006. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, not to exceed $500,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to train, equip and provide related assistance only to the New Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police to enhance their capability to combat terrorism and to support U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: Provided, That such assistance is in support of the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 9007. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, not to exceed $25,000,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to train, equip and provide related assistance only to the New Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police to enhance their capability to combat terrorism and to support U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: Provided, That such assistance is in support of the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 9008. At least 15 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes of the programs under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report in writing no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter notifying the congressional defense committees of any purchase described in this title, including the cost, purposes, and quantities of equipment or services at issue.

SEC. 9009. During the current fiscal year, funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and seafair, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this title.

SEC. 9010. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a comprehensive report on operations in Afghanistan and Iraq: Provided, That such report shall include performance indicators and measures for progress toward military and stability objectives in Afghanistan and Iraq.

SEC. 9011. Congress, consistent with international and United States law, reaffirms that torture of prisoners of war and detainees is illegal and does not reflect the policies of the United States Government or the values of the people of the United States.

SEC. 9012. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, and executed in direct support of the Global War on Terrorism only in Iraq and Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: Provided, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government cost.

SEC. 9013. Amounts appropriated or otherwise available in this title are designated as making appropriations for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 802 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006”.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Along with the Senator from Hawaii, I am pleased to present the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006. This bill reflects the bipartisan approach with cochairman, Senator INOUYE, and I have always maintained regarding the Department of Defense. It is, once again, a pleasure.
to work with him on this bill and with other members of our subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee through this process.

This bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee yesterday by a vote of 28 to 0. We have worked hard to make certain the bill reaches out and is understood, is appreciated, and supported by every member of our Appropriations Committee.

As we will be debating this bill, there are hundreds of thousands of men and women in uniform forward deployed and serving our country in over 120 countries and also throughout the United States. Their bravery and dedication to our country are extraordinary, and their sacrifices do not go unnoticed.

Each year, the Department of Defense faces critical challenges. The Department must ensure that we can maintain high levels of readiness and are able to respond to the call of duty whenever and whenever it is necessary. And it must ensure we are simultaneously invested in the resources which will enable us to meet the threats of tomorrow.

This bill, which Senator INOUYE and I will work hard to pass today, reflects a prudent balance among those challenges. It recommends $140.2 billion in budget authority for the Department of Defense. This funding includes $50 billion for contingency operations related to the war on terrorism. In addition to section 402 of the concurrent budget resolution on the budget for 2006.

While this bill is a $7 billion reduction from that provided in the President’s budget request for 2006, it still meets the Defense Subcommittee’s allocation for both budget authority and outlays, and it is consistent with the objectives of this administration and the recommendations contained in the Senate Armed Services authorization bill for 2006 as it was reported.

We have sought to recommend a balanced bill to the Senate. We believe this bill addresses key requirements for readiness, quality of life, and transformation of the force. This bill will honor our commitment to our Armed Forces. It helps ensure they will continue to have first-rate training, modernized equipment, and quality infrastructure. It also provides the funds needed to continue the global war on terrorism.

Mr. President, yesterday Senator INOUYE and I met with GEN John Abizaid, Commander of the U.S. Central Command, and GEN George Casey, the Commander of the multinational force in Iraq, to discuss the global war on terrorism and the current situation in Iraq.

The central command, with its responsibility for the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, parts of south Asia, and central Asia, has the lead in fighting this war on terrorism. It is a war that some envision may last for several generations. I am not talking about the war in Iraq. I am talking about the overall war on terrorism. And I repeat, we are informed that is a war that many envision will last for generations.

The terrorists we face view this war as a worldwide crusade for their ideology, a war that they are willing to win at all costs, at least try to win at all costs. In fact, they see that inflicting suffering on innocent civilians further their cause. In my view, the United States must lead in fighting this terrorist movement. We must remain resilient. We must set the example. We must stay the course.

Our meeting with Generals Abizaid and Casey was both insightful and disturbing, but I am convinced our country has entrusted this global war on terrorism to two very capable leaders. They understand the challenges we face and are committed to successfully prosecuting this war on terrorism.

We also asked that strategy in Iraq and agreed that building local Iraq military capacity is a central tenet to our success there. General Abizaid and General Casey informed us that Iraqi security forces in charge of large parts of Iraq. Fourteen of the country’s 18 provinces are now in charge of their own force.

Last year, before the Iraqi elections, we deployed an additional 12,000 troops to maintain stability throughout the countryside. This year, our senior commanders have only requested 2,000 troops for that same purpose. Let me repeat that. When they had an election last year, in the 18 provinces, our troops, in addition to the forces there, were needed to help maintain stability throughout the countryside. This year, senior commanders have only requested 2,000 troops for that same purpose. Let me repeat that. When they had an election last year, in the 18 provinces, our troops, in addition to the forces there, were needed to help maintain stability throughout the countryside. This year, senior commanders have only requested 2,000 troops for that same purpose.

Earlier this month, along with Senators WARNER and KERRY, I traveled to Iraq, and I repeatedly asked two questions: Can we speed up the training and equipping of Iraqi forces? And even Army officials was that we cannot be rushed in the process of training Iraqis. It must be done in a careful and measured way.
Ashworth, who has worked with me, and Charlie Hauy, who has worked with Senator INOUYE, and recognize them for their tremendous efforts on this bill. We have all worked together for a long time now, and I believe this is as good a bill as we have ever brought before the Senate, as reported by the Appropriations Committee. Every member of the full Appropriations Committee voted that we should be allowed to bring this bill to the floor.

I hope that sometime today that will be possible. I hope my friend understands the circumstances under which we are making statements. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Martinez). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my strong endorsement of H.R. 2863, the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill. As the chairman noted, this bill was unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee. The bill was crafted by Chairman STEVENS with the full involvement of the minority.

In compliance with the committee allocations, this bill is $7 billion lower than the amount requested by the administration. In fact, the committee had to make several difficult decisions to meet the reduced level. Even under these conditions, I can assure my colleagues that this is a very good bill which will meet our national security needs for the coming year.

The top priority of this measure is to ensure that we provide for the well-being of our men and women in uniform and their families. The bill includes a 3.1-percent pay raise, and it provides $19.3 billion to run our military hospitals and pay for the other day-to-day health care costs for our forces.

Not counting the costs of operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, this measure includes nearly $622 billion to safeguard military readiness and pay for other routine operations of the Department of Defense.

As most of my colleagues are surely aware, recruiting has become a greater challenge in recent years. So I am pleased to note that this bill includes $622 million above the budgeted amount to improve recruiting tools so that we can maintain the highest quality in our military. Furthermore, a total of $125 billion is appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for emergency preparedness, to increase in domestic vaccine infrastructure including development and research.

Today is September 29. The fiscal year ends tomorrow. It is imperative that we move this bill as quickly as possible. After Senate passage, the committee will still need to take this bill into conference. Because of that, I would urge my colleagues not to offer amendments to this bill which might be better suited for other legislation except the few emergency requirements. I believe there will be plenty of time in the coming months to consider issues which are not relevant to this defense spending measure.

This is a good bill. I strongly support it and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that the classified annex that accompanies the 2006 Defense appropriations bill is available in S407 for all Members and those staffs who have appropriate clearance. There has been a request that we distribute this to Members’ offices. That is prohibited. We must keep these documents in a classified area, and only those who are authorized to have access to them. This annex is available in S407. We will make arrangements for that room to stay open whatever time the Senators and their cleared staff wish to have access to it, but it is not possible for us to distribute.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 1886

(Purpose: To make available emergency funds for pandemic flu preparedness)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will record the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DOSS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1886.

On page 5, at the appropriate place at the end of Title 9, insert the following:

TITLE 9

SEC. 101.

(a) From the money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated or appropriated, there are appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention $3,913,000,000 for activities related to the avian flu epidemic during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, which shall be available until expended. (b) Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a), (1) $3,080,000,000 shall be for the stockpiling of antivirals and necessary medical supplies (2) $33,000,000 shall be for global surveillance and research relating to the avian flu pandemic, and (3) $125,000,000 shall be to increase the national investment in domestic vaccine infrastructure including development and research.

SEC. 102.

(a) From the money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated or appropriated, there are appropriated to the BioShield program $257,000,000 for activities related to the BioShield program, and (b) Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a), (1) $80,000,000 shall be for BioShield research and development, and (2) $177,000,000 shall be for BioShield operations and acquisition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate allow us to be in a period of morning business during this period of time? There are some people who want to come and talk.

Mr. STEVENS. I am asking for morning business during that period. There would be morning business with no votes from 2:30 to 4 o’clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wanted the amendment I sent to the desk read because I want those who are not here, who are maybe in their offices, and their staff to understand what it is. It is not that long of an amendment. It basically tracks what I said earlier in my opening statement.

I wish to respond a little bit to what was said on the floor just a minute ago. First of all, I point out to the Senator from Alaska that maybe this might be more appropriate on the Labor-HHS bill, the Labor-Health and Human Services appropriations bill.

I remind people, tomorrow is the end of the fiscal year. They have not brought the Labor-Health and Human Services appropriations bill to the floor. We do not know if they are ever going to bring it to the floor. So we do not have an opportunity to offer it there. The Defense authorization bill was up, and they took that off the floor. So I have not had an opportunity to offer it there.

Now we have BioShield appropriations. Quite frankly, this is about defense. It is about defending our people—not against a terrorist but against terrorism, the terrorism of an avian flu pandemic. That is what this is about.

Now, I heard the Senator talk about BioShield. Well, I think maybe we ought to understand that BioShield money cannot be used for this because BioShield money can only be used for...
drugs for which there is no commercial market. Obviously there is a great commercial market for Tamiflu.

So they can have all kinds of study groups and stuff going on down at the White House, but they have been privy to this midnight hour. We have to do something about this. We have to put the money up there. We have to get moving on it now—not next year, not after some study group in the White House has banged this thing around for another 3 months.

Who is in charge of this study group? I do not know. We had a briefing yesterday by Secretary Leavitt, Dr. Fauci, Dr. Gerberding, others. I thought it very unusual we would have a top-secret meeting, a briefing. Be that as it may, I do not know what they wanted to do. It became clear to me we have to do something. We can’t dawdle any longer.

The Senator said there is a task force at the White House working under BioShield, fine, that has its own process. There is a reason for BioShield, for developing drugs that have no commercial market. That is not what this is about. This is about money for surveillance. That is why this is about the BioShield, fine, that has its own process.

We only have one flu vaccine manufacturing plant in America. I am told the reason for that is because there is not much profit in vaccines, not like Viagra or Cyalis, drugs such as that. I can’t imagine that all the pharmaceutical companies that is no money to be made from this.

They are in the business of answering to their shareholders. This is a proper place for Government interference, interjection.

Some of the things I heard from Alaska didn’t comport with what we are trying to do. H5N1, the virus that struck in Southeast Asia, was isolated. We brought it back to NIH. They have been developing a vaccine based on H5N1. We expect some positive results and promising, but we are not there yet. The problem is, if we run off on a tangent, all we do is make the vaccine for H5N1, we might be invaded by H5N2 or 3, or 4 or 5, some other mutation, and that vaccine may not be adaptable for that. That is what we need to build up our vaccine production. It is about our infrastructure deficiency for avian flu.

Yes, we need to be preparing the vaccine for H5N1, but we have to build up capacity for rapidly developing other vaccines in case it is a mutation and it is not that virus. Keep in mind, this is not some scenario of maybe. When you talk to the people at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or NIH, they say it is not a matter of if, it is when. We have to be prepared.

We had warnings before. We had warnings about Katrina. We knew things weren’t adequate in New Orleans and other things before 9/11 about terrorists blowing up the World Trade Center, using airplanes as weapons. We had all those warnings. We ignored them. We cannot afford to ignore this.

The Senator raised all kinds of arguments as to why this should not be on the Defense appropriations bill. Well, we don’t have any other bill. It is before us. This is a money matter. It has to do with using Government money to get us ready. Quite frankly, I can think of a better place than the appropriations bill.

The Senator from Alaska also said this has never happened where we have done something that didn’t pertain to our troops and defense on an appropriation bill. I am sorry. About 14 years ago, I offered an amendment to increase funding for breast cancer research to the Defense appropriations bill, and it was adopted. Quite frankly, I must say, the DOD has done a great job as it has since. I am sorry. About 14 years ago, and the money we put in after that.

They have done some of the best grant programs on breast cancer research. That didn’t have anything to do with troops in the field, but it was added to the appropriations bill at the urging of the only Senator from Alaska. There are others. I mentioned that one because I happened to be involved. To say we have never done this before on a Defense appropriations bill is not factual.

I am hopeful we can get to a vote on this amendment and have a strong bipartisan vote on this bill to get us ready and to reassure our people that we are going to defend them to the maximum extent possible from an outbreak of avian flu.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise to commend my colleague from Iowa. My colleague recognizes the need for this country to prepare for a possible influenza pandemic. I am not here to be a historian, to determine what has happened in the past on Defense appropriations bills when they talked about anthrax protection. I think that disease surveillance is not something new. It occurs day in and day out. The Centers for Disease Control is an active participant in the surveillance efforts for a potential global outbreak of avian flu. Post-9/11, this country became not only concerned but began an early warning system for the possibility of chemical, biological, and radiological threats that could be used by terrorists.

We should pause and remind ourselves these potential acts are not delib-erately permanent, accidental, or natural. Clearly, the threat of avian flu is a natural occurrence. The Centers for Disease Control, the World Health Organization, all participate in preventing the spread of avian flu and work to make us better understand when that threat may affect us here at home.

The Senator from Iowa targets a number of things that are very appro-priate and important: stockpiles, global surveillance, a national investment in domestic vaccine infrastructure, additional grant monies for local public health agencies. But clearly, the chair-man of the Appropriations Committee needs to be considered in and appropriated from the committees that have jurisdiction over the relevant agencies—the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control.

We are all alarmed about any of these threats, whether it is deliberate, accidental, or natural. This year the Subcommittee on Bioterrorism and Public Preparedness has held six hearings and/or roundtables on this subject. We have examined the infrastructure deficiency for avian flu but all of those chemical, biological, radiological threats that exist today. I remind you of the bioterrorism and anthrax we have debated in this building before this date. I re-mind my colleagues that we have currently invested some $800 million for anthrax vaccines for the national stockpile. We have this week received a briefing from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as Senator HARKIN said, and the Director of the CDC and the head of National Institute for Allergies and Infectious Diseases during which they talked about the initial approach to the threat of avian flu. I stress the word “initial” because it is yet to have the input of this body, of the committees, and the subcommittees that have held hearings, that have met with representatives from industry, that understand the deficiencies in our infrastructure to confront this and other similar threats.

Vaccine shortages are not just an infrastucture deficiency for avian flu. There is a deficiency across the board for vaccines in this country. In large part because of the policies we have adopted. I suggest this is not an issue we can just throw money at. This is an
issue that needs a comprehensive plan and approach as to how we set up a structure and mechanism so we are not on this floor in the future talking about further deficiencies. In many cases, everything Senator HARKIN lists will be components of comprehensive legislative planning that deal with how much and what we should stockpile. It will deal with global surveillance and whether we can do it better than we do today. It will deal with the vaccine infrastructure and our reliance on having manufacturing, research, and development capabilities on the shores of the United States and not have us reliant on a company that might have a facility outside of the United States.

Once again, I urge my colleagues, let’s do it in a comprehensive way so we are prepared to move forward in an expeditious process that would answer all these questions before we adjourn this calendar year.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURR. I am happy to yield. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I was yielded to for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina yielded for a question to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, let me try to connect the logic with the reality, that if the Senator permits me, I will sit down with him next week. I believe I can show him at least the initial language that puts this altogether in a comprehensive way and in fact addresses not only the deliberate and accidental biological, chemical, and radiological threats but also includes the natural threat that avian flu clearly cannot be delayed.

Mr. President, Mr. President, let me set an example for the President. Mr. President, let me try to connect the logic with the reality, that if the Senator permits me, I will sit down with him next week. I believe I can show him at least the initial language that puts this altogether in a comprehensive way and in fact addresses not only the deliberate and accidental biological, chemical, and radiological threats but also includes the natural threat that avian flu clearly cannot be delayed. Mr. President, let me set an example for the President.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, let me try to connect the logic with the reality, that if the Senator permits me, I will sit down with him next week. I believe I can show him at least the initial language that puts this altogether in a comprehensive way and in fact addresses not only the deliberate and accidental biological, chemical, and radiological threats but also includes the natural threat that avian flu clearly cannot be delayed.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, let me try to connect the logic with the reality, that if the Senator permits me, I will sit down with him next week. I believe I can show him at least the initial language that puts this altogether in a comprehensive way and in fact addresses not only the deliberate and accidental biological, chemical, and radiological threats but also includes the natural threat that avian flu clearly cannot be delayed.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, let me try to connect the logic with the reality, that if the Senator permits me, I will sit down with him next week. I believe I can show him at least the initial language that puts this altogether in a comprehensive way and in fact addresses not only the deliberate and accidental biological, chemical, and radiological threats but also includes the natural threat that avian flu clearly cannot be delayed.
We know that one of our best opportunities to limit the scope and consequences of any outbreak is to rapidly detect the emergence of a new strain that is capable of sustained human-to-human transmission. Yet we are not devoting enough resources to effective surveillance.

We all know that State and local health departments will be on the front lines of a pandemic and health care providers must develop surge capacity plans so they can respond to a pandemic.

This Congress is poised to approve a $130 million cut for State and local preparedness funding for the Centers for Disease Control. That is in the President’s budget—a $130 million cut.

We also know once a flu strain has been identified, we need to develop a vaccine. That takes time, some say as long as 8 months. Our existing stock of vaccines, assuming they are effective against a future, as yet unidentified, strain, is less than 1 percent of all Americans. And we have only one domestic flu vaccine manufacturer located in the United States.

It is estimated that if our capacity to produce a vaccine is not improved, it could take years to vaccinate the first responders, medical personnel and other high risk groups.

We know it will take months to develop, produce, and distribute a vaccine once we have had it protected. But we must now have antiviral medicines as a stopgap against this pandemic. Other nations that certainly do not have the resources we have, including Great Britain, France, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Finland, and New Zealand have ordered enough of this Tamiflu, an antiviral pill, to cover up to 40 percent of their population. We have virtually nothing.

The consequences of a pandemic could be far reaching, impacting virtually every sector of our society and our economy. Yet we have not taken appropriate action to prepare the medical community, business community, or the American public so they can take necessary steps to prepare for and respond to an avian flu outbreak.

This great country of ours can do better. We have to. We cannot afford to wait to do better. That is why I am so happy to join my friends in sponsoring this amendment.

To pass this amendment in perspective, this amendment calls for $3.9 billion in emergency funds for pandemic flu preparedness at the CDC. To put this amount in perspective, the cost of our amendment is less than what we spend in 1 month on the war in Iraq. Far less than what we spend in 1 month on the war in Iraq.

We are facing the real prospect of another war here at home called the flu. This amendment would go a long way toward committing the resources necessary to fighting and winning the war.

People say, well, where are we going to get the money? We have no choice. The American people deserve it. We can’t stay back saying we will do it tomorrow. We need to do it today and I want everyone within the sound of my voice to know this is not a partisan issue. We need Republicans and Democrats to support this effort because this flu is going to hit and hit hard. This is not meant to be alarmist. It is meant to let everyone know the time is here to do something about this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. BURR. Mr. President, we have several minutes remaining before we move on. I take this opportunity to assure the minority leader that I was in the same briefing. I think all Members were somewhat shocked at some of the things we heard. This is a Member who was not shocked because I have been charged as a subcommittee chairman since the beginning of the year with looking at all the aspects of this. I read carefully today the press reports of how many new cases of avian flu, in what country, how many humans have contracted it from an animal source, how many humans potentially have contracted it in an animal-human. The reality is this is something that from a committee standpoint we keep up with. I understand the sense of urgency. I plead with my colleagues that the answer is not to throw money at the problem. It is to have a comprehensive plan where research and the investment for that research pays off in countermeasures to protect the American people.

Senator HARKIN described very well that what is H5N1 avian flu in most of Southeast Asia today, by the time it travels, whether it is by humans or potentially by wild birds, the mutations which may take place might make irrelevant any vaccine that is produced today. That is why we believe we need to continue our research and development, how in the world do we expect new antiviral drugs and new vaccines to be available? To suggest that we put all our eggs into this limited approach—let’s put this money up, and let’s buy whatever is available on the marketplace—is comforting if, in fact, we believe this is a threat for tomorrow or next week or next month. The reality is this pandemic may occur next year or 3 years or 5 years down the road, and if we want to protect the American people, if we want to do our job, then you have to set up a comprehensive mechanism for that research, that development, and whatever product is needed to address the threat we may face.

Again, I commend those Members who have come to the floor and proposed the appropriations for this item. I disagree that this is the appropriate bill. I disagree that you should appropriate this much money or any money without a comprehensive plan as to how we would provide countermeasures that continue past this one appropriations.

I pledge to the minority leader and to Senator HARKIN, but more importantly to every Member of this body, to work with them aggressively over the next 60 days to not only produce legislation out of the subcommittee, but to work with my chairman, Chairman Enzi, and to work with both leaders and all 100 Senators to make sure this legislation is signed into law by the President. I believe that it is that urgent. But, there is also a requirement for us to do it right, in fact, that is the single most important facet that we should consider.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to a vote on the pending amendment, the motion to proceed to the department of defense appropriations bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1886 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to continue the discussion we were having. I cannot tell you how disappointed I am that the first amendment on the Department of Defense appropriations bill is one dealing with avian flu. If that is the most important amendment the other side of the aisle has for the Department of Defense bill, we ought to go ahead and vote on the appropriations bill as a whole right now. That is not the appropriate place to put it.

To make it sound as though nobody is working on this issue and no money is available is a total disservice to the agencies that work on it and this body as a whole. We have been working on it. We have been working on it partly through the Katrina episode, making sure vaccines and other items that were needed for whatever was needed were down there in a timely manner. Fortunately, we already had some laws in effect that allowed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take some emergency action to put items in place and get things done. We will be reviewing that to see if they worked as well as they could.

We have had a bioshield fund in place for a while. That bioshield fund has money in it to do what needs to be done on any kind of terrorism or pandemic that comes up. What we have lacked is the plan. Actually, the plan falls under the jurisdiction of my committee, and we have been working on it. I divided the committee up—and Senator HARKIN is on the committee—to more closely follow the ecosystem of our office. We are the HELP Committee, and we are in charge of health and education and labor and pensions.

Of course, we have been devoting a tremendous amount of time recently to getting a pensions bill ready so it can be debated on the floor on a moment’s notice. It is ready to go. There is a lot of agreement on both sides of the aisle, so we can get that out of here pretty
fast and protect hard-working Americans’ pension funds. But we need to do the Department of Defense appropriations bill first.

A more appropriate place to debate this issue would be on almost anything that gets up there. As the Senator from Iowa knows, if there is a lot of debate on a bill that comes up, it probably is not going anywhere at this time of the year and with the crises we face. So perhaps that is why he decided he would put it on this bill.

We are working on it. Again, I assure everybody we are working on it in the subcommittee that deals with public health and bioterrorism, under the jurisdiction of Senator Burr. He has been doing an outstanding job with that subcommittee. He hired some spectacular people who have a depth of understanding that I don’t think we have seen for a long time in regard to those particular issues. He has held hearings on those issues and gathered valuable information. He has gone pretty far afield to make sure we are covering all of the things that could happen.

He has a bill that is virtually ready to go. It will include the capability and the planning for a pandemic, as well as any unexpected event. It greatly compresses the time for dealing with those issues from anything we have had before. It provides a coordination basis that is necessary for unexpected events.

I congratulate him for his efforts and for how widely he has researched it, and for the number of fellow Senators he has involved in it.

Yesterday, there was a briefing he helped set up so we would know more about, particularly, avian flu. That kind of thoroughness should be congratulated. We ought to be working with him to make sure we are getting the bill done.

I hope, Mr. President, whether the threat is made by man or one that occurs naturally, we need to be prepared, and I agree with Senator Harkin on that point.

Senator Harkin, Senator Burr, and I serve on the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. All of us also serve on the Subcommittee on Bioterrorism and Public Health Preparedness. As I said, Senator Burr is chairman of that subcommittee. He has held six hearings and roundtables on what we need to do to have a strong national biodefense.

As chairman of the full committee, I am looking forward to working with Senator Burr, Senator Harkin, and the rest of the committee members to pass a bill this fall that will develop our capabilities to develop defenses against avian flu and a host of other biological threats we face—some known and some unknown—regardless of whether they are manmade or naturally occurring.

Senator Burr has been working on that comprehensive bill to build on Project BioShield. His bill will address everything from liability protection to biosurveillance, from the threat of terrorism to the threat of a normal disease.

As committee chairman, I fully intend to report that legislation to the floor this year to create a viable and innovative biodefense industry. We do need to create a comprehensive plan to eliminate barriers to develop this industry because we cannot count on the Government alone to supply us with the countermeasures, the antidotes, and the detection tools we have to have to ensure our safety against biological threats.

Most importantly, we already have billions of dollars available in Project BioShield to do what Senator Harkin wants to do. What we need to do is create an environment that will encourage business into this industry before we discourage them out of the industry. We need to get them back in. We need the innovativeness of small business and big business, and we need to make it more attractive so the drug and biotechnology companies will want to be engaged.

We have the money. What we need is a plan, and that plan is what we have been working on diligently. I do ask Senator Harkin to work with me, to work with Senator Burr, to work with our majority leader, and to work with Senator Kennedy, the ranking member on the HELP Committee, to make that happen. We have the capability to do it. We should be able to put together a package that should take relatively short debate on the floor, the House can match up to it, and we can do a conference and get it into effect. That would be better than having a full-blown debate on the Department of Defense appropriations bill, holding that bill up interminably when the money is needed, and creating difficulty in the conference committee, which will undoubtedly result in this measure being thrown out of the conference committee because it is not applicable to this bill and, therefore, that conference committee.

I appreciate the attention he has brought to the issue. It has brought attention to the issue. We need to do it the right way, and that is to include it in the development of a comprehensive bill that will deal with public health and bioterrorism.

Again, I congratulate Senator Burr and all those who have been working with him on developing that bill. I don’t think anybody could have put it together in a shorter time period than he has. We are just 9 months into this term, and he is already delivering. That is a tremendous statement on our part of his capability. Again, I cannot express how thorough it has been. Let’s do it right. Let’s do it through a stand-alone bill on which both sides of the aisle can join. Let’s get this done, that is why I’m involved, and this is the problem under the Department of Defense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AVIAN FLU

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking our colleague, Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts. He is busy and has a lot on his agenda. He has graciously agreed to let me speak before giving his remarks. I thank him for that.

I also commend Senator Harkin, our colleague from Iowa, and Minority Leader Harry Reid for putting this pressing issue squarely on the national agenda. The issue of avian flu is one of the critically important issues of our time. Second only to the potential for the existence of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of suicidal terrorists, this issue has the potential to be catastrophic to the national security interests of this country.

I cannot imagine a more timely issue or one more appropriate to be brought up on this legislation than something that will protect the American people who are currently dreadfully exposed to the possibility of a global pandemic. We need a new sense of urgency in addressing this issue.

People have died because of avian influenza: 115 people have contracted it in Asia; 59 of those people have died. Experts say a pandemic is only a matter of time before this deadly disease becomes more efficient in moving from person to person. We should not await that dreadful day, but act proactively to protect the national security interests and the health interests of the people of the United States of America.

Previous influenza epidemics have been catastrophic, killing not hundreds of thousands, but millions of human beings. We cannot afford to wait for that kind of event to occur.

We are currently woefully unprepared. The estimates are that we have in our stockpiles only enough vaccine to cover about 1 percent of the American people. There are about 2.3 million doses of Tamiflu and the same doses of experimental pandemic flu vaccine in our stockpile. And another antiviral may have been compromised by the Chinese use on their poultry population, thereby imperiling its efficacy. We are way behind the curve in preparing for a potential outbreak or pandemic of this severity and potential magnitude. Other developed nations are way ahead of us in terms of compiling their stockpiles and preparing to deal with the health and economic issues of a pandemic.

The final point I wish to make is I think more than anything else, the lesson of Hurricane Katrina has taught us this: When it is a matter of life and death for the American people, we better prepare for the worst, even as we hope for the best because then one of two things will happen: If the worst occurs, you are prepared to protect the life, the security, and the safety of those who place their confidence in us. That is the very least we should expect from their Government. And if the worst did not happen, then we will be pleasantly surprised.
When it comes to dealing with avian influenza, let us not have a repeat of the mistakes of Hurricane Katrina. Let us be prepared so we may protect our citizens or so we may be pleasantly surprised. That is what Government is all about. That is why I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of the Harkin amendment.

I thank our leader HARRY REID and, once again, Senator KENNEDY for a lifetime of leadership on these issues and for his courtesy to me today. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I first pay tribute to my friend, colleague, and the chairman of our HELP Committee, Senator ENZI, for his comments and his statements. We have worked very closely together and will continue to do so. We are facing critical health-related issues. We are working together on the challenges that we are facing from Hurricane Katrina, and we are also working on health and education, as well as issues of pensions and higher education.

We come at this with somewhat different viewpoints. First, I commend Secretary Leavitt for an excellent briefing and presentation yesterday. All of us here had the opportunity to read in our national newspapers the dangers associated with avian influenza, including the potential threat that it presents and why it is different from the seasonal flu that concerns families all over this country, particularly the elderly.

We have to be reminded that 36,000 people every year die from the flu, even when we work to make sure they have access to the appropriate flu vaccine. But that of this number that we lose, and that certainly is a tragedy.

We heard an outstanding presentation by Secretary Leavitt, as well as an outstanding presentation by Dr. Julie Gerberding, who is the head of the CDC and who has been enormously perceptive in terms of looking at the avian flu that we are facing. We also heard from General Michael Hayden, Deputy Director of National Intelligence, and others. The one thing that came out of that meeting, that I think all of us were impressed by, is the sense of immediacy. I think that is what Senator HARKIN is reacting to and responding to, the real potential danger, which is devastating to potentially tens of millions of Americans.

Perhaps we are being overly sensitive to this issue by adding this amendment to the Defense appropriations bill because of the recent tragedy of Hurricane Katrina. Hurricane Katrina has been particularly devastating, and Rita was certainly enormously harmful as well.

There were several of us in that briefing who left saying if we are going to make a mistake, it will be on the side of taking too much action.

The Secretary outlined a very vigorous program that he himself is involved in, working with the other agencies of Government and working with other members of the Cabinet. Avian flu is going to involve just about every kind of public policy issue, including transportation, health, commerce, and so many others. He gave us the assurance that he has his own plan that will be released in the next few weeks.

As Senator HARKIN and others have pointed out, this particular legislation outlines what funding should be directed, and also gives great flexibility to the administration in terms of its expenditures. Senator HARKIN says that the funds will be available until spent. By passing this amendment today, we will not get caught at a time when either the Senate or the House is not in session. We now have an opportunity to make the necessary resources available, as well as direct the ways that it ought to be expended.

During the presentation, the Secretary pointed out that their goal was to buy enough antiviral treatment to cover 80 million people, which is about one-quarter of the Nation's population. That was going to be at the cost of $20 a course of treatment. It was brought up by our colleagues that if this pandemic strikes the United States, there is not going to be a family that is not going to want to make sure that they have protections for their children and for themselves, for the spouses for their parents, and for their grandparents.

Every family is going to want to make sure they are able to afford and obtain that antiviral treatment. If one is affected by avian influenza and the antiviral treatment is taken immediately, the risk of death is diminished in a dramatic way. I think it is going to be very difficult to accept that this Nation will be satisfied with just one-quarter of our Nation's population having access to this treatment. Even more so, when we already know the potential dangers of a pandemic by what we have seen in the places affected and impacted by avian flu.

This legislation will only cover 50 percent of the population. It does not cover three out of four Americans. And, it does not cover the whole population. It costs $1.6 billion just to cover a quarter. We doubled that roughly to $3.2 billion, which puts us into the range suggested by experts.

The point that was made very carefully by the Secretary is that we are going to have to deal with surge capacity, and that our hospitals do not have this capability at the present time. That is going to be very important.

Previously, we have provided help and assistance to local communities and to State agencies to help them meet their surge capacity needs. Beyond that, it is going to be enormously important that we invest funds, as this legislation does, in surveillance—not only detection in this country but detection in foreign countries. That is the best way that we are going to be able to deal with this avian flu, to get the earliest possible detection.

As a result of that briefing yesterday, I do not think any of us would feel that we have a full alert system working around the globe and the world reports from various countries. A number of the countries, large countries as well as small, have effectively buried this health challenge and denied that they had it. It will be very proactive if we are going to protect Americans. We have to be able to develop a system internationally where we can identify early warning signs of a pandemic. That kind of surveillance, is included in this legislation.

We have to make sure we have the capability in our States to be able to detect this when it first affects a community. We have to set up a system for our health clinics and for our hospitals to be able to say that if the first threat of this kind of health challenge are going to be addressed. We need the detection and then we need the containment. To contain flu, we need to build our public health infrastructure in the local community and keep it far away from that kind of capability.

A year ago, I think the Department submitted a public report about how many States actually had moved ahead of our plans. About half of the States have yet to develop pandemic preparedness plans, and those with plans have yet to be evaluated for quality and feasibility.

When I entered the Chamber, I was listless and declared by my friend, Senator ENZI, talk about the BioShield Program which we put in place in preparation for the kind of challenge that we might face from bioterrorists. It focused on different bioterrorism agents that the FBI has said might pose a direct health threat, and allows the Secretary to put in place a system to respond quickly and effectively to those kinds of challenges.

Our colleague, Senator BURR from North Carolina, has held an extraordinary number of hearings in these areas. I know he has been preparing legislation to deal with a number of these items that I am mentioning today. He has done a magnificent job in the development of those hearings. But, that still does not mean that with the kind of challenge avian flu presents, which can be so devastating, that we should not be alert and ready to go.

We can point out that our whole system of vaccines is desperately lacking in the United States for a variety of different reasons. Today, we do not have the direct capability and capacity to develop the kind of avian flu countermeasures we need, including vaccines that provide enough countermeasures to deal with the flu. The best estimate is even if we were to give all the contracts out today, it would be well into the year 2007 before we were able to provide important coverage for all Americans. So, before we can even provide Tamiflu, something that we know can make a difference.
It does seem to me that we do not have a day to waste. This is something that is very dangerous.

Finally, one could ask, Is it appropriate to be on a Defense appropriations bill? Well, if we were talking about controlling the nuclear proliferation, I would say, yes, because we are concerned about the dangers of nuclear proliferation. I, quite frankly, believe avian flu presents a much greater threat, because it is imminent, highly lethal, and we have few countermeasures.

I do not see a great difference myself—certainly it will not be much of a difference to the families who are affected, whether it is terrorism or the fact that this kind of influenza has spread to this country and their family is infected with a deadly virus. That is why I believe that action is necessary. Very quickly, we have seen reductions in two very important agencies. One is HRSA, which provides grants to help the area of preparedness so that they can develop a response plan, get clearance with the State and HHS. Hospitals have begun working on plans, but they are woefully far behind, and this program was cut again.

Then we have the Centers for Disease Control that will certainly a lead agency—I would hope that it would be a lead agency—and we know that their public health expenditures have been reduced. I think this is tragic myself. It is a jewel of an organization in terms of American public health, and it has done extraordinarily well. It is extremely well led at the present time, and it does not seem appropriate to me.
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take a look at America from a different angle.

Perhaps too many of us had been lulled into the belief that this sort of thing could never happen, that leaders in America would never let us reach this terrible point, whether it is a natural disaster or a terrorist disaster, that someone somewhere in Washington or in a State capital or in a city hall had not made preparations and plans to deal with it. It is that concern that has led so many people to call for an honest appraisal of what happened with Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita and what we need to do in America to be better and stronger and better prepared.

I don’t think the people of this country expect the Senate or their Government to look at the world through the rearview mirror. We can’t spend our time looking back and reliving every moment and pointing a finger of blame here and there or some place for something that satisfied. That is important. But it is critically important that we review that scenario, that we don’t repeat the same mistake, so that the next time, we are better prepared. That is what we need.

There are many of them. I think we need an independent, nonpartisan commission—people without allegiance to the President or to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party but people who are truly Americans first who will come together in a commission and ask these questions so that we can be better prepared for our future. Unfortunately, there has been resistance to this idea, but that is nothing new.

After 9/11, many of us called for the creation of a commission to find out why our intelligence sources failed so miserably and what we could have done to avoid that terrible disaster of 9/11. At that time, the White House opposed the creation of the 9/11 Commission, and members of the Republican Party also said it is premature, we don’t need it. But good sense prevailed. More than that, the 9/11 survivors’ families prevailed—these widows and widowers, these children and spouses who came forward and demanded the creation of this independent Commission. They were the political force. They were an irresistible force. They created this Commission with two extremely talented individuals: Governor Kean of New Jersey and Senator Lee Hamilton of Indiana, a Democrat. They came together with others of like mind and did a great national service.

The 9/11 Commission not only analyzed what went wrong, what you all have to start with, but then they said: Here is how we could do better. They produced a proposal for reforming the intelligence agencies of America—there are many of them—so that they would be better coordinated, share information, there to protect America. The first line of defense against any terrorism is not our military. The first line of defense is intelligence. We need to see the danger coming before it strikes and stop it. That is what good intelligence can bring you.

With their suggestions, on a bipartisan basis with the support the 9/11 Commission leaders were in place. They pointed to weaknesses, and they told us how we could overcome. They called for reform. They stayed with the agenda until it was accomplished. It was a model for all of us and one we should look to when it comes to Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita. That is why I believe an independent, nonpartisan commission is so necessary.

The House of Representatives had a hearing earlier this week. They brought in a model, I pointed a finger of blame in every direction, including his own administration. When it was all said and done, people said: Well, at least he was brought before this committee and the members that did appear and was held accountable. That is a good thing. It is an important thing. But it isn’t going to bring us to the point we ought to be in this country. We want to find out what went wrong. Why didn’t we think ahead if we had been warned so many times about the danger? Why didn’t we plan ahead when it came to positioning forces, positioning food and supplies? Why didn’t we have a communications network that could survive a natural disaster? Why didn’t we have better cooperation at all levels of government? Where do we need to change the law so that at some given moment, it is clear who is in charge? What could we have done to save those lives we lost in those disasters? What should we do more as a country to preserve these families and put their lives back in order? These are all valid points.

The reason I have reflected on these circumstances, 9/11 and the hurricanes, is because the amendment that is pending right now on this Department of Defense appropriations bill gives this Senate an opportunity to step forward right now at an early moment to avert the next tragedy. Let me tell you what I mean. We need a wake-up call in America. Most public health officials here that an outbreak of a new pandemic is virtually inevitable. I use the words “virtually inevitable” with some care.

Those are the words of Dr. Gerberding, who is the head of the Centers for Disease Control.

You have to be a student of history to remember the great flu pandemic of 1918 that claimed so many innocent lives in America. According to the CDC and other health officials are telling us is that unless we aggressively monitor and immediately contain this avian flu, it is likely to be a global pandemic.

The difference, of course, is the world of 2005 is so much different from the world of 1918. In the world of 2005, an infected person is 12 hours away from your doorstep. That is about as long as it takes to fly from one part of the world to another.

We have to prepare and we have to start now, no excuses. That is why the Harkin amendment, which I am happy to cosponsor, is so important. People say: Why would you bring up an amendment about a national pandemic on a bill about Department of Defense appropriations? Don’t you have health appropriations or other things? It is true. And Senator HARKIN and I happen to be on the subcommittee that would more naturally be the place to bring up this amendment. However, he and I have a very limited number of few opportunities in this Senate to act. We believe, in supporting this amendment, we need to act, and to act now.

I am told what makes the avian flu so dangerous is that humans have no natural resistance to this flu. We remember the flu shots and all the warnings we have received over the years. For the most part, those flu shots are increasing our already natural resistance to flu. When it comes to the new strain of avian flu, we have no resistance. We have no immunity. It is not a question of children and sick people and the elderly being vulnerable, we are all vulnerable. That is what happened in 1918. The healthiest looking people on the streets were dead in 24 hours. That was the nature of that flu and could be the nature of this flu challenge.

The Centers for Disease Control has suggested that an avian flu outbreak in the United States could claim the lives of 200,000 people—a conservative estimate. Compare that to 36,000 lives lost each flu season to typical, normal flu. It is not just that the CDC that is anticipating a flu pandemic. Yesterday, I asked the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Leavitt, to ensure that there are U.S. antiviral drugs in the national stockpile to provide treatment for 50 percent of the American population in the event of an outbreak. I fully support Senator Frist’s recommendation. As most everyone knows, he is a medical doctor, in addition to being the major leader of the Senate.

I am pleased to join in offering this amendment which provides the Department of Health and Human Services with the money it needs to purchase those drugs. That recommendation alone will require about $3 billion.
What is the antiviral drug? The one most commonly referred to is called Tamiflu. If a person has flu-like symptoms and calls the doctor as soon as they feel them coming on, that doctor might prescribe Tamiflu, which if taken early enough can prevent the spread of the virus.

Another lesson from last year’s flu vaccine shortage, we have to have a plan. In the face of the vaccine shortage, prices for a dose of flu vaccine in Kansas at one point went as high as $600. In Colorado, 600 doses of flu vaccine were stolen from a doctor’s office.

We should be prepared. We need to be prepared. It includes enough flu vaccine to be prepared for a pandemic flu. Tamiflu. If a person has flu-like symptoms and calls the doctor as soon as they feel them coming on, that doctor might prescribe Tamiflu, which if taken quickly, could lessen the severity of the flu.

We had a lesson from Hurricane Katrina. We learned a lesson from Hurricane Katrina.

The funding we propose to add to this bill to prepare for a virtually inevitable, probably global public health crisis is less than we spend on the war in Iraq in 1 month. That is what it will take to get America ready so this avian flu does not claim so many lives.

If we intend to rely on good work, long hours, and a public health workforce that does the right thing, we may have to depend on other countries for the medicines we need during a global health crisis.

Another lesson from last year’s flu vaccine shortage, we have to have a plan. In the face of the vaccine shortage, prices for a dose of flu vaccine in Kansas at one point went as high as $600. In Colorado, 600 doses of flu vaccine were stolen from a doctor’s office.

I yield the floor.
Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am here for my daily speech on oil independence for this country. Before the assistant minority leader leaves the floor, as he has been such a leader in this area, and before this Senator launches into this series of conversations for the Senate about the energy crisis, I would like to make in a colloquy before I continue with the series of speeches on oil independence.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. He has identified an issue which every American family understands every time they go to the gasoline station.

The cost of filling up the tank nowadays is stunning. Even the automobile manufacturers are starting to advertise cars with good gas mileage. We haven't seen that in a long time, have we? It reminds all Americans how dependent we are on foreign fuel and foreign sources of energy.
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Automobile companies but their workers. Do you know what they said? They said: It is technologically impossible. The cars and trucks you want us to build will not be safe. And you are going to force foreign manufacturers on American consumers. They will not have any influence. If you are looking to see some story we heard 30 years ago The amendment was defeated.

But today I think if we called it up for reconsideration there would be a few more votes. People are understanding that you close and you cannot control your pocket-book if you are spending $100 every time you drive into the service station to fill the tank of that SUV. So I think folks are more sensitive to it.

I have written to the big three manufacturers, to their CEOs, and said: Listen, it is time to sit down and get serious. The American consumers want a more fuel-efficient vehicle. You know you can do it. How can we work together to achieve it?

How can we do it. You know you can do it. When did you last have a talk with your CEO, your manufacturing man? How can we do it?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, just exactly what the Senator from Illinois caused a great deal of suffering; whether it is caring for Hurricane Katrina, with a scare of a shortage, millions here and millions there. What an irony that we provide subsidies to oil companies at a time when they are experiencing the highest profits, windfall profits, they have ever seen—billions of dollars. And do you know why? Because the price of gasoline is much higher than is warranted by the price of crude oil.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I believe Americans want us to move toward energy independence, to move toward using fuels that are efficient and do not pollute. And I believe they want us, as a nation, to create incentives for renewable, sustainable energy sources, for innovation in energy technology that will create new companies, new jobs, new opportunities in this country.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, this Senator would say that it is only going to get worse if we do not do something new. This Senator thinks we are approaching a crisis because we are dependent on oil. China, and China is becoming a huge consumer of oil. They are second only to the United States in the consumption of oil. They have had 40 percent growth in their demand on the world's oil supply. China's purchases of new passenger cars has risen by 75 percent.

In a tight world oil market, with new demands put on the supply by emerging nations such as China, it is only going to get worse. And here we are, the United States of America, importing 58 to 60 percent of our daily consumption of oil from foreign shores. It is an accident waiting to happen.

What does it take to collectively shake the American people to the point that they demand of their elected representatives that we start making changes—synthetic fuels, alternative fuels, higher miles per gallon, alternatives such as ethanol, hybrid vehicles, encouraging them, satisfying the demand? The waiting list is a long list. What is it going to take?

Mr. DURBIN. I would say, in response to the Senator from Florida, through the Chair, I think America understands what this means. Our vulnerability, our dependence on foreign oil, means we are drawn into wars and foreign policy decisions which we may not want to make. It also means our economy is burdened by inefficiency and vehicles that are really burning too much gasoline. It also means that for every extra gallon we burn, there is more pollution in the air. So it is from three different perspectives.

Our lack of fuel efficiency in our vehicles is burdening America with responsibilities and decisions which American consumers would agree and American families would agree we should not have to make as a nation.

Now, I know I voted for the Energy bill—I do not know how the Senator from Florida did because it contained provisions without ethanol and biofuels. But if you look beyond those provisions, you will find in that bill many subsidies for oil companies. What an
and diesel, petroleum products, accounted for over 98 percent of transportation motor fuels sold in the year 2004. Only 2 percent are from alternatives to petroleum. We need to increase that 2 percent, and it can come from many different sources of alternatives to petroleum such as ethanol.

As the Senator from Illinois and I discussed, corn is clearly a basis for ethanol. But with the advance of technology, there are many other sources as well. Cellulose and glucose are two. Glucose and sugar, we raise a lot of sugar cane in Florida. They do in Louisiana. We raise a lot of sugar beets throughout the Midwest and the West. That is a source of ethanol. It was one of the things that I pushed for, at the time of the discussion of CAPTA, to get the administration, through the Department of Agriculture, to start the study on making ethanol from sugarcane. I will pick up in the future with a discussion of ethanol made from sources other than corn, as I bring to the attention of the Senate how much this is getting to be an emergency situation that we are depending on oil. And of that oil, almost 60 percent of it comes from foreign shores. That is not good for this country. We have to change that.

I yield the floor.

MEDICARE COST-SHARING AND WELFARE EXTENSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1778 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAUCUS). Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1778) to extend Medicare cost-sharing and welfare extension for Needy Families Program, transitional medical assistance under the Medicaid program, and related programs through September 30, 2006, to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, transitional medical assistance under the Medicaid program, and related programs through March 31, 2006, and for other purposes. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1894) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate coverage under the Medicare and Medicaid programs for drugs used for treatment of erectile dysfunction)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. RESTRICTION ON COVERED DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.

(a) EXCLUSION UNDER MEDICARE BEGINNING IN 2007.—Section 1860D-2(e)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(e)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting ‘‘and, only with respect to 2006, other than subparagraph (K) (relating to agents when used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, unless such agents are used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration)’’ after ‘‘agents’’.

(b) RESTRICTION UNDER MEDICAID.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d-2(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph: ‘‘(K) Agents when used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, except that such exclusion or other restriction shall not apply in the case of such agents when used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration.’’

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to drugs dispensed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question of adoption of the amendment is closed. The amendment (No. 1894) was agreed to, as follows:

The bill (S. 1778), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1778

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 Cost-Sharing and Welfare Extension Act of 2005’’.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF QI PROGRAM THROUGH SEPTEMBER 2006.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iv) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(E)(iv)) is amended by striking ‘‘September 2005’’ and inserting ‘‘September 2006’’;

(b) TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION.—Section 1933(g)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a-3(g)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(D) for the period that begins on October 1, 2005, and ends on December 31, 2005, the total allocation amount is $100,000,000; and

‘‘(E) for the period that begins on January 1, 2006, and ends on September 30, 2006, the total allocation amount is $300,000,000.’’;


(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities authorized by part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and by sections 510, 1108(b), and 1925 of such Act, and by sections 2(e)(2)(A) of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant Program, and by section 603(a)(3)(H)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(3)(H)(ii)), as amended by section 2(e)(2)(A) of the TANF Emergency Response and Recovery Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 616-62), are extended for 15 months by striking ‘‘December 31, 2005’’ and inserting ‘‘March 31, 2006’’.


(c) EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL RANDOM SAMPLE STUDY OF CHILD WELFARE AND CHILD WELFARE WAIVER AUTHORITY THROUGH MARCH 31, 2006.—Activities authorized by sections 420A and 1130(a) of the Social Security Act shall continue through March 31, 2006, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2005, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the second quarter of fiscal year 2006 at the level provided for such activities through the second quarter of fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 4. RESTRICTION ON COVERED DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.

(a) EXCLUSION UNDER MEDICARE BEGINNING IN 2007.—Section 1860D-2(e)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(e)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting ‘‘and, only with respect to 2006, other than subparagraph (K) (relating to agents when used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, unless such agents are used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration)’’ after ‘‘agents’’.

(b) RESTRICTION UNDER MEDICAID.—
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(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to drugs dispensed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question of adoption of the amendment is closed. The amendment (No. 1894) was agreed to, as follows:

The amendment (No. 1894) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate coverage under the Medicare and Medicaid programs for drugs used for treatment of erectile dysfunction)

At the end, add the following:

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
SAVINGS AND ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, more than 10,000 years ago, on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean Sea, people became farmers. They started growing crops of emmer and einkorn wheat. They harvested their grain with curved, handheld sickle-blades.

And 5,000 years ago, Mesopotamian farmers yoked cattle to pull plows. The plows’ bronze-tipped blades cut deeply, greatly increasing productivity.

Today, wheat farmers still harvest their wheat with oxen or by hand. They use tools much like those invented 5,000 years ago. An Ethiopian wheat farmer harvests an acre of wheat in half an hour. A few weeks ago, in Montana, a wheat farmer whom I know near Fort Benton, in Chouteau County, finished harvesting this year’s hard-red spring-wheat crop. He and his family drive a John Deere 60 series STS combine that they bought for more than $225,000, a couple of years ago. STS stands for the “single-tine separator” system that the combine uses for threshing and separating. This combine’s rotor technology yields a smooth, free-flowing crop stream, giving the farmer higher ground speeds and increased through-put capacity. This Fort Benton wheat farmer harvests 5 acres and 220 bushels of wheat an hour.

What the Ethiopian farmer can do in a week, the Montana farmer can do in 6 minutes.

There are a lot of reasons for the difference: land, climate, seed quality, farming skills. But one big difference: land, climate, seed quality, farm computer, instead of a pencil.

In the late 1950s, there were about 2,000 computers in the world. Each of these computers could process about 10,000 instructions per second.

Today, there are about 300 million computers. Each of them can process several hundred million instructions per second.

In less than 50 years, the world’s raw computing power has increased four-billion-fold. This sustained increase in productivity has paralleled in history.

In 1960, capital investment in information technology made it possible. By 1980, investment in IT increased to 6 percent of our economy. By 2000, investment in IT increased to 6 percent of our economy.

These are slow, single-digit increases in investment. But look at the revolution that they ignited.

This information technology investment contributed to a new era of American worker productivity and competitiveness. That productivity continues today. In the mid-1980s, when the benefits from IT began to kick in, American workers began producing nearly 4 percent more per hour. As increased productivity surged through the economy, the standard of living improved for the Nation.

Capital makes possible this unprecedented productivity. Investment made possible this capital. And savings made possible this investment. Savings is the seed corn for productivity growth.

National savings. Investment provides capital to our workers. Capital ignites productivity. And productivity makes our economy accelerate.

Savings is what is left of income after consumption. National savings collects the surpluses of private households, businesses, and governments. When workers part put of their salaries into 401(k) plans, that adds to national savings. When companies hold on to their earnings instead of paying them out, that too adds to national savings. And when the government runs a budget surplus, that public sector savings adds to the national pool of savings, as well.

The three elements of national savings—household savings, corporate savings, government deficits—are fundamental to economic competitiveness.

Savings lets us invest in new factory equipment, machines, or tools. Savings lets us invest in high-technology innovations. Savings lets us invest in human, physical, and intellectual capital.

But America’s level of national savings is dwindling. The decline of America’s savings demands action.

At the beginning of the year, net national savings stood at just under 2 percent of gross domestic product. That is less than $2 for every $100 that our Nation earns. This is down more than 70 percent since 2000. No other industrialized country has such a low national savings rate.

If we break down national savings into its component parts, we can see why national savings has fallen off.

First the good news: Corporate savings has held steady—even increased—over the past decade. But the good news ends there.

Personal savings—what American households are contributing to the Nation—has fallen dramatically. Just 10 years ago, Americans saved about $4 of every $100 that our economy produced. By the end of 2004, we were saving just 99 cents. And today? The recent data show that personal savings has fallen even further.

In July, for every $100 of disposable income that Americans generated, we spent that $100, plus 60 cents more. Rather than saving, American households are borrowing. In the 1980s, total household debt equaled about 70 percent of a year’s aftertax income. By 2004, household debt equaled 107 percent of aftertax income.

And the bad news gets worse. As American households fish pennies out of their savings piggy bank there is a growing hole at the bottom. The public sector is draining national savings as the huge Federal budget deficits grow.

In just 4 years, the Federal Government’s contribution to national savings has gone from a positive contribution of more than 2 percent of the economy, to a drain of more than 3 percent. Instead of contributing $2 for every $100 the economy earns, the Federal Government takes out $3 dollars. Government deficits are the chief cause of our abysmal national savings rate.

With national savings so low, how has America’s economy remained an engine of growth?

We find the answer in Japan, Europe, China, and even the developing world.

Americans have stopped saving. But the rest of the world has not.

Today, Americans turn to foreign lenders for our savings. The rest of the world has become America’s creditor, helping to fund our Government deficits and national savings. The world’s largest debtor.

This is a big change. Between 1950 and the early 1980s, our foreign borrowing was balanced. Some years we borrowed from foreigners. And other years we lent. But for most years, we remained a net creditor.

Then, our situation has dramatically reversed. We now depend on foreigners to fuel our economy.

Look at foreign and domestic investment flows. Last year, our net borrowing from foreign lenders totaled nearly $70 billion. This year, our net foreign borrowing could well exceed $800 billion.

This kind of borrowing adds up. As recently as 1985, America had zero net foreign debt. Today, America’s net foreign debt is the size of nearly 30 percent of our economy.

The last time that we had this level of foreign debt, Grover Cleveland lived in the White House. The last time that
we had this level of foreign debt, 18 percent of Americans were unemployed, violent railroad strikes shook the Nation, and a deep depression gripped the world economy.

What is worse, soon, the ratio of foreign debt to GDP will hit 50 percent. In 7 years, that ratio will hit 100 percent.

This is unprecedented, not just for the United States. It is unprecedented for any modern industrialized country.

We welcome foreign investment in America. Our country’s openness to the world’s capital has helped keep our economy strong. Foreign investment fuels our economy and creates good American jobs.

But if we continue to become increasingly dependent on foreign capital, then we will have to pay the piper.

First, continued borrowing means an ever-growing claim on our Nation’s assets. The more that foreigners lend to America, the more dividend and interest payments they will collect—not Americans but foreigners.

In 2005, for the first time since these data were recorded, America will pay more on foreigners’ investments in America than American investors earn on their investments abroad. This year, these payments could amount to $55 billion. By 2008, these payments could rocket to more than $260 billion.

That would be a quarter of a trillion dollars paid out that would not boost our productivity. That quarter of a trillion dollars would increase foreign countries’ standard of living, not ours.

That would be a quarter of a trillion dollars simply paying on our existing debt. More and more, we would have to borrow new amounts from foreign sources to pay back funds that we had already borrowed.

And that would be a quarter of a trillion dollars of behavior that one associates with a Third World economy, not the United States of America.

Second, foreigners are increasingly not investing their savings in America’s productive sectors, but in U.S. Government securities. Foreigners are frequently buying our Government securities as part of schemes to manipulate currency markets and subsidize their exports. Those schemes further hurt our competitiveness and our future standard of living.

That is, they are not investing in plants and equipment, they are investing in Government securities so they can accomplish other objectives and goals.

When 80 percent of the world savings flows to one country, the world economy is unbalanced. When 80 percent of the world savings flows to just the United States of America, that is a big imbalance.

This imbalance creates dangerous problems and distortions in the U.S. economy and throughout the world.

Eventually, the pendulum will swing back. The world economy will return to equilibrium. Foreign investors will decide to rebalance their portfolios. They will reduce their lending to America. America will have to pay more for its borrowing. Interest rates will rise. This rebalancing could cause severe dislocations in our economy.

We can steer clear of some of these costs. But we can do so only if we consider them now and do what we can to secure our economy from sudden and difficult adjustments.

Where do we look for solutions?

America must increase its own national savings. We must finance more of our own investment.

We must create a reliable and stable pool of investment funding to fulfill our investment needs. This saving will also make us more profitable in the long run. We will gain the returns on capital investment here. We will not send them abroad.

We will continue to welcome foreign savings to our shores. But America will have a higher standard of self-financed investment.

How do we do this? First, we must plug the biggest leak in our national savings pool: the federal budget deficit. The federal government continues to run huge deficits. Prior to 2003, the record deficit was $290 billion in 1992.

But in 2003, the government set a new record deficit of $375 billion dollars. In 2004, the government set an even higher record deficit of $412 billion dollars.

This year, the government is projected to run a deficit of more than $300 billion dollars. The last 3 years have produced the 3 largest deficits in the Nation’s history.

Now with the immense costs of Hurricane Katrina, Goldman Sachs now predicts that the deficits for the next 2 years will once again be about $400 billion. That would be 2 more years of deficits once again approaching record levels. Each year’s deficit adds up.

These deficits increase our national debt. At the end of fiscal year 2001, the government’s debt held by the public was $3.3 trillion. By the end of this year, the government’s debt held by the public will rise to $4.6 trillion.

This would be an increase of 40 percent in just 4 years.

There are times when deficits are appropriate. If the economy is in a recession, net borrowing by the federal government can help to restore prosperity and job growth. But with the economy humming along now, huge deficits no longer serve Americans well. Instead, these large deficits divert domestic and international savings away from productive economic sectors. These productive sectors need savings to invest in innovative capital goods that can boost productivity, help our economy to grow, and improve our Nation’s living standards.

We must be honest about our spending needs today and in the future. Budget forecasts for the near-term that neglect the costs of war and of neglect upcoming reductions in revenues—such as reform of the alternative minimum tax—serve no one but cynical political strategists. And the retirement of the baby boom generation beginning in 2008 will put enormous long-term pressure on the federal budget through increased Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare spending. We must own up to these long-run problems.

Once we define the problem honestly, we must find ways to solve it.

First, we must restore the pay-as-you-go rules for both entitlement spending and tax cuts. We are stuck in a hole. We have to stop digging. We must pay for any new spending or tax cuts that we enact.

Until 2003, tough pay-as-you-go rules governed the Congressional budget process. But these rules expired in 2003. And a virtually meaningless alternative has taken their place. We must restore strong and meaningful pay-go rules.

Second, we must reduce the annual tax gap. As much as $350 billion of taxes went unpaid in 2001. Since then, the government has collected only $55 billion less than 2001’s shortfall. These huge gaps occur every year. We cannot afford this tax gap.

Third, we must eliminate wasteful and unnecessary spending. For example, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services recently discovered that the government had paid nearly $12 million in benefits to recipients in Florida who had already died.

Fourth, we must eliminate wasteful and unfair tax breaks such as abusive tax shelters and corporate tax loopholes,

Finally, we must slow the growth in healthcare costs. We cannot rein in budget deficits without controlling the growth in healthcare costs. The private sector cannot sustain its current healthcare cost growth. And neither can the public sector. We cannot clamp down on healthcare costs in the public sector alone. Providers will just shift healthcare costs to the private sector. Fortunately, solutions that contain private sector healthcare costs will likely also help contain public sector healthcare costs, as well.

Making those five things would go a long way towards reducing Federal budget deficits and increasing national savings.

Increasing private savings is more complicated. We cannot adopt pay-as-you-go rules for families. Instead, we have to provide families with the tools that they need to develop their own growth plan.

The first tool is financial education. Today, few Americans know how to develop a family budget. And too few know how to assess the risk of an adjustable rate mortgage when interest rates are rising.

We need to provide our children, and their parents and grandparents, with the tools that they need to make good financial decisions—to have more savings and less debt.

Programs such as “Stash Your Cash”—a program to teach young people the basics of finance, saving, and investing—are a good start.

As part of “Stash Your Cash,” this summer, 15 pigs—each one 4 feet tall
and 750 pounds—appeared in the streets of Washington. And it was not just another political statement.

The colorful animals on street corners were oversized piggy banks. Local middle school students and artists painted each of them with a slogan. "Stash Your Cash" gets to kids early. It teaches them financial vocabulary, how to create a budget, and how and why they should save for the future.

But these middle-school students that creating a budget helps them understand where their money goes, ensures that they do not spend more than they earn, finds uses for money to achieve goals, and helps them set aside money for the future.

We can all benefit from these lessons. Savings is vital for our children’s and our families’ financial future. And what is vital for our families is vital for our country.

Second, we need to make it easier to save.

The most successful savings programs are payroll-deduction savings through employer-sponsored 401(k) plans. We can make these programs even more successful by encouraging employers to enroll eligible employees automatically. Employees would opt out of saving instead of opting in. Without automatic enrollment, just two-thirds of eligible employees contribute to a 401(k) plan. With automatic enrollment, participation jumps to over 90 percent. The largest increases are among younger and lower-income employees.

Only half of private sector workers have a 401(k) or similar plan available to them. We need to bring payroll-deduction retirement savings to the other half.

Who is that other half? Part-time workers, those who put in less than 1,000 hours a year, do not have to be covered by 401(k) plans. Small employers are less likely to offer 401(k) plans, or similar arrangements, to their workers. Lower-income workers are less likely to have a plan available than moderate- and higher-income workers.

We have a voluntary pension system. We should not change that. But we can make savings opportunities available to more workers without forcing employers to provide more benefits.

Third, we need to make incentives for saving more progressive. Like many tax incentives, our current savings incentives give more bang-for-the-buck to those in the higher tax brackets. Our income taxes go to just the opposite.

In ancient times, people viewed the toll of farming as a curse. The ancient text tells how when man left the Garden of Eden, he heard God say:

Cursed be the ground because of you; By toil you shall eat of it All the days of your life:

But now, increased investment, capital, and productivity have made it so that we may hear the blessing with which Moses blessed the children of Israel on the plains of Moab, across the River Jordan:

The Lord will give you abounding prosperity in . . . the offspring of your cattle, and the produce of your soil in the land that the Lord swore to your fathers to assign to you. The Lord will open for you His bounteous store, the heavens, to provide rain for your land in season and to bless all your undertakings. You will be creditor to many nations, but debtor to none.

From ancient times, the sages recognized that the terms “prosperity” and “debtor” rarely apply to the same country.

Let us return to being a country whose saving provides the seed corn that brings us blessings of “abounding prosperity.”

Let us seek the blessings of being “debtor to many nations, but creditor to none.”

And let us do the work that we need to do to see that what the Lord will [continue], to bless all [the] undertakings” of this great Land. I yield the floor.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006—Continued**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there have been so many legislative fellows and interns requesting to have seats on the floor, I am not sure there will be room for any regular staff soon. So I am going to start refusing to agree to floor privileges unless we are sure that there is going to be space for those staff who are assigned to work with members of the committee on this bill. It is our hope we will be able to get to a vote on the Harkin amendment soon. I want to make a short statement, and that is, we have had some information from the Department of Defense.

May we go back on the bill now? We are back on the bill automatically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the money for Iraq and Afghanistan is in a reserve account in this bill and, theoretically, it should have started being available this Saturday. It will only be available when this bill is signed into law by the President.

Some time accounting the first quarter, operating accounts for day-to-day operation—costs—operation and maintenance for the Army, for the Marine Corps, and for the training efforts of Iraq—are in the reserve account and will not be available. It is imperative we get this bill to the President so it can be signed to make the money available by the middle of November.

Increased fuel costs are putting pressure on operating costs. We all know what it costs us when we pull up to a gas station and fill up a tank. It costs just as much or more to fill up the tanks in Iraq and Afghanistan for those people who are in the air and on the ground. That money is not going to be available unless we approve this bill.

One of the things that bothers me is that there is money in this bill to finance continued production of the C-130Js. That production contract is planned for mid-November, but there is no money available now. It will not be available until the 2006 bill is signed. There are a whole series of things in this bill that are designed to take the pressure off of the way the funding is being carried out at the Department of Defense. The ability to finance the improved explosive device task force initiatives will be constrained unless that $50 billion portion of this bill is passed.

So I urge the Senate to help us get this bill through as quickly as possible. I know that is sort of difficult now with the recesses that are coming up, but very clearly we are starting to get amendments that are not germane to this bill, and I hope that will not go on.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I discussed this with the distinguished floor managers.

First, parliamentary inquiry: Is the Harkin amendment now the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending question.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside
that amendment so the distinguished Senator from Missouri and I could offer an amendment, and that upon the completion of action or the setting aside, whichever transpires first, it be in order to return to the Harkin amendment.

‘The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?’

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself and Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 1901.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To appropriate $1,300,000,000 for Additional War-Related Appropriations for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for homeland security and homeland security response equipment)

On page 228, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for “NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE Equipment; $1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended; Provided, That the amount available under this heading shall be available for homeland security and homeland security response equipment; Provided further, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95 [108th Congress].”

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, so Members will know, this amendment adds $1.3 billion in emergency funding for National Guard equipment to the supplemental portion of the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill. The funding is set aside for the National Guard to buy much needed items for homeland security and natural disaster response.

Hurricane Katrina exposed glaring deficiencies in the equipment available for the National Guard to respond to such disasters. After Hurricane Katrina, we had barely sufficient levels of trucks, tractors, communication, and miscellaneous equipment that is necessary to respond to the overwhelming scale of this storm. If we have another hurricane or, God forbid, a large-scale terrorist attack, our National Guard is not going to have the basic level of resources to do the job right.

As we know, in every one of our 50 States, we have seen in our career times where the National Guard was called upon to help. The National Guard Chief, LTG Steven Blum, recently noted that the Guard has only about 35 percent of what is officially required to respond to hurricanes, natural disasters, or possible terrorist attacks at home.

Yesterday, in an appearance in the House of Representatives, General Blum noted that Guard members responded to this disaster with insufficient and outdated communications. General Blum noted we are going to need at least an staggering amount—$7 billion to procure the communications, trucks, medical supplies, and machinery necessary to respond to future disasters.

We knew, even before that hearing, that without any doubt there is an immediate need and $7 billion. We have to procure essential equipment such as a family of medium tractor vehicles, new SINOGARS radios, night-vision goggles, and other equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent report from the National Guard on these critical needs be printed in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National Guard units that deployed to combat homeland security and homeland security assistance missions have been the best trained and equipped force in American History. $4.3 billion has been invested to provide those units with the very best, state-of-the-art equipment available in the world today.

This is an unprecedented demonstration of the DoD commitment to ensure that no soldier or airman, regardless of component (Active, Guard, or Reserve), goes to war ill-equipped or untrained. With the help of the US Congress, this was accomplished over a two-year period to support the National Guard overseas warfighting needs. The Guard and Reserve have a greater percentage and a greater activity than at any time in decades, and they need the help. The funding we are now asking for takes a big step forward.

I have worked with them closely. Of course, I want to see the amendment accepted. I will, of course, ask for a vote, if we can’t reach such agreement.

I know the distinguished Senator from Alaska and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii have spent even more years in this body than I have, and they worked closely to help our National Guard. Senator BOND and I have done our best to fashion a reasonable and necessary piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to join wholeheartedly my National Guard Caucus cochairman, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, in urging the Senate to adopt these emergency appropriations for our National Guard.

We have had a lot of talk about emergency responders and people wondered, Did this group do their job? Did that group do their job? As Governor of Missouri for 8 years, I saw the National Guard respond, and respond fully, to every natural disaster we had. We had floods, we had tornadoes, we had hurricanes, we had other civil disorders, and the Guard responded. They responded with the equipment they needed.

Since that time, I have served in the Senate as cochairman of the National Guard. I have seen the Guard continue to respond to State and federal emergencies time after time after time. When they have been called upon to go abroad as part of the national defense mission, they have done so extremely well.

Unfortunately, the men and women of the National Guard, those vital citizen soldiers who volunteer to serve their country, have not been well resourced. It appears when equipment
is available the Pentagon obviously takes care, first, of the active. In this situation, we have seen a tremendous drain on equipment—not just from emergencies around the country but from the National Guard’s participations in overseas military situations. As a result, the equipment readiness in critical areas of the National Guard has fallen to about 34 percent. We are asking the men and women of the Guard to go into situations that will be very demanding in overseas military situations or a vital rescue mission such as New Orleans—without the equipment.

Our Guard, along with others, responded and responded promptly to the disaster of the gulf coast. They were in Louisiana. They went proudly. We sent an engineer battalion from Jefferson Barracks in Missouri. They went down there, and they performed admirably. They had one set of trucks, one set of communications equipment, and one set of night goggles. This was great, and they asked for a second of the National Guard engineering units to be deployed. We had to refuse, not because we did not have the personnel ready—but we did not have the equipment. They cannot go without the communications equipment. We absolutely could not respond in that situation because of a lack of equipment.

When we read the stories about the National Guard’s participation, one gets a better—ever more of an idea of how effective and how responsive the National Guard is.

As the Senator from Vermont said, we have requested that an emergency appropriation be added to the supplemental. I join with him today in asking the Senate to approve as an emergency appropriation measures the money we need. This money is critically important. It includes trucks. The big trucks the National Guard has can drive through flood areas. They can help save people. They can also go in war zones. They need night vision goggles. You may think night vision goggles are necessary primarily in war. Think about going into New Orleans, which has lost all of its power; all of its lighting, and you are trying to find people who are in grave personal danger because of the rising floodwaters. You need the night vision goggles to see them. Most importantly, think about communications. How do they work with other units, other Federal units, other State units, when they are on a civil mission? When they are under control of the local officials who have the responsibility, who have the local command, how do they communicate with them? They cannot do in too many instances.

That is why this particular appropriation is so important that we begin resourcing our Guard. We can all be extremely proud of his or her National Guard. They know when the chips are down, when lives are in danger, the Guard can and will respond. The Guard comes to our defense regularly. The very least we can do is make sure we support our Guard when they go in. Not giving them the equipment they need is not an answer. We are not going to send them into harm’s way without the equipment to do their job.

This is an important amendment. This is a large sum. We, obviously, are very much aware of the needs. This is a pressing need, and the emergencies and the wartime situation we are in compel a response to the needs of the Guard.

I thank my colleague from Vermont for offering this, and I urge my colleagues to join in seeing that the National Guard gets the appropriation resources they need. I thank the managers of the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I was going to suggest that if the Senator from Alaska has indicated that the Senator from Hawaii want to accept the amendment, we could actually get some significant business done right here.

While they are thinking about this, I must say there are few people in this Senate more senior than I, but certainly the Senator from Hawaii is much more senior, the Senator from Alaska is much more senior. They are only two of five people senior to me, and they want a quorum.

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. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, one of the minor procedural problems we have around here with an emergency clause is this has to go through several layers of clearance. It is not a higher pay grade, it is a different pay grade, it is a different responsibility. The distinguished floor managers are working on that. We have the budget committees and others who have to act on it.

I appreciate very much the work of Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUYE. I hope we will be able to resolve this very shortly. We have two of the best leaders in the Senate handling this bill. Whatever needs to be done I assure my colleagues will be done.

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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, is the Harkin amendment the pending amendment?

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I clarify with the desk that I am shown on the Leahy amendment; it is the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I clarify with the desk that I am shown on the Leahy amendment; it is the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Leahy amendment is pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1886

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the Leahy amendment be set aside and the Harkin amendment be brought before the Senate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. We have had some conversations about this amendment. It is an amendment that raises the subject of the Senate that is going to approach the great problems associated with Asian flu. Under the circumstances, it has been my recommendation that we take this amendment to conference because then the subject will be in this bill. If the agencies involved can come together with an appropriate plan and request for money, we would then be able to do this in conference.

Although I have had some question about this amendment, we have discussed it with the author of the amendment. As I indicated to him, if it would pass, I would cosponsor, and I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. The pending amendment is the Leahy amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Leahy amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Is that the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I clarify with the desk that I am shown on the Leahy amendment; it is the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.
the legislative and executive branch of Government, and the division of power reserved for the Federal Government and the governments of the individual States. As a Member of this legislative body and in a former life as a State Governor, I am acutely aware of the importance of the lines and the consequences when they are broached.

As a Member of the Senate, I do not welcome decisions overturning legislative acts that I support, but I frequently work with my colleagues to re- ject efforts to meddle in State affairs. As a Governor attempting to guide my State, I had to labor through many burdens placed in our way, the State's way, by an intrusive Federal Government.

The judicial branch of our Government—most notably the Supreme Court—has been designated by the Constitution as the branch to maintain these divisions of power and referee the tensions between our governments. After Judge Roberts argued the farthest thing from their mind. "That would have been

As Judge Roberts repeatedly reminded his inquisitors, he is not a politician. I commend him on his willingness to remind my colleagues that he was not before Congress to compromise or give hints on how he might vote on a hypothetical case in exchange for confirmation votes; rather, he confirmed repeatedly that the Constitution will be his guide to these questions.

I suspect that some of my colleagues have come to rely on the judiciary to advance changes that have no support in the duly elected member of our legislature, State and national; hence, their frustration with Judge Roberts.

Judge Roberts has clearly defined views of the role of the judiciary and the role of the legislature, and they do not appear to be blurred. As Judge Roberts put it so well:

If the people who framed our Constitution were jealous of their freedom and liberty, they would not have sat around and said, "Let's take all the hard issues and give them over to the judges." That would have been the farthest thing from their mind.

As did the Founders, I do not believe State and National legislative bodies are incapable of settling tough and contentious issues. I do not believe it is benevolent or admirable for judges to remove questions from the public realm because they are divisive. Judge Roberts has shown the modesty and respect for that path.

Judge Roberts also has made it clear he finds no place for reflection on the public attitudes and legal documents of foreign lands in the consideration of constitutional questions. They do not and should not offer any guidance as to the words and the meaning of our own Constitution.

During his testimony, Judge Roberts displayed respect for the Constitution and the rule of law as the principles that should guide him when ruling on a case. His view of the role of the judiciary is very consistent with my own.

Finally, I believe President Bush has executed his duties in a responsible manner that will serve our Nation well. He interviewed many distinguished and qualified judges and attorneys in the country. He consulted with Members of the Senate. After careful and thoughtful deliberation, President Bush returned to the Senate the name of John Roberts. I am very pleased today that 78 Members of the Senate agreed and confirmed him to the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business."
Section 5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard

(a) Short Title.—This section may be cited as the "Reservists Pay Security Act of 2006".

(b) In General.—Subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard

"(a) An employee who is absent from a position of employment with the Federal Government in order to perform active duty in the uniformed services pursuant to a call or order to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101a(13)(B) of title 10 shall be entitled, while serving on active duty, to receive, for each pay period described in subsection (b), an amount equal to the amount by which—

"(1) the amount of basic pay which would otherwise have been payable to such employee for each pay period if such employee's civilian employment with the Government had not been interrupted by that service, exceeds the basic pay the employee would have received if such employee's civilian employment had not been interrupted; and

"(2) the amount of pay and allowances which (as determined under subsection (d))—

"(A) is payable to such employee for that service; and

"(B) is allocable to such pay period.

"(b)(1) Amounts under this section shall be payable with respect to each pay period (which could otherwise apply if the employee's civilian employment had not been interrupted)—

"(A) during which such employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38 with respect to the position from which such employee is absent (as required by subsection (a)); and

"(B) for which such employee does not otherwise receive basic pay (including by taking any annual, military, or other paid leave to which such employee is entitled by virtue of such employee's civilian employment with the Government).

"(2) For purposes of this section, the period during which such employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38—

"(A) shall be determined disregarding the provisions of section 2302(d) of title 38; and

"(B) shall include any period of time specified in section 4312(e) of title 38 within which an employee may report or apply for employment or reemployment following completion of service on active duty to which called or ordered as described in subsection (a).

"(c) Any amount payable under this section to an employee shall be padded—

"(1) by such employee's employing agency;

"(2) from the appropriation or fund which would be used to pay the employee if such employee's civilian status existed; and

"(3) to the extent practicable, at the same time and in the same manner as would basic pay if such employee's civilian employment had not been interrupted.

"(d) The Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with Secretary of Defense, prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out the preceding provisions of this section.

"(e)(1) The head of each agency referred to in section 2302(a)(2)(C)(II) shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of such agency.

"(2) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of that agency.

"(f) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the terms 'employee', 'Federal Government', and 'uniformed services' have the same respective meanings as given in section 4303 of title 38;

"(2) the term 'employing agency', as used with respect to any employee entitled to any payments under this section, means the agency or other entity of the Government (including an agency referred to in section 2302(a)(2)(C)(II)) with respect to which such employee has reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38; and

"(3) the term 'pay' includes any amount payable under section 5304.

"(g) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5537 the following:

'5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard.'

"(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to pay periods (as described in section 5538(b) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section) beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this amendment has been offered before and has been agreed to by the Senate. Unfortunately, it has not been enacted into law. It does very well on the floor of the Senate. It just doesn't do very well in conference committee. For some reason, when it gets to a conference committee, it is usually rejected. But I'm glad to be here today to talk about something that is so important. I think what we are talking about with this amendment is something that most Senators on both sides of the aisle would agree with.

The premise behind this amendment is as follows: If you are willing to serve in the Guard or Reserve and if you are willing, when activated, to leave your job and your family behind to risk your life for America, we should do our best as a nation to stand behind you. That is it.

How do we stand behind the men and women of the Guard and Reserve when they are activated to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan? In a variety of ways. Companies, churches, some friends, community groups help the family of a soldier who is overseas. But there is one other thing that happens that is as important, if not more. Many times that activated Guard or Reserve soldier has a good job. They have a good job. They have been activated. They have to serve for a year or more. They are being paid less during the time they are serving our country. So we encourage employers across America to stand behind their employees. If your employee is activated, stand behind your employee. Make up the difference in their pay.

It turns out that hundreds of corporations across America have said that is the right thing to do. That is the patriotic thing to do. Yes, we will stand behind the men and women activated into the Guard and Reserve. We will make up the difference in pay so that their family will have financial peace of mind that they can pay the mortgage, the utility bills, keep the family together while that soldier is risking his life overseas.

We think so highly of these companies for their patriotism and dedication to our soldiers that we have created a Web site at the Department of Defense. You can go to it. It is a site that congratulates these employers for their devotion and allegiance to our troops.

Unfortunately, there is one employer that refuses to do this. It turns out that is the largest single employer of all the Guard and Reserve who are being activated. One employer that refuses, despite this Web site, despite all these people who are working to stand behind the soldiers who were activated in the Guard and Reserve and to make up the difference in pay if they are paid less when they are activated than they were paid in civilian life. Who is this employer? Is this employer who won't listen to these calls for patriotic responsibility to the men and women in uniform? What employer in America, after all that these soldiers have been through, will not stand behind them and make up the difference in pay? That employer is the Federal Government of the United States.

One out of 10 Guard and Reserve serving today are Federal employees. The Federal Government refuses to make up the difference in pay for those who have had a cut in pay because they are risking their lives for America.

I have offered this amendment time and again. I don't understand why it gets killed in conference committee every time I offer this amendment. What employers come to the floor and say what a great idea it is. Yet when it goes to conference committee, it doesn't survive. This amendment brings the Federal Government into the 21st century and into line with countless other major employers. So many of America's top companies do the right thing for members of the National Guard and Reserve. So many of these are good patriotic corporate citizens in our private sector. But in the public sector, 24 States across the country, including the State of Illinois, provides the same income protection for their State government workers. Counties do it, cities do it, villages do it at great sacrifice, and we thank them for that.

This amendment simply allows the Federal Government to catch up with the times, to match what other major employers are already doing, and to provide the same type of income protection for our Federal Government citizen employees who also serve in the Guard and Reserve.

I propose this amendment because it is not clear that a real opportunity to
offer it will ever come on the Department of Defense authorization bill this year.

The Senate is on record as supporting this measure. We have passed it on three previous occasions. Two of those occasions were amendments to appropriations bills, such as the one before us.

This is the same language as reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee last Congress, except this version does not include any retroactivity provision. Though I personally support that, this amendment doesn’t go that far.

The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that this measure has a cost but not a budget score. It is not retroactive. It is prospective only and subject to available appropriations. The funds to provide this differential pay to these Federal employees in the Guard and Reserve can come from funds already appropriated to the agencies for salaries and expenses—four State governments do this. We have letters from those States attest to the fact that the benefit has required no additional appropriations.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have supported this measure in the past, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart for standing with our men and women in uniform.

Let me show data which is illustrative of what we are facing.

Recent data from the Department of Defense’s newest “Status of Forces Survey of Reserve Components” tells us that 51 percent of reservists lose income during mobilization, and 11 percent lose more than $2,500 per month.

So in addition to the sacrifice of being separated from their family, risking their lives in service to their country, many of them are taking substantial cuts in pay.

The new “Status of Forces Survey of Reserve Components” also reveals that income loss is one of the top factors cited by National Guard and Reserve components as reasons they might choose to stop serving in Reserve components. This is not only an injustice that we in the Federal Government are not making up the pay differential, it, in fact, is one of the reasons some in the Reserve and Guard say they are not going to re-up. We cannot retain their good services to our country because of the economic sacrifice which that service creates.

The Department of Defense operates a program called Employer Support of Guard and Reserve—ESGR for short—which recognizes and pays tribute to those patriotic, outstanding employers who go beyond the legal minimum job protections in support of their workers who are citizen soldiers. ESGR operates this Web site which lists 900 companies, nonprofits, and State and local governments which offer this pay differential to mobilized workers. Search our Government Web site, all you will, but you will not find the Federal Government on the list. We do not provide the same benefit to these men and women in service to our country as these other employers.

The number of employers providing this type of support to their workers in the National Guard and Reserve has grown over time. This great debt of gratitude for the love of country and devotion to our men and women in uniform, but the Federal Government is still not one of those employers.

I think this measure is long overdue. The Federal Government should not be lagging behind major corporations and roughly half of the governments of the States of the United States in terms of the quality of support for the men and women in the Guard and Reserve.

We should be a leader, not a follower. We should set the example right now with this amendment. We can fix this problem, and we can do it quickly.

Let me briefly make a few points for the benefit of any colleague who might continue to have reservations about this concept.

This measure does not bust the budget. Certainly, it results in some expenditures, but the money to make up for any lost income by these mobilized Federal employees is available from the funds already previously appropriated to the same agency the workers were serving in before they were activated. The money is already there. State governments that provide similar benefits to their workers do not have to make any additional appropriations to meet this responsibility.

Second, this measure is not additional pay for military service. Reserve component officers continue to receive the same military pay for the same military job. Any differential pay they receive from their Federal civilian employer is separate and apart from that and is simply intended to keep such employees financially whole while they are away. It is a reflection of the value they will provide again when they return.

The military pay a reservist gets during mobilization is for the military role he or she performs and is utterly unchanged by this amendment.

Third, the wisdom of this amendment is readily understandable by the entire force, whether Active Duty or Reserve. Many people ask how to explain to an Active-Duty soldier or his or her family why a Reserve soldier sharing the same foxhole—with an old colloquialism—performing the same duties, is allowed to draw both military pay as well as the lost portion of their civilian income. This is easy to explain and easy to understand.

Unlike Active component troops, Reserve component troops structure their lives and make their financial commitments based on their regular civilian income. These include their car payments, the kids’ tuition payments—everything in their financial picture is based on the income of a civilian life. When that income disappears during mobilization and is replaced by lower military income, the family suffers a real hardship.

The Active component family may not suffer that hardship. They understand that Reserve soldiers sharing the same foxhole—with the Active-Duty soldier or his or her family—are making a commitment to our troops. How can we comprehend all these other employers who go that far.

What we can do is adopt this amendment. I invite all my colleagues to come together once more to adopt the Reservist Pay Security Act, and I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, when this amendment is adopted, for goodness’ sake and for the sake of these soldiers, don’t kill it in conference committee. Stand by these soldiers all the way through the process. For years now, these soldiers have been shortchanged. It is time for us to make a difference in their lives and make a commitment to these great men and women.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Chafee). Is there a sufficient second?

At this moment, there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I withdraw that request and ask for the adoption of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1908. The amendment (No. 1908) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.
Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no further action on the Defense appropriations bill tonight.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that we go into a period for morning business.

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

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

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

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, here we go again, yes, here we go again. The fiscal year ends tomorrow at midnight. Only two of the annual appropriations bills required to fund the Federal Government have been sent to the President. This is deja vu all over again.

As a result, the Congress is rushing through the stopgap money measure called a continuing resolution in order to prevent a massive shutdown of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Is this the way to run a government? Is this the way to run a government.

The appropriations process is a very simple process, in reality. The President sends his recommendations to the Congress in the form of a budget, usually in early February. Subsequently, the Appropriations Committees in both houses of Congress meet to determine the amount of money that will fund critical investments in our schools, in our healthcare systems, and for our Nation’s transportation infrastructure? Are Senators not going to have the opportunity to debate bills that provide over $211 billion?

We need to debate each of these funding bills individually. We need to confer with them individually with our House counterparts—not just consider them as sub-parts of a large omnibus package. That is what I believe the chairman of the Appropriations Committee wants, and that is what I, too, would like to see happen. I urge my colleagues to work toward that goal.

It is unfortunate that most of the regular programs of the departments and agencies of Government will limp into the new fiscal year, which begins—when? this Saturday, the day after tomorrow, under the terms and conditions of a very restrictive continuing resolution. Here we are in the midst of one of the worst economic disasters to hit the United States, and only two regular appropriations bills have been enacted. One would think that the Congress would want to enact all of the annual appropriations bills before the beginning of the fiscal year so that the Federal agencies can hit the road running on October first and deal with the problems confronting the American people. Instead, we are enacting a very restrictive stop-gap measure that will prevent Government from shutting down. What a shame. It is very unfortunate that the House majority refused to fix the problem created by the continuing resolution for the Community Services Block Grant program, which provides critical healthcare and nutrition services to the neediest Americans. It is very unfortunate that, as we approach winter with fuel prices expected to grow dramatically, this continuing resolution reduces funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

In conclusion, I am disappointed that the appropriations bills have not been enacted on a timely basis. Having said that, I urge my colleagues to support the continuing resolution. We have no other choice.

I urge the leadership to call up the remaining appropriations bills, debate them, and send them to conference with the House. We have an obligation to the American people and to our hard-earned dollars. Debate and deliberation is the job of the Senate. The Senate is supposed to be about—debate and deliberation and amending.

The American people expect us to debate these bills and to protect their power to protect their hard-earned tax dollars. These matters should not be swept under a carpet somewhere. More, not less, transparency is needed in debating appropriations bills.

The Congress should have completed action on all the appropriations bills—not just two—on all the appropriations bills before the end of the fiscal year tomorrow night. Failing that, we should enact eleven individual, fiscally responsible annual appropriations bills before the termination of this continuing resolution on November eighteenth.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. 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.

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

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

IN REMEMBRANCE OF SAM VOLPENTEST

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate and pay tribute to the life of a great Washingtonian, a great American, and someone that I know even in the Nation’s Capital will be remembered for volunteering contributions. Yesterday, I learned of the death of Sam Volpentest, a resident of Washington State, who lived to be 101-year-old.

Sam has continued to play a leadership role in our State. We were all proud of the fact that we all attended his 100th birthday party last year and that for the last several months he has continued to play a vital role in the State of Washington on important economic issues.

I am proud to say that Sam was a friend, and I am grateful for his mentorship and his wisdom. My thoughts are with his family and the larger Tri-City community that mourn his loss. This is a man who had a list of unending accomplishments and literally touched thousands of lives of his fellow citizens. He changed the course of history in Washington State and left his mark on this Nation’s history, as well.

Sam’s legacy was one of generosity, of leadership, of commitment, of inspiration—important lessons for Washingtonians to still benefit from.
My remarks today cannot justify the significance of his contribution. Sam moved with his family from Seattle to the Tri-Cities in 1949 and went into business as a tavern owner. The Tri-Cities was just at the beginning the epicenter of the nuclear age, a sleepy little town transformed in a region from literally an agriculture and fishing economy centered on the Columbia River into a Federal booming town. It changed the course of our State and Nation’s history.

Central Washington was booming, and Sam thought it was the right place for a salesman like him and his family; so he went to work right away on community and business issues.

It was his vision for the community that he wanted to push the community and the representatives who came here to Washington and those in Washington, DC, to further see the future in Washington State.

Hanford had grown due to the Federal investment in the Manhattan Project and later in support of the Cold War. At that time, Sam, a former salesman and tavern owner, found himself rubbing shoulders with the likes of Senators Jackson and Magnuson, and stories about Sam. Scoop, and Maggie are numerous and legendary. I think this picture shows that even at that time, with my predecessors, Senator Warren Magnuson and Senator Scoop Jackson, Sam Volpentest even back then was right in the thick of things. The fact that he still consulted with Senator MURRAY and me up until the last several months showed his dedication to what this country needed to be focused on.

In 1949, Sam decided that Richland, WA—one of the Tri-Cities surrounding Hanford—looked too much like a construction camp. That is because it was a community that literally sprang up overnight out in the desert. Sam wanted that community to continue to grow.

The N-Reactor was one of the most critical investments in the Tri-Cities, with Sam Volpentest’s fingerprints on it. The Hanford site evolved as our Nation’s nuclear needs changed. Sam’s efforts helped to put a stay in the trend during the nuclear age, put Americans to work, improved the lives of those living in central Washington, and it played an incredible role for our country.

In the mid-1960s, as the nuclear age transitioned, Sam saw the writing on the wall: the Tri-Cities would need to evolve with it. As Hanford’s nuclear weapons material production activities began to slow, Sam’s vision drove him to change his strategy as well. I come back to a critical point I want to say. In the 1940s, as World War II raged in Asia, Europe, and North Africa, my State responded to the Federal Government’s call. As Federal investment grew during the early days of the Manhattan Project, this remote area of our State responded with the energy infrastructure that was so critical in helping launch the nuclear age. This work that Sam was a part of, won the nuclear reactor, the B Reactor, located in our State, played an incredibly vital role.

The reason I emphasize that is because Sam knew that goal was achieved, the region needed to keep playing an important role in our national security issues, and that was through the contributions of its workforce and materials needed throughout our time period post-World War II.

Our contribution and Sam’s continuing contribution was to make sure the Federal investment and cleanup work at Hanford was actually achieved. Sam knew that the Tri-Cities had a lot to offer our Nation, but he knew that vision was a role of diversity and that cleanup was part of it. So what did Sam do? He went about convincing Federal officials, private investment, and other resources to come to Hanford and explore more efficient ways to clean up the waste, and not just at our site in Washington State but around the world.

Sam’s vision led to a larger vision that has leveraged the workforce in the State of Washington. Those efforts led to the creation of our National Laboratories, the Pacific Northwest National Lab in the Tri-Cities. Today, Federal research dollars spur research and development in countless scientific areas—from proteomics research, nuclear materials cleanup, biofuels, and many more.

Sam did not just want to get the work done; he wanted the workforce and the community to be safe. Sam worked to further the economic development of the community through a variety of government and community organizations.

One of his most important projects was helping the business community get access to small business contracts that were being part of the Federal work commissioned at Hanford. Some of the most notable projects Sam Volpentest is responsible for in the Tri-Cities in Washington State are a six-story Federal building in Richland, the establishment of their investment in the Institute of National Laboratory, three freeways, twin bridges over the Columbia River, the N- Reactor Hanford Generating Plant, the Fast Flux Test Facility, the Life Sciences Laboratory and the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory, the Hanford House Red Lion Hotel, the Iowa Beef Processing Plant, and Sam’s namesake, the Volpentest HAMMER Training and Education Center.

This training center is probably one of Sam’s greatest accomplishments because it still today provides Hanford workers with real-time training in safety and response. The training facility now has trained countless first responders from governments all over our country and all over the world on how to respond to safety incidents from a more robust public participation. Sam’s efficiency at this training facility gives those who are first responders the on-the-job training they need.

Sam was often asked when he was going to retire—for example, whether it would be at age 65 or 75. He said: Why would I want to do that? Don’t you just love doing it? You can do for your community that has been so good to you. Get out there and do something. And even if you do it for free, it will make you feel great afterward.

That was Sam Volpentest, a great Washingtonian, a great member of our country. We will miss “Mr. Tri-Cities,” and we will try to live up to his legacy of accomplishment and continue to bring about a good cooperative relationship between a key part of Washington State, the great Tri-Cities, and our Federal Government, in making sure the Volpentest legacy continues.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

AMENDING THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thought the CR—the continuing resolution, as it is known around this place—was going to be laid down tonight. I guess it will not be laid down until tomorrow. But I will be offering an amendment the first thing in the morning on behalf of myself and a number of other cosponsors: Mr. KOHL, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BINGHAMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LUTENBERG, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ARAKA, Mr. FYOR, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. CANTWELL. I think by tomorrow morning we are going to be a lot more on this list.

It is basically a very simple amendment. All it says is:

Notwithstanding section 101 of this joint resolution, amounts are provided for making payments under the “Community Services Block Grant Act” at a rate not less than the amounts made available for such Act in fiscal year 2005.

Well, what that means is that this amendment, then, will continue the community services block grants at last year’s level.

Now, you might say: Well, wait a minute. Isn’t that what a continuing resolution does, it continues everything at last year’s level?

Well, we have a continuing resolution the likes of which I have never seen. I have not seen it in the last 10 years. I have asked my staff to go back 20 years or so to see if we had something like it. This is what the House has done. They have sent us a continuing resolution that continues funding either at last year’s level or at the House budget level, whichever is lower—whichever is
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lower. Now, what you will find out in there is that there are cuts in education, cuts to a whole lot of things. But most of those cuts do not take effect until next year. Education money goes out next summer. So for the continuing resolution, from now until what day of the month, I think it is the 15th or something like that—a couple months—they will not be hit. But there will be a 50-percent cut in the Community Services Block Grants, which means by Saturday they will be cut 50 percent right now.

Now, the occupant of the Chair, a former distinguished Governor of Virginia, I know he knows about the community services block grants. They do a lot in his State, as they do in our States: the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, housing, Head Start, transportation for the elderly, job search, all kinds of things, even helping low-income people apply for the earned income tax credit. There are a whole bunch of things done by Community Services Block Grants. It will be cut 50 percent, not next year, Saturday, Sunday. It will be a 50-percent cut immediately.

Now, I am going to read it into the Record this evening. I am sorry I have to keep the distinguished Senator in the chair for a little while tonight, but I think it is important for people to understand what we are doing here.

If this were just affecting programs like education, we are going to fix that by November, granted. But this is now. This happens now. The poorest of the poor in our country are going to get hit Saturday, Sunday, Monday, because of the wording of that continuing resolution, with a 50-percent cut, including victims of Hurricane Katrina, children all across the country.

We just had the mayor of Baton Rouge here the other day, Kip Holden. He was working for more money for community services block grants. When he found out from my staff what the continuing resolution did in cutting it 50 percent, he couldn’t believe it. He said they have been invaluable in assisting Katrina evacuees, getting things done that FEMA could not. He was up here pleading for more funding for community services block grants. He said it was beyond belief that Congress would be cutting this program at a time when it is most urgently needed. But that is exactly what the Congress will do if it passes this CR.

Once again, we are 1 day from the end of the fiscal year. Like an irresponsible schoolchild, the Congress has not completed its homework. It has finished 2 of the 11 appropriations bills. Why do we find ourselves once again in this sorry state of disarray? Consider the Labor-Health and Human Services appropriations bill, which is the bill that funds community services block grants. Very capable leadership of our distinguished chairman, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, our subcommittee did its job in a timely, orderly manner. We passed the Senate Labor-Health and Human Services—Education appropriations bill 2½ months ago, July 14. But once it left our committee, it seemed to disappear into a black hole. It hasn’t been brought up on the floor, not even scheduled to be brought up on the floor. This is the bill that funds the community services block grants.

We didn’t cut it. It was bipartisan. Republicans on the subcommittee and on the full Committee on Appropriations voted to continue the funding for community services block grants at last year’s level. Here we are, 1 day away from yet another end-of-fiscal-year train wreck. Like actual train wrecks, this one will have real human casualties and victims, real hardship. This has not been done before. I know no one is here. There are no more votes tonight. Senators have all gone home. But I will be back on this floor tomorrow. We get 30 minutes tomorrow morning, 30 minutes to do something to protect the poorest of the poor, those who have no one to fight for them, those who rely upon our community service agencies out there to help them get through a tough time, to provide the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program. Even in Virginia, as well as Iowa, up in the northern part of the country, cold weather is starting to set in. It is in the 30s at night. Pretty soon it will get down to freezing, in October and November. We are going to need to get LIHEAP money out to these people. How are we going to do it when we have cut funding 50 percent? We are not supposed to speak about the other body here, but what could have been on their minds in doing something like this?

Now we are going to bring this up tomorrow. I assume the leadership is going to want us to rubberstamp it, a continuing resolution that will mandate drastic cuts to these vital services for the poorest of the poor, rubberstamp it out of here, stampede 30 minutes of debate tomorrow. We will talk about it. We will rubberstamp it, and we will get on our planes and go home. We are comfortable. We are going to be able to afford heat. We will be able to afford food for our families. We don’t have anything to worry about. We make a lot of money around here. Eighty percent of this place is filled with millionaires. That is fine. We are comfortably wealthy.

Think about those who are not so comfortable. We are going to see devastating cuts. I mentioned serving victims of Hurricane Katrina. One hundred seventy-one thousand people, estimated to be there, those involved with the evacuees, 171,000 people are being served under the community services block grants right now. It is 50 percent, this weekend—not next year, now—a 50-percent cut now. I don’t know what to call this. Poor people are going to suffer.

For the record, in fiscal year 2005, the CSBG was funded at $637 million, $536.6 million, to be accurate. The House provided $320 million for next year. Therefore, under this continuing resolution, which says you either take last year’s level or the House level, whichever is less, that is what you do. Well, the House level is $320 million, a 50-percent cut.

I have a chart that shows the funding levels for community services block grants. In each of the last 3 years, it has been cut. The last time it was raised was in the fiscal year from 2001 to 2002 to $650 million. Ever since then, in fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005, it was cut from 650 to 645 to 642 to 636.6. Now they want to cut it in half. What is interesting about this chart is they want to cut it to $220 million. That is the level it was at in 1996. That is how much we provided in 1986 for the community services block grants.

I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed in the Record.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funding Level (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$646.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>642.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>645.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>650.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>651.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2000</td>
<td>627.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1999</td>
<td>608.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1998</td>
<td>688.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1997</td>
<td>696.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1996</td>
<td>696.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1995</td>
<td>685.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1994</td>
<td>685.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1993</td>
<td>670.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1992</td>
<td>645.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1991</td>
<td>643.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1990</td>
<td>630.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1989</td>
<td>616.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1988</td>
<td>395.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1987</td>
<td>386.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1986</td>
<td>396.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1985</td>
<td>395.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1984</td>
<td>318.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1983</td>
<td>342.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1982</td>
<td>394.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. HARKIN. We are saying to the poorest in our country: We are going to take you back to 1986. I have a modest proposal. Why don’t we take our Tax Code and move it back to 1986? Whatever people were paying in taxes, we will move everything back to then. How would the most comfortable in our society, the wealthiest, the richest, like that? I rather doubt that would be something you would ever accomplish around here. Yet for the poorest people in our country, we can take them back to 1986.

I have been here 30 years. I have never seen anything like this: 170,000 victims of Hurricane Katrina; in Texas, 72,000 evacuees have been served by this program; in Louisiana, more than 100,000 hurricane victims. Almost all the community action agencies in the impacted area were up and running by the second day after the storm. They were finding shelter, feeding people, clothing people, getting them medical attention. Now they are helping victims find employment. Community action agencies have been actively working with faith-based organizations all across the gulf coast to provide relief...
services. I mentioned what the mayor of Baton Rouge said. He was up here wanting to get more money for community services block grants. What does he get hit in the face with? Not only are you not getting more, they are cutting you in half. He couldn’t believe it.

Nationwide, this cut would eliminate or disrupt essential services for some 6.5 million low-income people, including nearly 2 million children. A majority of rural service centers will be closed, denying rural communities access to services. Many of the one-stop neighborhood centers in suburban and urban areas would also be shut down.

Here is a chart that gives you an idea of what this 50-percent cut means. I mentioned 6.5 million people, 2 million kids. Communities will lose 21 million CSBG-supported volunteers. These are the volunteers the CSBG people pull together to do things. These are volunteers, for example, volunteers their time to drive some elderly, low-income people to a community health center. These are good people, many of them church based, who volunteer their time to drive people to a meal for seniors. These are volunteers. They volunteer their time to take low-income kids to a Head Start Program, for example. They are volunteers doing good things, but they need someone to pull it together, organize it, manage it, and get the transportation. That is what CSBG does. So we are going to cut it by 50 percent.

These volunteers are going to say: I would like to volunteer my time to drive these elderly, but you don’t have any vehicle for me. Who is setting up the time? Who is making sure they are going to be there when I get there? No one. As a result, we are going to lose all these wonderful volunteers.

Private food banks all over the Nation rely on refrigerators and transportation supported by CSBG. Think about all of the food banks all over America that are already being stressed to the limit. They are supported by the community services block grants. Now we are going to cut them in half. What happens to the space, what happens to the refrigerators, the transportation? Several million Americans will lose nutritional services and emergency food—not next year; this is not prospective. This is next year.

The Next Steps Income Energy Assistance Program is administered by CSBG. This cut will reduce staff in half, while home heating costs are expected to rise 50 to 70 percent. Cold weather is coming. Heating costs are going up. The cut is 50 percent.

That is something we can be proud of right? We can be proud of what we are doing here. What a shame.

These cuts are callous, ill advised, and they are cruel. This is cruel. I have no other way to say it. They are cruel. It couldn’t come at a worse time. We know the rate of poverty is going up. Winter is coming on. We have had a couple of disasters, Rita and Katrina. What we are saying is, guess what, we are going to pull the rug out from under you. We are going to hurt you a little bit more. Maybe the House didn’t know what they were doing. Maybe they didn’t know this was in my amendment. My amendment does is, it simply continues the level at last year’s level. It ought to be increased by all rights. We know the number of Americans living in poverty has increased in each of the last 4 years. The number of community services block grants continues to decline. Each year, about 1 million more people qualify for community services block grant services. There is not any money to meet their needs right now. As bad as this is, the picture I am painting, right now community service agencies provide services to only 1 in 5 people in poverty; with $836 million, 1 in 5 are served. Now we are going to take that down even more.

I don’t know if the majority party in this Congress again and again proposes to slash programs from those who have the least in our society while adamantly insisting that tax cuts for the most fortunate are untouched and unsurpassed. We can’t touch them.

We all recognize that after 4 years of tax cuts, war and emergency spending, budget deficits are out of control. We all know this must be addressed, including with appropriate spending cuts. But I want to ask, why are we asking the poor to bear the lion’s share of the burden when it comes cutting the funding? Why are they on the front line? Why are they being cut this weekend? I object to repeated efforts by the majority party in this Congress to try to balance the budget on the backs of the poor. Even before Katrina struck, the majority party was already planning to slash food stamps by $3 billion and Medicaid by $10 billion. Katrina stopped that.

But who is the target of spending cuts? The poor, those who rely on Federal programs for health, education, disability, and veterans benefits.

Last week, a group of House Republicans launched what they call Operation Offset. They insist that all of the tax cuts of the last 4 years are off limits and untouchable, including the huge tax cuts for the most privileged and wealthy people in our society. Instead, they want to use their pay for Katrina recovery by slashing programs for the least fortunate among us, including deep cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts to the School Lunch Program, cuts to the Children’s Health Insurance Program, cuts in college aid, needy students, and on and on.

In short, with the leadership in this Congress, tax reductions for the rich are sacred and cannot be touched, while programs for the poor are fair game for deep cuts. I object. I object to this. I object to the way that majority of Americans reject this approach also. It offends their sense of fairness and equity.

This has to stop, and this is the place to stop it on this continuing resolution. We have to stop this one. This is so unconscionable. I don’t know how anyone could ever feel good about this or feel we have done our job.

It is unconscionable and it is cruel to cut the community services block grants in this manner.

I know what people are going to say tomorrow. They are going to come out and say: Well, the House passed the continuing resolution and they have gone home. If my amendment is adopted, why, it has to go back to the House and they went home, and we will be accused of shutting down the Government.

Mr. President, I am sorry. The House of Representatives can come back on Palm Sunday. On Palm Sunday, they can come back to vote on the Terri Schiavo situation. Regardless of what you think about it, right or wrong, I am saying, if they can call the House back for that, if they can do that, they can call the House back to protect the poorest in our society from the cuts in the CSBG. We can call the Senate, call the House back, and they can vote on it. We would not be shutting the Government down. If the House does not want to come back, they will be shutting the Government down. We are supposed to put a knife in the backs of the poorest in our country because the House did this? They can come back. We ought to force them to come back. We ought to force them to do what is right.

It is up to us in this body to have the correct response. We have to seize this opportunity and correct the misplaced priorities of the last 5 years and correct this one.

Mr. President, I am sorry. The House that this is perfectly fine with me, I don’t know how anyone could ever feel good about this or feel we have done our job.

Let me repeat that. You may not have gotten it the first time. President Bush said on September 15: We have a duty to confront poverty with bold action.

Let me repeat that. You may not have gotten it the first time. President Bush said on September 15:

We have a duty to confront poverty with bold action.

OK, so what we are going to do is pass a continuing resolution that cuts community services block grants by 50 percent—starting this weekend—that service the poor in our country. They are going to cut it by 50 percent. I guess that is pretty bold action. I guess they are going to confront poverty with bold action; yes, they are going to make more poor people. We have a duty to confront poverty with bold action.

I wonder if the President knows this. I wonder if anyone around the President has told him what the House did. I wonder if he is saying: Yes, that is the thing to do. Is the President okaying this? Has he sent word to the House that this is perfectly fine with him, that this conforms with what he said last week?

I would like to hear from the President on this one. I would like to hear if he supports cutting community services block grants by 50 percent.
The result of a Continuing Resolution as proposed, which would be the reduction of CSBG funds by 50 percent. Ozarks Action, Inc., located in rural Southern Missouri (Douglas, Howell, Ozark, Oregon, Texas and Wright counties), would be faced with reducing its current staffing levels by 50%. As a result many of the services to low-income families would be unavailable.

Currently we have staff located in 10 communities on a full time basis in each of these six counties. The reduction would mean that 3 [full-time] would be reduced. The issue then becomes which of the six counties no longer will be served or will have significantly reduced services.

In addition to serving the resident low-income population in this high poverty service area, these ten staff carry out the function of providing services to those individuals that have come to the area as a result of the two devastating hurricanes (Rita and Katrina). CSBG staff also conducts LIHEAP services for both the Energy Assistance program as well as providing the emergency energy services.

I did not mention that. Sometimes low-income families especially those who have money, get caught with the first or second cold snap. They have not thought ahead, and maybe they don’t have enough oil in the tank. They need some help right away. They don’t have credit, and they don’t have money. The community services block grants provide for that, to get them enough fuel oil, heating oil—whatever it might be—to get them through that snap. They say:

This in and of itself will put a large burden on the State to provide adequate service to those in need of energy assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Ozark Action, Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

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

**OZARK ACTION, INC.,** West Plains, MO.

The result of a Continuing Resolution as proposed, which would be the reduction of CSBG funds by 50%, Ozarks Action, Inc., located in rural Southern Missouri (Douglas, Howell, Ozark, Oregon, Texas and Wright counties), would be faced with reducing its current staffing levels by 50%. As a result many of the services to low-income families would be unavailable.

Currently we have staff located in 10 communities on a full time basis in these six counties. The reduction would mean that about 5 fte’s would be reduced. The issue then becomes which of the six counties no longer will be served or will have significantly reduced services.

In addition to serving the resident low-income population in this high poverty service area, these ten staff carry out the function of providing services to those individuals that have come to the area as a result of the two devastating hurricanes (Rita and Katrina). In Howell County, which has seen approximately 15 to 20 evacuee families, Ozark Action is operating as the clearinghouse and information hub for needs and services. This service would no longer be available through that snap. They say:

This will require more volunteers for clients who are home bound. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated. We will put individuals receive through the EITC program.

CSBG Funds are used also, in a variety of ways, to support other agency programs where their own funding is inadequate. All such support would of necessity cease.

Sincerely,

**BRYAN ADCOCK,**
Executive Director, OAI.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have another letter from East Missouri Action Agency, again outlining what is going to happen here.

In the event that a continuing resolution is passed which would effectively fund CSBG at the FY-06 House appropriations level—

A cut of 50 percent—

serious cuts in services provided to low-income families in Southeast Missouri would occur. . . .

In-home visits will no longer be a priority. This will require more volunteers for clients who are home bound. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated.

[East Missouri Action Agency] serves as the point of service for most other helping agency with little or no follow-up. Partnerships with these other organizations will be in jeopardy because we will not have the staff to effectively work with them.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, people say, What do community services block grants do? Here are some of their activities: Parenting education to 175,000 parents; Head Start families, helping people be good parents; transportation for elderly; chore services for homebound elderly. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated.

In-home visits will no longer be a priority. This will require more volunteers for clients who are home bound. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated.

[East Missouri Action Agency] serves as the point of service for most other helping organizations in seven of our eight counties. . . .

We have the staff to effectively work with them.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the East Missouri Action Agency also be printed in the RECORD.

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

**EAST MISSOURI ACTION AGENCY, INC.,**
BOLLINGER, CAFI GIRARDEAU, IRON, MADISON, PERRY, ST. FRANCISO, STE. GENEVIVRE, & WASHINGTON COUNTIES

IMPACT OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION AT HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS LEVEL

In the event that a continuing resolution is passed which would effectively fund CSBG at the FY-06 House appropriations level, serious cuts in services currently provided to low-income families of Southeast Missouri would occur.

1. Working with families and individuals in out-of-case management situations to help them achieve self-sufficiency and providing projects to assist them in this effort will have to be eliminated. The remaining resources will have to be expended doing only emergency services.

2. EMMA serves as the point of service for most other helping organizations in seven of our eight counties. EMMA serves as the clearinghouse and screener for emergency services throughout the county. There will be no time for discussion of the underlying causes of the emergency situation with these families. Families will be referred to the other helping agency with little or no follow-up. Partnerships with these other organizations will be in jeopardy, because we will not have the staff to effectively work with them.

3. As just recently seen with Hurricane Katrina, EMMA was one of hundreds of CAs mobilized relief efforts even before several of the national charitable organizations and the Federal Government itself mobilized. CAs have always had the flexibility to rise to the need in these situations, however, with this cut, that ability is gone.

4. Community Change projects such as, re- sident development, market research, career education, housing development, community gardening, emergency service coordination networks, leadership development, childcare development, and other projects to improve the community at large will be greatly scaled back due to the lack of funding.

5. In-home visits will no longer be a priority. This will require more volunteers for clients who are home bound. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated.

In-home visits will no longer be a priority. This will require more volunteers for clients who are home bound. Other catalytic activities such as life skills training workshops will be scaled back if not totally eliminated.

Yo
Iowa, this is the time of the year temperatures are starting to drop and food supplies are running short as gardens stop producing. I think I just picked the last tomato off my tomato plant last week.

Without the ability to take and process applications and provide assistance, the LIHEAP program year starts October 1. That is what, Saturday? That is Saturday. The LIHEAP program year starts October 1, Saturday.

In northeast Iowa, the CAA there faces an inability to ensure that those in poverty will continue to receive home heating assistance and food assistance. If CSBG is reduced—this is southeast Iowa—by 50 percent, the agency will have to reduce staff and close one very rural outreach center. That will mean clients who need emergency assistance for food, utilities, disconnect notices would have to drive about 45 miles to apply for assistance. These are people who probably do not have even transportation. They do not own cars.

The centers—I am reading here from the report—are terribly busy with the increase in the number of families coming to the outreach centers because they have nowhere to go to become homeless, have a disconnect notice from their utilities or their utilities have already been disconnected.

President Bush, September 15, 2005:

We have a duty to confront poverty with bold action.

I hope someone in the bowels of the White House is listening to a little bit of my remarks. They do not have to buy it all. I hope they listen to a little bit of it. I hope that something will click up in one of those heads in the White House and say: Wait a minute. Is Harkin right? Could this possibly be happening? He must be wrong. He is just up there doing his thing. But just in case, we better check on it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.

So they are going to be a little uncomfortable—oh, my goodness. I assume some Congressmen have probably gotten on a plane, and they went someplace, they have gone home. My goodness, they will have to get on an airplane—not at their expense. The Government will pay for it. They do not have to pay anything for it. They have to go to an airport, get on an airplane, fly back to Washington, put on a suit and tie and go back to the House floor and correct this. I know it is a terrible burden. It is a terrible thing to ask of someone making $160,000 a year, or whatever we make around here now.

Well, I jest, tongue in cheek. It is not too much to ask. They should do it, and the President should tell them to do it. Come back and fix it. Do not let him hanging out there having said this and then turn around and expect me to sign a continuing resolution that cuts the poverty guideline.

That is what we would be saying. He said that last week. Now he is going to get something and he has to sign it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.

So they are going to be a little uncomfortable—oh, my goodness. I assume some Congressmen have probably gotten on a plane, and they went someplace, they have gone home. My goodness, they will have to get on an airplane—not at their expense. The Government will pay for it. They do not have to pay anything for it. They have to go to an airport, get on an airplane, fly back to Washington, put on a suit and tie and go back to the House floor and correct this. I know it is a terrible burden. It is a terrible thing to ask of someone making $160,000 a year, or whatever we make around here now.

Well, I jest, tongue in cheek. It is not too much to ask. They should do it, and the President should tell them to do it. Come back and fix it. Do not let him hanging out there having said this and then turn around and expect me to sign a continuing resolution that cuts the poverty guideline.

That is what we would be saying. He said that last week. Now he is going to get something and he has to sign it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.

So they are going to be a little uncomfortable—oh, my goodness. I assume some Congressmen have probably gotten on a plane, and they went someplace, they have gone home. My goodness, they will have to get on an airplane—not at their expense. The Government will pay for it. They do not have to pay anything for it. They have to go to an airport, get on an airplane, fly back to Washington, put on a suit and tie and go back to the House floor and correct this. I know it is a terrible burden. It is a terrible thing to ask of someone making $160,000 a year, or whatever we make around here now.

Well, I jest, tongue in cheek. It is not too much to ask. They should do it, and the President should tell them to do it. Come back and fix it. Do not let him hanging out there having said this and then turn around and expect me to sign a continuing resolution that cuts the poverty guideline.

That is what we would be saying. He said that last week. Now he is going to get something and he has to sign it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.

So they are going to be a little uncomfortable—oh, my goodness. I assume some Congressmen have probably gotten on a plane, and they went someplace, they have gone home. My goodness, they will have to get on an airplane—not at their expense. The Government will pay for it. They do not have to pay anything for it. They have to go to an airport, get on an airplane, fly back to Washington, put on a suit and tie and go back to the House floor and correct this. I know it is a terrible burden. It is a terrible thing to ask of someone making $160,000 a year, or whatever we make around here now.

Well, I jest, tongue in cheek. It is not too much to ask. They should do it, and the President should tell them to do it. Come back and fix it. Do not let him hanging out there having said this and then turn around and expect me to sign a continuing resolution that cuts the poverty guideline.

That is what we would be saying. He said that last week. Now he is going to get something and he has to sign it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.

So they are going to be a little uncomfortable—oh, my goodness. I assume some Congressmen have probably gotten on a plane, and they went someplace, they have gone home. My goodness, they will have to get on an airplane—not at their expense. The Government will pay for it. They do not have to pay anything for it. They have to go to an airport, get on an airplane, fly back to Washington, put on a suit and tie and go back to the House floor and correct this. I know it is a terrible burden. It is a terrible thing to ask of someone making $160,000 a year, or whatever we make around here now.

Well, I jest, tongue in cheek. It is not too much to ask. They should do it, and the President should tell them to do it. Come back and fix it. Do not let him hanging out there having said this and then turn around and expect me to sign a continuing resolution that cuts the poverty guideline.

That is what we would be saying. He said that last week. Now he is going to get something and he has to sign it. I would hope the President might get on the phone or at least have his Chief of Staff do and tell them we have to fix this. If it means the House of Representatives comes back on Friday afternoon or Friday evening or Saturday morning to fix it, so be it.
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we live up to what the President said a week ago. This is not even bold action. This is continuing to do what we have been doing in the last year. It is not too much to ask. It is time that we made the comfortable a little bit uncomfortable and we can give the uncom- fortable a little bit of comfort to those who are uncomfortable.

We will be voting on this tomorrow. I hope that Senators will not be swayed by this. “Well, we cannot do this because the House has gone home.” Well, let us comfort the uncomfortable. Let us give the one of the poor we are not going to leave them in the lurch, we are not going to cut them by 50 percent, and let us have them come back and fix this tomorrow night. They can do it.

I appreciate the indulgence of the occupant of the chair for allowing me to talk about my amendment because I will not have much time in the morning. I only have 30 minutes. Some other people may want to talk. I know no one in the Senate watching and feeling as I will be back tomorrow morning. In a more succinct manner, obviously, to lay out this case on why we have to adopt an amendment to keep the community services block grants at last year’s level.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

REIMBURSING CHARITABLE WORK

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, earlier this week the Washington Post reported that the Federal Emergency Management Agency was making plans to “reimburse churches and other organizations that have opened their doors to provide shelter, food and supplies to survivors of hurricanes Katrina and Rita.”

I understand FEMA’s good intentions here, but we need to be very careful. There may be extraordinary circumstances when FEMA may need to rent buildings that might happen to belong to a church or mosque or synagogue. And I understand that under both Presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton, there have been appropriate ways to provide charitable choice and to fund faith-based organizations. I support that. I am currently working with Senators on both sides of the aisle on our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on legislation to help all of Katrina’s 372,000 displaced schoolchildren, including some who are enrolled in private and even religious schools. But the kind of reimbursement described in the Washington Post article makes me want to waive three yellow flags and two red ones.

One obvious concern is constitutional. The first amendment says that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Paying churches for work they choose to undertake as churches raises obvious questions. That is not my major concern. My major concern is making sure that we honor what it has always been one of the things that makes this a unique country. Our forefathers would be dumbfounded to think that if a neighbor’s barn burned down and the community joined together to rebuild it, that they would expect a check from Washington, DC to pay them back.

In that same Washington Post article, Reverend Robert E. Reccord of the Southern Baptist Convention helped put this in balance when he said:

Volunteer labor is just that: volunteer. We would never ask the government to pay for it.

At my church in Nashville, Westminster Presbyterian, where I am an elder, we took up a collection for the victims of Katrina and raised about $90,000 in cash. We then filled up the back of a truck with diapers and Clorox and other necessities, and our associate pastor went down there with that truck for a few weeks to help people in need. Are we now supposed to send the Federal Government a bill for the food and the supplies and three weeks of the pastor’s salary? Of course not. No one in our church expects that, nor should they.

So churches and synagogues and mosques and religious organizations that are being good neighbors aren’t looking for a Government handout. They are looking to lend a hand. We should respect them. We should thank them. They are performing an invaluable service. We encourage them by providing tax incentives for charitable giving. But we should also remember that virtue is its own reward and that some rewards are in heaven, and we should be very careful before we start reimbursing churches for their charity.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
FEMA PLANS TO REIMBURSE FAITH GROUPS FOR AID—AS CIVIL LIBERATARIANS OBJECT, RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS WEIGH WHETHER TO APPLY  
(Alain Cooperman and Elizabeth Williamson)  

After weeks of prodging by Republican lawmakers and the American Red Cross, the Federal Emergency Management Agency said yesterday that it will use taxpayer money to reimburse churches and other religious organizations that have opened their doors to hurricane survivors. FEMA said it will follow the lead of the American Red Cross, which has already paid for the cost of running about 600 churches that took in evacuees, and for most religious groups helping to cope with a domestic natural disaster.

“I believe it’s appropriate for the federal government to assist the faith community because of the scale and scope of the effort of how long it’s lasting,” said Joe Becker, senior vice president for preparedness and response with the Red Cross.

Civil liberties groups called the decision a violation of the traditional boundary between church and state, accusing FEMA of trying to bolster its shattered reputation by playing to religious conservatives.

“The really rests my head about this all, is here is an administration that didn’t do its job and is now trying to make right-wing groups happy,” said the Rev. Barry W. Lynn, executive director of Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

FEMA officials said religious organizations would be eligible for payments only if they operated emergency shelters and food distribution centers within the affected areas. All requests for state or local governments in the three states that have declared emergencies—Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama—will receive reimbursement.

“The need was so overwhelming that the faith-based groups stepped up, and we’re trying to find a way to help them shoulder some of the burden for doing the right thing,” said Janet Lynn, the Salvation Army’s general secretary.

Lynn said both the organization and the federal government are aware that “part of our effort is getting the local governments to be interested in being their sponsor.”

A spokesperson for the Salvation Army said it has been in talks with state and federal officials about reimbursement for the 76,000 nights of shelter it has provided to Katrina survivors so far. But it is still unclear whether the Salvation Army will qualify, she said.

The Rev. Flip Benham, director of Operation Rescue, said the decision presents a quandary. Some groups, he said, will apply for federal reimbursement, “but that part of our effort is getting the local governments to be interested in being their sponsor.”

Meanwhile, other religious and secular groups were still trying to find a way to help them shoulder some of the burden for doing the right thing.

Religious groups, like secular nonprofit groups, will have to document their costs and file for reimbursement from state and local emergency management agencies, which in turn will seek funds from FEMA.

David Fukitomi, infrastructure coordinator for FEMA in Louisiana, said the organization has begun briefing for potential applicants and said it is too early to know how many will take advantage of the program.

“Federal reimbursement is inappropriate. We’ve explained about using a religious organization as a distribution point for food or clothing or anything else,” Lynn said. But “direct cash reimbursements would be unprecedented.”

FEMA outlined the policy in a Sept. 9 internal memorandum on “Eligible Costs for Emergency Sheltering Declarations.” Religious groups, like secular nonprofit groups, will have to document their costs and file for reimbursement from state and local emergency management agencies, which in turn will seek funds from FEMA.

Lynn added that he accepts the need for the government to coordinate with religious groups in a major disaster, but not to “pay for their good works.”

“We’ve explained about using a religious organization as a distribution point for food or clothing or anything else,” Lynn said. But “direct cash reimbursements would be unprecedented.”

FEMA outlined the policy in a Sept. 9 internal memorandum on “Eligible Costs for Emergency Sheltering Declarations.” Religious groups, like secular nonprofit groups, will have to document their costs and file for reimbursement from state and local emergency management agencies, which in turn will seek funds from FEMA.

Lynn added that he accepts the need for the government to coordinate with religious groups in a major disaster, but not to “pay for their good works.”

“We’ve explained about using a religious organization as a distribution point for food or clothing or anything else,” Lynn said. But “direct cash reimbursements would be unprecedented.”

FEMA outlined the policy in a Sept. 9 internal memorandum on “Eligible Costs for Emergency Sheltering Declarations.” Religious groups, like secular nonprofit groups, will have to document their costs and file for reimbursement from state and local emergency management agencies, which in turn will seek funds from FEMA.

Lynn added that he accepts the need for the government to coordinate with religious groups in a major disaster, but not to “pay for their good works.”

“We’ve explained about using a religious organization as a distribution point for food or clothing or anything else,” Lynn said. But “direct cash reimbursements would be unprecedented.”

FEMA outlined the policy in a Sept. 9 internal memorandum on “Eligible Costs for Emergency Sheltering Declarations.” Religious groups, like secular nonprofit groups, will have to document their costs and file for reimbursement from state and local emergency management agencies, which in turn will seek funds from FEMA.
Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Senator Smith is ordered to be printed in the Record.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator 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 October 31, 2002, Patrick Vogrich was convicted of murder on the side of Chicago, IL. The apparent motivation wasEnviar consejos y de la política de ayuda internacional. Así que no hay fronteras y se puede propagar.

Hasta donde yo sé, el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos tiene como primer deber proteger a sus ciudadanos, que son parte de los problemas que salen a la luz pública. El Tratamiento Legal de la Enfermedad de la Vida y la Economía. Además, la enfermedad de la vida que afecta a nuestra industria y economía. Por lo tanto, enfermedad que afecta a nuestro mundo necesita de soluciones internacionales.

El agua es un recurso que debemos conservar y proteger. El agua es un factor esencial para mantener la vida. Debemos hacer todo lo posible para proteger el agua y garantizar que esté disponible para todos en el mundo.

Se debe tener en cuenta que una política internacional es esencial para abordar estos retos globales. Debemos trabajar juntos para encontrar soluciones que beneficien a todos los países y garantizar que el agua esté disponible para todos.
This point has been hammered home by a report to be released by the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Sandia National Laboratories today. The report reinforces what any organization addressing international water issues already knows: the local community must accept, maintain and take responsibility for the solution to their water issues. There are several initiatives in place in our country that are helping local communities across the globe in this regard.

The Department of Energy National Laboratories have tested tools and techniques for improving our domestic capacity in the desert southwest. The labs have shared that information with institutions around the globe to help strengthen local capacity.

As an example, Sandia National Laboratories’ efforts to create new technologies to address major U.S. water issues are being applied to critical water issues in strategically important Middle East. Ongoing interactions with Iraq, Jordan, Libya and Israel are helping address water safety, security and sustainability issues with technologies in water management modeling and other quality monitoring and desalination.

Sandia is also working to rebuild Iraq’s science and technology capacity in collaboration with the Arab Science and Technology Foundation and the Department of Energy and Science. Last week in Amman, Jordan, Sandia co-hosted a meeting where proposals developed by Iraqi scientists and their international collaborators were reviewed and presented to international funding agencies. Two such proposals for improving water resources management in Iraq were presented by Sandia staff and their Iraqi counterparts.

Separately, Sandia is working with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to develop a proposed planning framework for water management in Iraq. This framework will utilize an advanced water management model developed at Sandia coupled with training of Iraqi water managers and scientists. This proposed framework is expected to be presented to Iraq’s Ministry of Water in November.

In other areas, Sandia has reached a preliminary agreement with the Royal Scientific Society, RSS, in Jordan to pilot test a new technology for real-time collaborative development of water management models over the Internet. This technology will enable U.S. and Jordanian water experts to jointly assemble, test and deploy water management models, work together, real-time while half a world apart. Sandia has also developed a proposal with the Jordanians to pilot test real-time water quality monitoring technology utilizing Sandia’s chem-lab-on-a-chip technologies in Libya.

In Libya, Sandia is working on a program with the Departments of Energy and State to refocus former Libyan weapons scientists on development of peaceful technologies that will enable Libya to develop a strong, internationally-recognized economy. Water is a very high priority for the Libyans, and they are reconfiguring their former weapons development laboratories into a facility they will use to develop Energy and Water Desalination Research Center. Sandia is helping identify desalination technologies for use in Libya, with particular attention to technologies for treating the brackish water that Libya produces as a by-product of pumping oil and gas.

Further, Israeli water experts came to Sandia in 2003 to learn about water security. The trip led to a series of visits between Israeli water security experts, the Environmental Protection Agency’s National Homeland Security Research Center, and Sandia. These interactions resulted in a collaborative proposal to test Sandia’s real-time, chem-lab-on-a-chip water quality monitoring technology in Israel’s water supply system.

Congress helped develop these tools by allowing the Department of Energy Laboratories to use part of their resources for laboratory directed research. In the case of Sandia, these seed funds have produced sensor technologies to test water for contaminants and terror agents, numerical models to help groups jointly manage and plan for the future and real-time water quality monitoring technologies that may reduce costs and make impaired water available for beneficial uses, and tools to detect and respond to terrorist attacks in our municipal drinking water systems. These seed projects have then been extended and are coming to fruition under direct funding we have provided through the Department of Energy, DOE.

The work at Sandia National Laboratories does not represent a comprehensive list of the advances within the DOE. In fact, twelve of our national laboratories, all of whom have worked to expand and protect water supplies in some way, have worked jointly for three years to develop an outline of the ways water and energy resources are inter-related. These institutions are now working under DOE direction to develop a report to Congress on this interdependency, which I believe will help us determine which programs will most effectively ensure sufficient water supplies to support our energy needs and sufficient energy supplies to meet our water needs.

Additionally, these national laboratories are now working with both Federal and non-Federal institutions around the U.S. to develop a technology development roadmap. This effort will clearly identify our highest priority investments in research, development and commercialization so we can expand our nations’ water supplies. The DOE proposals led to a bill that has caused us to authorize a new DOE program as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This program is broad. I believe that overall it will help resolve problems related to water just as we are working to resolve our energy supply problems. I am particularly interested in the technology development aspects of the program and therefore plan to introduce a bill soon to instruct the DOE to develop peaceful technologies for improvement and commercialization. A similar bill was introduced last Congress in partnership with Members from the House, and I have high hope that working together we can pass legislation this Congress.

I must note that DOE efforts are not the only activities that can assist the U.S. in addressing international water issues. The Bureau of Reclamation has a 30-year history of developing desalination technologies that have a significant international impact. The Bureau’s reputation and capabilities in this area cannot be underestimated, and I hope the administration will develop a long-term strategy for use and expansion of those efforts.

I have supported the Office of Naval Research’s efforts to develop mobile water treatment technology for our troops. This technology has proven its worth by being deployed to Mississippi in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Additionally, my colleague and friend, Majority Leader Frist, introduced legislation this spring entitled the “Safe Water Currency for Peace Act of 2005,” S.492, which directs the Department of State to develop a comprehensive international water development policy and then to begin to implement that strategy. This policy effort holds strong promise for the future of water as well.

I believe and remain a champion of the need to look ahead, to see the future of water supplies in this nation and the world and to actively prepare for that future. I have said before, and I still believe, that there is no more important or essential substance to us than water. It is the source from which life springs. It also has the potential to be the source of incredible conflict at both local and international levels. Fresh water supplies are coming under pressure all over the globe. Seriously confronting this problem before it leads to tremendous burdens on this nation and the world is an endeavor as worthwhile as any I can contemplate.

The need is great. The goal is good. The initiatives I have discussed today, and others I will dream, can help us confront this problem.

AVIAN INFLUENZA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support and cosponsor Senator HARKIN’s amendment aimed at enhancing our capability to combat an avian flu pandemic. This amendment provides absolutely crucial funding for key items that will clearly be needed to fight this menace: a substantial stockpile of the only antiviral medication effective against H5N1 flu; expansion of the ability of our State and
local public health departments, which are the first line of defense against flu, to meet the threat; increased global surveillance for dangerous pathogens to pick up the first signs of a spreading epidemic, a priority issue that Senator Frist and I have worked on for several years; improving our country’s infrastructure for vaccine manufacture, which is sorely deficient; and money for communication and outreach, so we can have everybody prepared and on the same page.

We are all concerned about preparation for bioterrorist attacks. Smallpox, anthrax, plague, and other pathogens may be coming down the road at some point. But the public health experts tell us that H5N1 avian flu has already started down the road. It is not in the U.S. yet, and the scientists don’t know when it might get here, but it is heading in our direction. The avian flu virus is spreading throughout Asia, carried by migratory waterfowl with a worldwide reach. The virus is continuously changing and adapting, heading toward the human-to-human transmission capability that could trigger a pandemic.

And we do know from the first 100 human cases, which have been limited so far to Southeast Asia, that this stuff is really lethal, with a case-fatality rate approaching 50 percent. By contrast, the deadly 1918 Spanish flu that killed millions of people had a case-fatality rate of only 2 percent. We’re talking about a threat to this Nation as big as any we have faced.

Fortunately, we have a good idea of the measures we need to take to mitigate the impact of avian flu. But these measures cost money and have a significant lag time before they can be put in place. Many of these measures require resources only available in foreign countries. We don’t know how much time we have got, and we have got to get moving on this right now. We really can’t wait weeks and months for the “right” appropriation bill, for some “advisory committee” to finish its work, or for the completion of a “comprehensive” antiterror plan. The responsible, prudent move is to act now, to start putting in place the countermeasures that we know will work if implemented in time. The old philosopher who said that “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” may not have known anything about RNA viruses, but that advice would seem quite applicable to our current situation.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Con. Res. 95, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2005 budget through September 13, 2005. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2006 concurrent resolution on the budget, H. Con. Res. 95.

The estimates show that current level spending is over the budget resolution by $3.145 billion in budget authority and over the budget resolution by $101 million in outlays in 2005. Current level for revenues is $447 million above the budget resolution in 2005.
TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF SEPTEMBER 23, 2005—Continued (In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (P.L. 109-59)</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-61)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Acts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 106-54)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, enacted this session: 7,193 | 177 | 81 |
Total Current Level: 3,145 | 101 | 447 |
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements: 3,046 | 96 | 0 |
Adjusted Budget Resolution: 0 | 44 | 0 |
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution: 0 | 44 | 0 |
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution: 0 | 44 | 0 |

Notes: See explanation in appropriation sections.

1 The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolutions assumptions.
2 Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes $81,140 million in budget authority and $33,034 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13), $15,500 million in budget authority and $150 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act to Meet Immediate Needs Arising From the Consequences of Hurricane Katrina, 2005 (P.L. 109-61), and $53,800 in budget authority and $25 million in outlays from the DTV Act and the Emergency Communications Act.
3 Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.
4 H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed the enactment of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005, in the amount of $81,811 million in budget authority and $33,121 million in outlays, which would be exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level excludes the emergency appropriations in P.L. 109-13 (see footnote 2), the amounts specified in the budget resolution have also been modified to reflect this.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
satellites, wireless and terrestrial-based systems. They will evaluate all available public and private resources that could provide such a system and submit a report to Congress detailing the findings.

The DHS is then authorized to request appropriations to implement the system. Congress would then be in position to put in place whatever programs and funding are needed to get the job done. We have myriad day-to-day communications issues to address. I am addressing these needs. As was pointed out by a witness in the Commerce Committee’s morning hearing, we have major problems with interoperability within a particular agency that must be addressed before we can seriously tackle “operability”—communicating across jurisdictions and among different agencies.

However, we must also take steps to address an immediate crisis. We must ensure that we can respond in emergency with an eye toward building a reliable, redundant system for the long term. It is my hope that the Congress will consider this proposal, and other relevant proposals, before we recess for the year. I look forward to working with my colleagues in that regard.

The Pontifical Visit of His Holiness Aram I

Mr. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize the Pontifical Visit of His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia, to my home State of California in October, 2005.

The Catholicos represents the Great House of Cilicia, an historic Armenian religious center established in 1411. The Catholicosate relocated to Antelias, Lebanon following the atrocities of the Armenian Genocide, which included destruction of houses of worship in Cilicia. Today, His Holiness Aram I represents hundreds of thousands of Armenians across the Near East. The Armenian faith is 1,700 years old and it is significant that Armenia was the first nation to officially adopt Christianity as a state religion in 301 AD.

The Catholicos’ spiritual, cultural and educational influence extends well beyond the Armenian people. His Holiness Aram I, who holds a Master of Divinity, a Master of Sacred Theology, a Ph.D., and several honorary degrees, has authored numerous articles and texts on Armenian church, some of which have been translated into other languages. The Catholicos has worked to strengthen interfaith relations between Christian and Muslim communities. In 1974, the Catholicos was one of the founders of the Middle East Council of Churches.

His Holiness Aram I was elected as Moderator of the Central and Executive Committees of the World Council of Churches, WCC, a renowned organization which represents over 400 million Christians worldwide. The WCC brings together over 340 churches and denominations in more than 100 countries throughout the world. The Catholicos is the first Orthodox, first Middle Easterner and youngest person to hold this position and his unanimous re-election as Moderator in 1998 was exceptional in the history of the WCC.

During his trip to California, which is titled “Towards the Light of Knowledge,” the Catholicos will visit churches as well as educational and cultural institutions in Los Angeles, Fresno and San Francisco. This momentous visit was initiated by His Eminence, Archbishop Moushegh Marderosian of the
Western Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America to commemorate the 90th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide and the 1600th Anniversary of the creation of the Armenian alphabet.

I am honored to recognize this milestone visit to California by a distinguished Armenian and world leader. I wish both the Catholics and the Armenian community in California a renewed sense of purpose and inspiration from this visit.

ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, INC.

Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. President, I am proud to pay tribute to Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, America’s first Greek-letter organization established by black college women.

On Thursday, September 22, 2005, I had the pleasure of spending time with nearly 100 members and members of this remarkable organization, including Representative Sheila Jackson Lee and AKA’s International President, Linda White. I have long been aware of the rich history and tremendous contributions of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. Its distinguished community members have contributed $25,000 to the National Women’s Mortgage Liquidation Fund.

In addition to advancing these services, AKA maintains a focus on improving the quality of life for its members. AKA cultivates and encourages high scholastic and ethical standards; promotes unity and friendship among college women; alleviates problems facing girls and women; maintains a progressive interest in college life and serves over 170,000 women in the United States, Canada, and Africa. Its distinguished alumni include national civic leaders such as astronaut Mae Jamison, author Toni Morrison, poet Maya Angelou, Coretta Scott King, Rosa Parks, and the late Judge Constance Baker Motley.

I am privileged and proud to have a special bond with the remarkable women of Alpha Kappa Alpha, Incorporated, and the Ivy League. My colleagues the many reasons we should all admire and thank the members of this organization for their long-lasting and unwavering commitment to improving the lives of so many.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. President, 40 years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson signed landmark legislation into law creating the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I was privileged to be one of the cosponsors of this legislation. The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and bring a new nationwide focus to the creative community across America in the fields of literature and history, the visual arts, and the performing arts.

Throughout these four decades, the Endowments have provided impressive leadership in enhancing the cultural life of the Nation. The budget for the two agencies is relatively small, but they have distributed Federal grants to a wide range of deserving educational and cultural organizations in communities all across our nation.

The best of our cultural heritage has broad appeal to peoples everywhere. The scholarship, the history, and the arts of America are admired around the world. Each generation of artists and educators has much to share with the rest of the world, and with the generations to come as well. The important role of the Endowments is to support the museums, the galleries, and the theaters in our communities, and assist them in presenting these artistic achievements so that audiences, students and scholars can study them, and learn from them.

Down through the ages, the arts have inspired millions, after generations with their beauty, tolerance and understanding. They enable individuals to reach beyond their own experience and know something of other peoples and other cultures. In this shrinking world, it is even more important to respect our neighbors, and build cultural bridges to reach out to one another in our shared world. The arts and humanities offer indispensable opportunities to achieve this important goal.

The Endowments help disseminate the creative work being done at the local level. In Massachusetts, we are privileged to have an extraordinary range of cultural institutions that document the story of the wealth of our communities from its earliest days to the present. We are very proud of the cultural landmarks that tell of our history, so that future generations too will understand the challenges that faced the Pilgrim settlers in Plymouth, the struggle for independence that began in Boston Harbor and at Concord Bridge, the harrowing era of one stop on the Underground Railroad, the rugged life in the fishing community of New Bedford, and the early years of the state.

So, too, in every other State in our Nation, the story is told of discovery, development and achievement, the continuing story of the American journey.

The important task of the Endowments is to honor and preserve this legacy. Over the past four decades, they have compiled an impressive record of vital support for both the arts and humanities. The Arts Endowment has funded major arts and humanities tours by large national companies, and performances by smaller regional companies. The Humanities Endowment has provided vital research and educational support in colleges and universities. It is important to recognize the National Endowment for the Humanities and its important role in preserving important documents, brittle books and important artifacts. Its public programs have undertaken brilliant documentary projects on topics ranging from the story of the Civil War to the story of baseball.

These two great Endowments have amply fulfilled the early hope that
they could improve the quality of the arts and humanities and expand their reach, and we in Congress are very proud of all they have accomplished.

There have been times of controversy and criticism as well, but the Endowments have clearly earned the distinction and support that they now enjoy. The arts and humanities are an essential part in the life of the Nation and in all of our lives, and the Endowment’s mission is to ensure that they always will be.

I would like to congratulate the current chairman of the Humanities Endowment and the Arts Endowment, Bruce Cole and Dana Gioia. They follow in impressive footsteps of their illustrious predecessors, through Republican and Democratic administrations alike. We are grateful for all that they and their outstanding staff members do each day to fulfill their important mission.

It is gratifying on this 40th anniversary of the creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to recognize their superb record of achievement, and I congratulate all those who have done so much to make it so.

### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### MASSACHUSETTS BEST COMMUNITY WINNERS

- **Mr. KERRY.** Mr. President, I am honored to recognize three outstanding Massachusetts communities, each of which has been chosen by America’s Promise as one of the ‘100 Best Communities for Young People’ in the Nation. The communities of Barnstable County, Brockton, and Cambridge, have demonstrated outstanding civic leadership for our children. Community leaders, businesses, teachers and Government work together in these communities to give their children both the tools and the opportunities they need to succeed. I am very proud that such exemplary communities can be found in my home State.

Barnstable has an impressive record of civic involvement. Not only are community leaders active in the lives of their youth, but they encourage their children to participate in community activities. Over 40 percent of the households in Barnstable have young people participating in community service, and this is, in large part, a reflection of the extensive programs in area high schools such as Junior State of America, Mentoring, Peer Leaders, and National Honor Society. In the Barnstable middle school communities, initiatives such as Schools for Success, which works with underachieving youth in the Barnstable Middle School to improve academic achievement and social skills, have evolved and flourished. The community involvement extends outside of the school systems as well with organizations such as Children’s Cove, a program run by the Barnstable County district attorney’s office, the State department of social service, and Cape Cod Health Care, together with other community partners to assist children who have experienced sexual abuse.

In Brockton, successful community organizations provide their children with every opportunity to learn, grow, and remain both physically and mentally healthy. The Brockton After Dark program organizes several different activities each weeknight for children residing across the city, including basketball games, open swim time, tennis, soccer, performing arts, and open mike nights. By keeping vulnerable youth off the streets, the program contributed to a significant drop in crime. The Target Outreach Initiative directs at-risk youth to positive alternatives offered by the Boys & Girls Clubs by recruiting children to club activities as a diversion to gang activities. In its first 2 years, the program far surpassed its enrollment goals.

In Cambridge, the Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment played a significant role in the recovery of the city’s
cultural institutions. The Arts Endowment supported the construction of the 100 Clearly 100 theater, the innovative new theater on Massachusetts Avenue, and the Cambridge Community Foundation supported the arts and humanities and expanded their reach.

- **Mr. LEVIN.** Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mildred Light Aldridge, an educator and administrator for many years and the wife of the late Reverend Dr. Avery Aldridge, who passed away at the age of 77 on September 22, 2005. She was an important member of the Flint community, and she will be sorely missed by many.

Dr. Aldridge was born in 1928 in Earle, AR. She received her bachelor’s of art degree in elementary education from the University of Michigan-Flint and her master’s degree in guidance and counseling from Eastern Michigan University. She taught in the elementary schools and worked as a guidance counselor in several middle schools before serving as principal of the Doyle Ryder Community School until her retirement in 1986. After retirement, she remained active by founding and serving as the director of the Eagle’s Nest Child Care and Development Center. She also served for the past 23 years as an instructor of the adult ladies fellowship class at Foss Avenue Baptist Church.

Mildred Light Aldridge participated in various civic and community organizations, including the Flint Chapters of the NAACP and the Urban League, the Visually Impaired Center of Flint, and the advisory board of the Mott Community College Foundation. She was also affiliated with the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the Flint Congress of School Administrators. In addition, Dr. Aldridge held honorary doctorate degrees from Arkansas Baptist College and Saginaw Valley State University.

Dr. Aldridge is mourned by many in the Flint community and is survived by her two children, Derrick Aldridge and Karen Aldridge-Eason, and her 10 grandchildren. This is, indeed, a great loss to all who knew her, and I know my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to the life of Mildred L. Aldridge.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN DEERING AND HIS “TESTAMENT” SCULPTURE

- **Mr. PRYOR.** Mr. President, nearly half a century ago, Arkansas experienced one of its darkest moments. As nine African-American students fought to integrate Central High School, they were accosted by students, threatened by parents and forsaken by local leaders. It took an intervention by President Dwight Eisenhower to bring desegregation to the Little Rock Nine.

But in the 48 years since this event my State has seen brighter days, most recently on August 30, 2005, when I was proud to be present for the unveiling of “Testament,” a sculpture of the Little Rock Nine depicting the nine brave students on their journey to claim an equal education.

“Testament” is a tribute by John Deering, one of Little Rock’s own, to those students and the courage they demonstrated that day. The life-sized bronze statue, unveiled as they were in 1957: Equally brave, scared, determined. It is the largest bronze statue in Arkansas and the first...
monument honoring the civil rights movement on the grounds of a Southern State capitol. During the 40th anniversary of the desegregation, John came up with the idea for the sculpture. With approval from the Little Rock City government, John created the work with his wife Kathy and studio partner Steve Scallon. The sculpture has been 7 years in the making and now stands proudly in Little Rock. I would like to recognize John for this sculpture and his contributions to journalism and the arts. As an editorial cartoonist for the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, John has earned numerous local and national accolades. He has been recognized by the Arkansas Press Association with the Best Editorial Cartoonist Award seven times in his career and in 1996 he won the illustrious Berryman Award from the National Press Foundation. His editorial cartoons are nationally syndicated, as is his comic strip “Strange Brew” allowing readers throughout the country to share in his humor.

But make no mistake, John is serious about his cartoons, and the artistry is as important to him as the jokes. His dedication to artistry has translated to other mediums, including painting and sculpture. John has works displayed throughout the country. “Testament” is not the first monument he has sculpted for Arkansas. In 1987, John created a life-size sculpture of an American soldier for the Arkansas Veterans Memorial, which I consider both poignant and powerful. When the “Testament” sculpture was unveiled, the Little Rock Nine once again stood together in solidarity. An emotional moment for those brave men and women, it was also a moving event for John as 7 years of private work was finally put on public display. As this sculpture stands on Arkansas’ capitol grounds, it serves as a testament to the Little Rock Nine, as well as Arkansas’ past. I applaud John for his valuable artistic contribution to Arkansas and the nation and I hope that this statue will serve as a lasting reminder of the difficulties and triumphs of the civil rights movement for generations to come.”

TRIBUTE TO JOHN H. JOHNSON

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today, I pay tribute to the life and legacy of John H. Johnson. John was a pioneer whose monumental works in publishing and generous acts of philanthropy have had profound influence on the lives of millions, both inside and outside Arkansas.

John’s life story is one we can all learn from and admire. Raising himself up from poverty to the top of the business world, he is proof that hard work and determination can create success. Born the grandson of slaves in a one-room house in Arkansas City in 1921, John went on to become the first African American to be named to Forbes’ list of the 400 wealthiest Americans.

The founder, publisher and chairman of Johnson Publishing company—the largest African-American owned publishing company in the world—John’s magazines, Ebony and Jet, are the number one African-American magazine and newsletter respectively. Ebony currently has a circulation of 1.7 million and a monthly readership of over 11 million, while Jet has a readership of over 8 million weekly, and both publications continue to lead the way in African-American media. Linda Johnson Rice, John’s daughter, currently serves as President and CEO of her father’s company and I wish her the best in building on her father’s success.

Awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1996—the highest honor this Nation bestows on civilians—John’s life was full of accomplishments and accolades. John was recognized with the Magazine Publisher’s Association publisher of the year award, the Black Journalists’ Lifetime Achievement Award and the Wall Street Journal/Dow Jones Entrepreneurial Excellence Award. He has been inducted into the Advertising Hall of Fame, the National Business Hall of Fame and, in 2001, he became the first African American inducted into the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame. During his life, John was also appointed to various posts by Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon and served on the boards of corporate giants including Dillard Department Stores to the Chrysler Corporation to Twentieth Century Fox Film.

But John’s influence extends beyond the business world. He helped shape race relations in this country, both with his publications and activism. In 1955, John made history when he published the unedited photographs of the mutilated body of Emmett Till, the 14-year-old murder victim who was viciously beaten and burned in Mississippi for allegedly whistling at a white woman. The pictures, intended to show the reality of the Jim Crow South, helped spark the Civil Rights Movement.

As far as John went in life, he was not one to forget his roots. Raised in poverty in Arkansas by his mother, John has spent much of life giving back to his community and state. John’s dedication to education and improving the lives of non-white people has been one of his greatest passions and the results of his work will be felt in Arkansas for decades to come. In May, Arkansas City and the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff dedicated the John H. Johnson Cultural and Educational Museum. The museum contains memorabilia, printed materials and videos about John’s life, which will serve as an inspiration to our children as they strive to succeed. There are also plans in the works for the John H. Johnson Cultural and Entrepreneurial Learning Center in Arkansas City, as well as a related academic complex in Pine Bluff. These facilities will undoubtedly be an asset to the university and provide valuable educational opportunities for the students of Arkansas.

John H. Johnson’s legacy will live on and continue to influence the State of Arkansas and the Nation, for many years. Through his publications, activism and generosity, John has left an indelible mark on society. He was a trailblazer and his contributions to our Nation are immeasurable. I join all of Arkansas in saluting the memory of John H. Johnson.

HONORING JUDGE CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise to honor and celebrate the remarkable life and legacy of Judge Constance Baker Motley, a trailblazer for civil rights who dedicated her life to advancing the American values of justice and equality for all.

Judge Motley was born and raised in New Haven, CT at a time when women and minorities were denied the right to an equal education, and employment, housing and voting rights. Despite these odds, Judge Motley graduated at the age of 15 that she would be an attorney. Although she was discouraged by many, Judge Motley remarked that she was “the kind of person who would not be put down.”

Judge Motley graduated from Columbia Law School in 1946 and joined the legal staff of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. It was there that for nearly 20 years, Judge Motley orchestrated the legal challenge to the “separate but equal doctrine,” culminating in the Supreme Court victory in Brown v. Board of Education that guaranteed equal educational opportunities for all Americans. In addition to the seminal decision in Brown, Judge Motley argued the 1957 school desegregation case in Little Rock, AR that led President Eisenhower to call in federal troops to protect nine black students at Central High School. During Judge Motley’s tenure at the NAACP, she successfully argued numerous cases desegregating restaurants and recreational facilities in Southern cities and cases overturning the convictions of the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and countless others who engaged in nonviolent sit-ins and protests of desegregation practices.

In 1965, Judge Motley became the first woman to be elected president of the Borough of Manhattan where she continued to advocate for the rights of women, minorities and the poor. In 2001, President Bush appointed Judge Motley to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. With her appointment, Judge Motley became the first African-American woman appointed to the Federal judiciary, where she served until 2001.

Judge Motley’s dedication and commitment to justice and equality changed our Nation for the better and
paved the way for women, minorities and the poor to enjoy the rights and privileges guaranteed by our constitution. Judge Motley stood tall in the face of great adversary for what was right. We all stand taller because of her life and because she was the kind of person who would not be put down.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

NOTIFICATION REGARDING THE PROPOSED USE OF PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDS PROVIDED TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PURSUANT TO TITLE I OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 108-333—PM 24

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with title I of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2005, Public Law 108-333, I am notifying the Congress of the proposed use of $10,151,538 provided in the District of Columbia pursuant to law, a report relative to re-authorize that Act.

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has signed the following enrolled bill:


At 7:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:37 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment.

S. 1802. A bill to provide for appropriate waivers, modifications, or exemptions from provisions of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to individual account plans affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3861. An act to assist individuals with disabilities affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita through vocational rehabilitation services.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The following enrolled bills, previously signed by the Speaker of the House, were signed yesterday, September 29, 2005, by the President pro tempore (Mr. STREIFER):

H.R. 2312. An act to extend the waiver authority of the Secretary of Education with respect to student financial assistance during a war or other military operation or national emergency.

H.R. 3200. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3667. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 South Barrington Street in Los Angeles, California, as the “Karl Malden Station”.

H.R. 3767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Oak Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the “Jacob L. Frazier Post Office Building”.

At 6:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:


EC-4039. A communication from the Assistant Administrator and Chief Information Officer, Office of Environmental Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to reducing the burden and streamlining program operations of the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) Program, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4040. A communication from the Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Fiscal Year 2005 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventories; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4041. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attain Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 7972-5) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
EC–4049. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Illinois; Lyons Township PM–10 Redesignation and Maintenance Plan” (FRL No. 7971–9) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4050. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Final Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors (Phase I Final Replacement Standards and Phase II)” (FRL No. 7971–9) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4051. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Stardard and Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units” (FRL No. 7971–9) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4052. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, the report of a draft bill “to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnus–Stevasen Fisheries Conservation and Management Act for the fiscal years 2006 through 2010”; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4053. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “The Status of U.S. Fisheries” for 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4054. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Packaging, Handling, and Shipping” (RIN2700–AD16) received on September 21, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4055. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) Change for NASA Shared Services Center (NSSC)” (RIN2700–AD13) received on September 21, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Report of the company H.R. 2683, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109–141).

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 1663. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence–related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109–142).

By Mr. COLLINS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3725. A bill to strengthen Federal leadership, direction, and control of emergency communications planning and guidance, and provide other support to State and local officials to enhance emergency communications capabilities, to achieve communications interoperability, to foster improved regional collaboration and coordination, to promote more efficient utilization of funding devoted to public safety communications interoperability, and to change Federal law to adapt to the new circumstances in which many communications are provided by both the public and private sectors for first responder communications, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WARNER for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nominations beginning with Salvatore A. Rotino, ending with Scott E. Wuesthoff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 5, 2005.

Air Force nomination of Gen. Stephen R. Lorenz to be Lieutenant General.


Air Force nomination of Gen. Douglas M. Fraser to be Lieutenant General.


Air Force nomination of Col. Richard J. Tubb to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James P. Eggleton and ending with Col. Blake E. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2005.

Air Force nomination of Col. James S. Goodwin to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Roger F. Clements to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Daniel P. Leaf to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. William S. Wallace to be General.

Army nomination of Col. Philip Volpe to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Eric B. Schoomaker to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael H. Sumrall to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Errol R. Schwartz to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. James R. Joseph to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Anne E. Dunwoody to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. John E. Cornelius to be Brigadier General.

Mr. WARNER, Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report the following candidate and nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Thomas L. Lutz to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Bruce A. Ellis, Jr. to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Anselmo Feliciano and ending with Dake S. Vahovich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 28, 2005.

Air Force nomination of Merrick R. Krause to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Anthony E. Barbaris to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wesley A. Arid and ending with Russell F. Zalewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2005.

Air Force nominations beginning with John M. Allen and ending with Wallace M. Yovetich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2005.

Air Force nomination of Sean D. McClung to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with John M. Andrew and ending with Martin E. Fesl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. A. Assa and ending with Andrew S. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 19, 2005.

Air Force nominations beginning with Peter D. Guzzetti and ending with Terry M. Larkin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 8, 2005.

Air Force nomination of Dennis J. Wing to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Kelvin L. George and ending with Deborah A. Roberts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2005.

Army nomination of William C. Dickey to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Laura T. Wells to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with William R. Everett and ending with Peter D.P. Vint, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Army nominations beginning with Stanley A. Bloustein and ending with Terry D. Neville, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Army nominations beginning with Dario A. Barrato and ending with David L. Jarratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Army nominations beginning with Jerry Bromman and ending with Franklin E. Tuttle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Army nominations beginning with Lynette M. Arnhart and ending with Daniel E. Zaleski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.

Army nominations beginning with William A. Acetta and ending with Peter J. Ziolmek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2005.
By Mr. SHELBY for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Kim Kendrick, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.*

*Keith A. Nelson, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.*

*David H. McCormick, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.*

*Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.*

*Israel Hernandez, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.*

*Darrell W. Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.*

*Emil W. Henry, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.*

*Patrick M. O’Brien, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.*

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.*

*(Nominations without an asterisk were reported, with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)*

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS**

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

**By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LACEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. FEINGOLD):**

S. 1790. A bill to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy, to provide no-fault insurance coverage to victims of security breaches, to establish civil penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains; to the Committee on Finance.

**By Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BAYH):**

S. 1792. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 265 West Washington Street in Knox, Indiana, as the “Grant W. Green Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

**By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):**

S. 1793. A bill to extend expirations to primary airports; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. OBAMA):
S. 1794. A bill to establish a Strategic Gasoline and Fuel Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MIKULSKI):
S. 1795. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to protect Social Security cost-of-living adjustments (COLA); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CORZINE):
S. 1796. A bill to promote the economic security and safety of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; to Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE:
S. 1797. A bill to provide for Congressional authority with respect to certain acquisitions, mergers, and takeovers under the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LUTTENBERGER, and Ms. STABENOW):
S. 1798. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit outbound call telemarketing to individuals eligible to receive benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit outbound call telemarketing to individuals eligible to receive benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit outbound call telemarketing to individuals eligible to receive benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. VOINOVICh, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. DOGLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. Harkin, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WARNER):
S. 1799. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reduction in government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOwE (for herself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. Bunning):
S. 1800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BOND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAFFEe, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. CLINTON, and Ms. LANDRIEU):
S. 1801. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to reauthorize the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI:
S. 1802. A bill to provide for appropriate waivers, suspensions, or exemptions from provisions of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to individual account plans affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita; read the first time.

By Mr. ROBERTS:
S. 1803. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Armed Services pursuant to Section 3(b) of S. Res. 400, 94th Congress, as amended by S. Res. 445, 108th Congress, for a period not to exceed 10 days of session.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. BROWNACK):
S. Res. 260. A resolution calling for free and fair parliamentary elections in the Republic of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. OMARA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. JEFFORDS):
S. Res. 261. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the crisis of Hurricane Katrina should not be used to weaken, waive, or roll back Federal public health, environmental, and environmental justice laws and regulations, and for other purposes to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. SNOwE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CRAPo, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. REED, Mr. cRAKE, Mr. SPRcETER, Mr. LEvIN, Mr. VOINOVICh, Mr. ByRD, Mrs. Dole, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. REID, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. STABENow, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. DURBIN):
S. Con. Res. 55. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the conditions for the United States to become a signatory to any multilateral agreement on trade resulting from the World Trade Organization’s Doha Development Agenda Round, to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 367
At the request of Mr. Craig, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

S. 347
At the request of Mr. Nelson of Florida, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 347, a bill 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 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.

S. 559
At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LATUENBERG) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 559, a bill to make the protection of vulnerable populations, especially women and children, who are affected by a humanitarian emergency a priority of the United States Government, and for other purposes.

S. 566
At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, a bill to continue State coverage of Medicaid prescription drug coverage to Medicare dual eligible beneficiaries for 6 months while still allowing the Medicare Part D benefit to be implemented as scheduled.

S. 576
At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros.

S. 595
At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit and the welfare-to-work credit.

S. 637
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 908
At the request of Mr. McCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Pryor) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to allow Congress, State legislatures, and regulatory agencies to determine appropriate laws, rules, and regulations to address the problems of weight gain, obesity, and health conditions associated with weight gain or obesity.

S. 927
At the request of Mr. CORZINE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 927, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand and improve coverage of mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 1396
At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.
DeWine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to provide sufficient blind rehabilitation outpatient specialists at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1417
At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1417, a bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates.

S. 1419
At the request of Mr. LUJAR, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1516
At the request of Mr. DEWINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1516, a bill to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 1700
At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1700, a bill to promote employment of individuals with severe disabilities through Federal Government contracting and procurement processes, and for other purposes.

S. 1689
At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1689, a bill to state the policy of the United States on international taxation.

S. 1691
At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. CORBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to amend selected statutes to clarify existing Federal law as to the treatment of students privately educated at home under State law.

S. 1692
At the request of Mr. DAYTON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1692, a bill to provide disaster assistance to agricultural producers for crop and livestock losses, and for other purposes.

S. 1749
At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PHYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1749, a bill to reinstate the application of the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act to Federal contracts in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina.

S. 1770
At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1770, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for advance payment of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for 2005 in order to provide needed funds to victims of Hurricane Katrina and to stimulate local economies.

S. 1772
At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to streamline the refinery permitting process, and for other purposes.

S. 1779
At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1779, a bill to amend the Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act of 1958 to ensure the humane slaughter of nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 1780
At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DeWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1780, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the public disclosure of activities of exempt organizations, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets, and for other purposes.

S. 1787
At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to provide bankruptcy relief for victims of natural disasters, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 25
At the request of Mr. TALENT, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DeMINT) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 25, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the President to reduce or disapprove any appropriation in any bill presented by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 25
At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 25, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the application of Airbus for launch aid.

S. CON. RES. 53
At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 53, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any effort to impose photo identification requirements for voting should be rejected.

S. RES. 256
At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 256, a resolution honoring the life of Sandra Feiman.

AMENDMENT NO. 1354
At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as co-sponsors of amendment No. 1354 intended to be proposed to S. 1042, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. Feinstein, and Mr. Feingold).

S. 1789
A bill to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy to provide notice of security breaches, and to enhance criminal penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPECTER. 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. 1789
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 “Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ENHANCING PUNISHMENT FOR IDENTITY THEFT AND OTHER VIOLATIONS OF DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY
Sec. 101. Fraud and related criminal activity in connection with unauthorized access to personally identifiable information.
Sec. 102. Organized criminal activity in connection with unauthorized access to personally identifiable information.
Sec. 103. Concealment of security breaches involving sensitive personally identifiable information.
Sec. 104. Aggravated fraud in connection with unauthorized access to personally identifiable information.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COMBATING CRIMES RELATED TO FRAUDULENT, UNAUTHORIZED, OR OTHER CRIMINAL USE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION
Sec. 201. Grants for State and local enforcement.

TITLE III—DATA BROKERS
Sec. 301. Transparency and accuracy of data collection.
TITLE IV—PRIVACY AND SECURITY OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION

Sec. 421. Right to notice of security breach.
Sec. 422. Notice procedures.
Sec. 423. Content of notice.
Sec. 424. Risk assessment and fraud prevention notice exemptions.
Sec. 425. Victim protection assistance.
Sec. 426. Enforcement.
Sec. 427. Relation to State laws.
Sec. 428. Study on securing personally identifiable information.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—
(1) databases of personally identifiable information are increasingly prime targets of hackers, identity thieves, rogue employees, and other criminals, including organized and sophisticated criminal operations;
(2) identity theft is a serious threat to the nation’s economic stability, homeland security, and the development of e-commerce, and the privacy rights of Americans;
(3) over 9,300,000 individuals were victims of identity theft in America last year;
(4) security breaches are a serious threat to consumer confidence, homeland security, e-commerce, and the electronic privacy of Americans;
(5) it is important for business entities that obtain, possess, or license personally identifiable information to adopt reasonable procedures to ensure the security, privacy, and confidentiality of that personally identifiable information;
(6) individuals whose personal information has been compromised or who have been victims of identity theft should receive the necessary information and assistance to mitigate their damages and to restore the integrity of their personal information and identities;
(7) data brokers have assumed a significant role in providing identification, authentication, and screening services, and related data collection and analyses for commercial, non-profit, and government operations;
(8) data misuse and use of inaccurate data have the potential to cause serious or irreparable harm to an individual’s livelihood, privacy, and underwrite inefficient and effective business and government operations;
(9) there is a need to insure that data brokers conduct their operations in a manner that prioritizes fairness, transparency, accuracy, and respect for the privacy of consumers;
(10) government access to commercial data can potentially improve safety, law enforcement, and national security; and
(11) because the use of commercial data containing personal information potentially affects individual privacy, and law enforcement and national security operations, there is a need for the Congress to exercise oversight over government use of commercial data.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—
(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the same meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.
(2) AFFILIATE.—The term ‘affiliate’ means persons related by common ownership or by corporate control.
(3) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term ‘business entity’ means any organization, corporation, trust, partnership, sole proprietorship, unincorporated association, venture established to make a profit, or nonprofit, and any contractor, subcontractor, affiliate, or licensee thereof engaged in interstate commerce.
(4) IDENTITY THEFT.—The term ‘identity theft’ means a violation of section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, or any other similar provision of applicable State law.
(5) DATA BROKER.—The term ‘data broker’ means a business entity, or any combination of information, in electronic or digital form serving as a means of identification, as defined by section 1028(d)(7) of title 18, United States Code.
(6) DATA FURNISHER.—The term ‘data fur- nisher’ means any agency, governmental entity, organization, corporation, trust, partnership, sole proprietorship, unincorporated association, venture established to make a profit, or nonprofit, or any contractor, subcontractor, affiliate, or licensee thereof, that serves as a source of information for a data broker.
(7) PERSONAL ELECTRONIC RECORD.—The term ‘personal electronic record’ means data associated with an individual contained in a database, networked or integrated data- bases, or other data system that holds personal identifiers of an individual.
(8) PERSONAL IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term ‘personally identifiable information’ means any information, or compilation of information, in electronic or digital form serving as a means of identification, as defined by section 1028(d)(7) of title 18, United States Code.
(9) PUBLIC RECORD SOURCE.—The term ‘public record source’ means any agency, Federal court, or State court that maintains personally identifiable information in records available to the public.

TITLE I—ENHANCING PUNISHMENT FOR IDENTITY THEFT AND OTHER VIOLATIONS OF DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY

SEC. 101. FRAUD AND RELATED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

SEC. 1009(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘or’ after the semicolon;
(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ‘or’ after the semicolon; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:

(D) information contained in the data-bases or systems of a data broker, or in other personal electronic records, as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005;".

SEC. 102. ORGANIZED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

Section 1061(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “section 1069(a)(25)(D) (relating to fraud and related ac- tivity in connection with unauthorized access to personally identifiable information)” before “section 1084”.

SEC. 103. CONCEALMENT OF SECURITY BREACHES INVOLVING SENSITIVE PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) In General.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(i) a good faith acquisition of sensitive per- sonally identifiable information by a busi- ness entity or agency, or an employee or agent of a business entity or agency, if the sensitive personally identifiable information is not subject to further unauthorized disclo- sure; or
(ii) the release of a public record not other- \(\ldots\)
§1039. Concealment of security breaches involving sensitive personally identifiable information

“(a) Whoever, having knowledge of a security breach and the obligation to provide notice of such breaches to individuals under title IV of the Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005, and having not otherwise qualified for an exemption from providing notice under that title, intentionally and willfully conceals the fact of such security breach which causes economic damage to 1 or more persons, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘person’ means any individual, corporation, partnership, association, firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company.”.

SEC. 104. AGGRAVATED FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH COMPUTERS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1039 the following:

“§1039A. Aggravated fraud in connection with computers

“(a) In General.—Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in subsection (c), knowingly obtains, accesses, or transmits, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person or, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of up to 2 years.

“(b) CONSECUTIVE SENTENCES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, should a court in its discretion impose an additional sentence under subsection (a)—

“(1) no term of imprisonment imposed on a person under this section shall run concurrently, except as provided in paragraph (3), with any other term of imprisonment imposed on such person under any other provision of this title or any other provision of this section, or be imposed in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of up to 2 years.

“(2) a consecutive sentence may be imposed for a person who is engaged in terrorist activity or aiding other individuals engaged in terrorist activity; or

“(3) a term of imprisonment imposed on a person for a violation of this section may, in the discretion of the court, be sentenced concurrently, in whole or in part, with another term of imprisonment that is imposed by the court at the same time on that person for an additional violation of this section.

“(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘felony violation enumerated in subsection (c)’ means any offense that is a felony violation of paragraphs (2) through (7) of section 1039(a).

(b) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1039 the following new item:

“1039A. Aggravated fraud in connection with computers.”.
related to crimes involving the fraudulent, unauthorized, or other criminal use of personally identifiable information; and
(3) will develop a plan for coordinating the programs described under this section with other federally funded technical assistant and training programs, including directly funded local programs such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program (described under the heading ‘Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance’ of the Department of Justice, and the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-119)).

(e) Matching Funds.—The Federal share of the grant under this section shall not exceed 90 percent of the total cost of a program or proposal funded under this section unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this subsection.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In General.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

(b) Limitations.—Of the amount made available pursuant to paragraph (a), the Attorney General shall allocate 0.25 percent.

(c) Minimum Amount.—Unless all eligible applications submitted by a State or units of local government within a State for a grant under this title have been funded, the State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), shall be allocated an amount in each fiscal year under this title not more than 0.75 percent of the total amount appropriated for a fiscal year for grants pursuant to this title, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands each shall be allocated an amount together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes).

(d) Grants to Indian Tribes.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Attorney General may use amounts made available under this title to make grants to Indian tribes for use in accordance with this title.

TITLE III—DATA BROKERS

SEC. 301. TRANSPARENCY AND ACCURACY OF DATA COLLECTION.

(a) In General.—Data brokers engaging in interstate commerce are subject to the requirements applicable for any person that offers a service offered to third parties that allows access, use, compilation, distribution, processing, analyzing, or evaluation of sensitive personal information from electronic records of individuals, a data broker shall:

(1) provide written information, with the name, address, and telephone contact information of the public record source; and

(2) notify such individual of the right to add to or correct any inaccurate or incomplete information, as appropriate, by any other means available to the individual, based on the results of the investigation.

(b) Limitation.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, this section shall not apply to—

(1) brokers engaging in interstate commerce for any offered product or service currently subject to, and in compliance with, access and accuracy protections similar to those in paragraphs (c) through (f) of this section under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (Public Law 91-508), or the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-12); and

(2) brokers offering in interstate commerce for any offered product or service currently in compliance with the requirements for such entities under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (Public Law 104-191), and implementing regulations;

(3) information in a personal electronic record maintained by a data broker if—

(A) the data broker maintains such information solely pursuant to a license agreement with another business entity; and

(B) the data broker providing such information to the data broker pursuant to a license agreement either complies with the provisions of this section or qualifies for this exemption; and

(4) information in a personal record that—

(A) the data broker has identified as inaccurate; and

(B) the data broker reasonably determines for the purpose of transmitting or otherwise providing that information, or assessments based on that information, to non-affiliated third parties.

(b) CREATING AN ACCURACY RESOLUTION PROCESS.—A data broker shall develop and publish on its website timely and fair processes and procedures for responding to claims of inaccuracies, including procedures for reinserting any information in the personal electronic record it maintains on individuals.

The disclosures required under paragraph (1) shall also include guidance to individuals on the processes and procedures for demonstrating and correcting any inaccuracies.

(c) DISCLOSES TO INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A data broker shall, upon the request of an individual, clearly and accurately disclose to such individual for a reasonable fee all personal electronic records pertaining to that individual maintained for the periods identified by the consumer in the ordinary course of business in the databases or systems of the data broker at the time of the request.

(2) INFORMATION ON HOW TO CORRECT INACCURACIES.—The disclosures required under paragraph (1) shall also include guidance to individuals on the processes and procedures for demonstrating and correcting any inaccuracies.

(d) SOURCE.

SOURCE.—The disclosures required under paragraph (1) shall also include guidance to individuals on the processes and procedures for demonstrating and correcting any inaccuracies.

(e) ACCURACY RESOLUTION PROCESS.—

(1) INFORMATION FROM A PUBLIC RECORD SOURCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an individual notifies a data broker in writing that the completeness or accuracy of a public record source, the data broker shall determine within 30 days whether the information in its system accurately and completely records the information offered by the public record source.

(B) DATA BROKER ACTIONS.—If a data broker determines under subparagraph (A) that the information in its system—

(i) does not accurately and completely record the information provided by the public record source, the data broker shall correct any inaccuracies or incompleteness, and provide to such individual written notice of such process.

(ii) does accurately and completely record the information offered by a public record source, the data broker shall—

(II) provide to such individual written notice of the public record source.

(f) SOURCE.

SOURCE.—The disclosures required under paragraph (1) shall also include guidance to individuals on the processes and procedures for demonstrating and correcting any inaccuracies.

(g) DISCLOSURES TO INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an individual notifies a data broker in writing of a dispute as to the completeness or accuracy of any nonpublic personal record information, the data broker determines under subparagraph (A) that the information in its systems of the data broker at the time of the request is disputed by an individual under paragraphs (1) or any investigation of any information disclosed to or made available to third parties, to non-affiliated third parties.

(2) INVESTIGATION OF DISPUTED INFORMATION.—If the investigation of the dispute is found to be inaccurate or incomplete or a data broker determines that the information cannot be verified.

(3) TREATMENT OF INACCURATE OR UNVERIFIABLE INFORMATION.—If any investigation of any nonpublic record information disclosed to or made available to third parties, to non-affiliated third parties.

(4) LIMITATIONS ON EXTENSION OF PERIOD TO INVESTIGATE.—If the data broker reasonably determines that the dispute by the individual is frivolous or irrelevant, including by reason of a failure by the individual to provide sufficient information to investigate the disputed information, the data broker shall notify the individual of such determination by mail, or if authorized by the individual, by any other means available to the data broker.

(5) NOTICE IDENTIFYING THE DATA BROKER.—If the data broker reasonably determines that the information is derived from a public record source, the data broker shall—

(1) provide to such individual written notice of the public record source, and

(2) notify such individual of the right to add to or correct any inaccurate or incomplete information, as appropriate, by any other means available to the individual.

(6) DETERMINATION THAT DISPUTE IS FRIVOLOUS OR IRRELEVANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (4), a data broker may decline to investigate or terminate an investigation of information disputed by an individual under those paragraphs if the data broker reasonably determines that the dispute by the individual is frivolous or irrelevant, including by reason of a failure by the individual to provide sufficient information to investigate the disputed information.

(B) NOTICE.—Not later than 5 business days after making any determination in accordance with subparagraph (A) that a dispute is frivolous or irrelevant, a data broker shall notify the individual of such determination by mail, or if authorized by the individual, by any other means available to the data broker.

(g) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—A notice under subparagraph (B) shall include—

(1) the reasons for the determination under subparagraph (A); and

(2) identification of any information required to be corrected.

(7) CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION.—In conducting any investigation with respect to disputed information in the personal electronic record of any individual, a data broker shall review and consider all relevant information and any investigation of such individual in the period described in paragraph (2) with respect to such disputed information.

(8) TREATMENT OF INACCURATE OR UNVERIFIABLE INFORMATION.—In conducting any investigation with respect to disputed information in the personal electronic record of any individual, a data broker shall review and consider all relevant information and any investigation of such individual in the period described in paragraph (2) with respect to such disputed information.

(9) TREATMENT OF INACCURATE OR UNVERIFIABLE INFORMATION.—In conducting any investigation with respect to disputed information in the personal electronic record of any individual, a data broker shall review and consider all relevant information and any investigation of such individual in the period described in paragraph (2) with respect to such disputed information.
In general.—Not later than 5 business days after the completion of an investigation under paragraph (2), a data broker shall provide written notice to an individual of the results of the investigation, by mail, if authorized by the individual for that purpose, or by other means available to the data broker.

(ii) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Before the expiration of the 5-day period, as part of, or in addition to such notice, a data broker shall, in writing, provide to an individual—

(I) a statement that the investigation is complete;

(II) a report that is based upon the personal electronic record of such individual as that personal electronic record is revised as a result of the investigation;

(III) a notice that, if requested by the individual, a description of the procedures used to determine the accuracy and completeness of the information shall be provided to the individual by the data broker, including the business name, address, and telephone number of any data furnisher of information contacted in connection with such information; and

(IV) a notice that the individual has the right to request notifications under subsection (f).

(b) EXPIRED DISPUTE.—If by no later than 3 business days after the date on which a data broker receives notice of a dispute from an individual of information in the personal electronic record of such individual in accordance with paragraph (2), a data broker resolves such dispute in accordance with subparagraph (A) by the deletion of the disputed information, then the data broker shall not be required to comply with subsections (e) and (f) with respect to that dispute if the data broker provides to the individual, by telephone or other means authorized by the individual, prompt notice of the deletion.

(i) NOTICE OF DISPUTE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the completeness or accuracy of any information disclosed to an individual under subsection (c) is disputed and unless the data broker believes that the information is not complete or accurate, the data broker shall provide to the individual a description of the dispute.

(2) EXPEDITED DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—If by no later than 15 days after receipt of a dispute from an individual of information in the personal electronic record of such individual in accordance with paragraph (2), a data broker resolves such dispute in accordance with subparagraph (A) by the deletion of the disputed information, then the data broker shall not be required to comply with subsections (e) and (f) with respect to that dispute if the data broker provides to the individual, by telephone or other means authorized by the individual, prompt notice of the deletion.

(ii) NOTICE OF DISPUTE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the completeness or accuracy of any information disclosed to an individual under subsection (c) is disputed and unless the data broker believes that the information is not complete or accurate, the data broker shall provide to the individual a description of the dispute.

(2) EXPEDITED DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—If by no later than 15 days after receipt of a dispute from an individual of information in the personal electronic record of such individual in accordance with paragraph (2), a data broker resolves such dispute in accordance with subparagraph (A) by the deletion of the disputed information, then the data broker shall not be required to comply with subsections (e) and (f) with respect to that dispute if the data broker provides to the individual, by telephone or other means authorized by the individual, prompt notice of the deletion.

(3) IN GENERAL.—Whenever it appears that a data broker to which this title applies has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice that violates this title, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) enjoin that act or practice; (B) enforce compliance with this title; (C) obtain damages; (D) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(ii) IN GENERAL.—Upon a proper showing in the action under paragraph (1), the court shall grant a permanent injunction or a temporary restraining order without bond.

(iii) STATE ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by an act or practice that violates this title, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(1) enjoin that act or practice; (2) enforce compliance with this title; (3) obtain damages; (4) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to the filing of an action by an attorney general of a State under this subsection if the attorney general of a State determines that it is not feasible to provide the notice described in this subparagraph before the filing of the action.

(C) NOTICE.—In an action described under subparagraph (B), the attorney general of a State shall provide the written notice and the copy of the complaint to the Attorney General as soon after the filing of the complaint as practicable.

(iii) ATTORNEY GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Upon receipt of notice under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall have the right to—

(A) move to stay the action, pending the final disposition of a pending Federal proceeding or action as described in paragraph (4); (B) intervene in an action brought under paragraph (1); and (C) file petitions for appeal.

(iv) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—If the Attorney General has instituted a proceeding or action for a violation of this title or any regulation promulgated thereunder, or if a State may, during the pendency of such proceeding or action, bring an action under this subsection against any defendant named in such criminal proceeding or civil action for any violation that is alleged in that proceeding or action.

(v) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing any civil action under paragraph (1), nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent an attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of that State to—

(A) conduct investigations;

(B) administer oaths and affirmations; or

(C) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(vi) VENUE.—

(A) VENUE.—Any action brought under this subsection may be brought in an appropriate district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code.

(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under this subsection process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(1) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(vii) NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this title establishes a private cause of action against a data broker for violation of any provision of this title.

(iii) SEC. 303. RELATION TO STATE LAWS.

No requirement or prohibition may be imposed under the laws of any State with respect to any subject matter regulated under section 301, relating to individual access to, and correction of, personal electronic records held by data brokers.

(iv) SEC. 304. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and shall be implemented pursuant to a State by State rollout schedule set by the Federal Trade Commission, but in no case shall full implementation and effect of this title occur later than 1 year and 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—PRIVACY AND SECURITY OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION

Subtitle A—Data Privacy and Security

SEC. 401. PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY OF DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subtitle is to ensure standards for developing and implementing administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the privacy, security, confidentiality, integrity, storage, and disposal of sensitive personally identifiable information.

(b) IN GENERAL.—A business entity engaging in interstate commerce that involves collecting, accessing, transmitting, using, discarding, or disposing of sensitive personally identifiable information in electronic or digital form on 10,000 or more United States
persons is subject to the requirements for a data privacy and security program under section 402 for protecting sensitive personally identifiable information.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other limitation contained in the title, this subtitle does not apply to—

(A) a business entity that is engaged in activities that are subject to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.), and (B) subject to—

(i) persons for compliance with the requirements of this Act by 1 or more Federal or State functional regulators (as defined in section 506 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act) under this Act.

(ii) compliance with part 314 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations; or (iii) covered entities subject to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.).

(b) SAFE HARBOR.—A business entity shall be deemed to be in compliance with the privacy and security program requirements under section 402 if the business entity complies with or provides protection equal to industry standards as identified by the Federal Trade Commission, that are applicable to the type of sensitive personally identifiable information involved in the ordinary course of business of such implementing regulations under this Act.

SEC. 402. REQUIREMENTS FOR A PERSONAL DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) PERSONAL DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY PROGRAM.—Unless otherwise limited under section 402(c), a business entity subject to this subtitle shall comply with the following safeguards and any others identified by the Federal Trade Commission in a rulemaking process pursuant to section 503 of title 5, United States Code, to protect the privacy and security of sensitive personally identifiable information.

(1) SCOPE.—A business entity shall implement a comprehensive personal data privacy and security program that includes administrative, technical, and physical safeguards appropriate to the size and complexity of the business entity and the nature and scope of its activities.

(2) PERSONAL DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY PROGRAM.—The personal data privacy and security program shall be designed to—

(A) the privacy, security, and confidentiality of personal electronic records; (B) protect against any anticipated vulnerabilities to the privacy, security, or integrity of personal electronic records; and (C) protect against unauthorized access to use of personal electronic records that could result in substantial harm or inconvenience to any individual.

(3) RISK ASSESSMENT.—A business entity shall—

(A) identify reasonably foreseeable internal and external vulnerabilities that could result in unauthorized access, disclosure, use, alteration of sensitive personally identifiable information; and (B) assess the sufficiency of its policies, technologies, and safeguards in place to control and minimize risks from unauthorized access, disclosure, use, or alteration of sensitive personally identifiable information.

(4) RISK MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—Each business entity shall—

(A) design its personal data privacy and security program to control the risks identified under paragraph (3); and (B) adopt measures commensurate with the sensitivity of the data, as well as the size, scope, complexity, and scope of the activities of the business entity that—

(i) control access to systems and facilities containing sensitive personally identifiable information, including controls to authenticate and permit access only to authorized individuals;

(ii) detect actual and attempted fraudulent, unlawful, or unauthorized access, disclosure, use, or alteration of sensitive personally identifiable information, including by employees or vendors of otherwise authorized to have access; and

(iii) protect sensitive personally identifiable information during use, transmission, storage, and other safety measures.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION TIME LINE.—Each business entity subject to this subtitle shall take steps to ensure employee training and supervision for implementation of the data security program of the business entity.

(c) VULNERABILITY TESTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each business entity subject to this subtitle shall take steps to ensure the regular testing of key controls, systems, and procedures of the personal data privacy and security program to detect, prevent, and respond to attacks or intrusions, or other system failures.

(2) FREQUENCY.—The frequency and nature of the tests required under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the risk assessment of the business entity under subsection (a)(3).

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO SERVICE PROVIDERS.—In the event a business entity subject to this subtitle engages service providers not subject to this subtitle, such business entity shall—

(A) exercise appropriate due diligence in selecting those service providers for responsibilities related to sensitive personally identifiable information, and take reasonable steps to assess and retain service providers that are capable of maintaining appropriate safeguards for the privacy, security, and integrity of the sensitive personally identifiable information; and (B) require those service providers by contract to implement and maintain appropriate measures designed to meet the objectives of this subsection subject to this section, section 401, and subsection B.

(e) PERIODIC ASSESSMENT AND PERSONAL DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY MODERNIZATION.—Each business entity subject to this subtitle shall on a regular basis monitor, evaluate, and adjust, as appropriate its data privacy and security program in light of any relevant changes in—

(A) technology; (B) the sensitivity of personally identifiable information; (C) internal or external threats to personally identifiable information; and (D) the changing business arrangements of the business entity, such as—

(i) mergers and acquisitions; (ii) alliances and joint ventures; (iii) outsourcing arrangements; (iv) bankruptcy and (E) changes to sensitive personally identifiable information systems.

(f) PENALTY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a business entity subject to the provisions of this subtitle shall implement a data privacy and security program pursuant to this subtitle.

SEC. 403. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any business entity that violates the provisions of sections 401 or 402 shall be subject to civil penalties of not more than $5,000 per violation per day, with a maximum of $35,000 per day, while such violations persist.

(b) INTENTIONAL OR WILLFUL VIOLATION.—A business entity that intentionally or willfully violates the provisions of sections 401 or 402 shall be subject to additional penalties in the amount of $5,000 per violation per day, with a maximum of an additional $35,000 per day, while such violations persist.

(c) EQUITABLE RELIEF.—A business entity engaged in interstate commerce that violates this section may be enjoined from further violations by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(d) OTHER RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies available under this section are cumulative and shall not affect any other rights and remedies available under law.

(e) INJUNCTIVE ACTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever it appears that a business entity or agency to which this subtitle applies has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of this subtitle, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) enjoin any such act or practice; (B) enjoin compliance with this subtitle; and

(C) obtain damages—

(i) in the amount of $5,000 per violation per day, with a maximum of an additional $35,000 per day, while such violations persist; (ii) in the sum of actual damages, restitution, and other compensation on behalf of affected residents of a State; and (iii) punitive damages, if the violation is willful or intentional; and (D) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(f) OTHER INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Upon a proper showing in the action under paragraph (1), the court shall grant a permanent injunction against further violations, a temporary restraining order without bond, or a temporary restraining order without bond.

(g) STATE ENFORCEMENT.—(1) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State makes application to a court to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by an act or practice that violates this subtitle, the State may bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of that State in a district court of the United States of appropriate jurisdiction, or any other court of competent jurisdiction to—

(A) enjoin any such act or practice; (B) enforce compliance with this subtitle; (C) obtain—

(i) damages in the sum of actual damages, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of affected residents of the State; and (ii) punitive damages, if the violation is willful or intentional; and (D) obtain such other legal and equitable relief as the court may consider to be appropriate.

(h) NOTICE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Before filing an action under this subsection, the attorney general of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General—

(i) a written notice of that action; and (ii) a copy of the complaint for that action.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to an action by an attorney general of a State under this subsection, if the attorney general of a
State determines that it is not feasible to provide the notice described in this subparagraph before the filing of the action.

(C) **NOTIFICATION WHEN PRACTICABLE.**—In an action brought under paragraph (A) or (B), the attorney general of a State shall provide the written notice and the copy of the complaint to the Attorney General as soon after the filing of the complaint as practicable.

(3) **ATTORNEY GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—Upon receiving notice under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall have the right to—

(A) move to stay the action, pending the final disposition of a pending Federal proceeding or action as described in paragraph (4);

(B) intervene in an action brought under paragraph (1); and

(C) file petitions for appeal.

(4) **PENDING PROCEEDINGS.**—If the Attorney General has instituted a proceeding or action for a violation of this title or any regulations thereunder, no attorney general of a State may, during the pendency of such proceeding or action, bring an action under this subsection against any defendant named in such criminal proceeding or civil action for any violation that is alleged in that proceeding or action.

(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of bringing any civil action under paragraph (1) nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent the Attorney General of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of that State to—

(A) conduct investigations;

(B) administer oaths and affirmations; or

(C) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(6) **VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—

(A) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States that meets applicable venue requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code.

(B) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under this subsection process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(1) is an inhabitant; or

(2) may be found.

(d) **NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.**—Nothing in this title establishes a private cause of action against a business entity for violation of any provision of this subtitle.

SEC. 404. RELATION TO STATE LAWS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No State may—

(1) require an entity described in section 401(c) to comply with any other provision of law; and

(2) **EXTENDED DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.**—If the Attorney General determines that the notification required under subsection (a) shall be relieved of such obligation if an owner or licensee of the sensitive personally identifiable information subject to the security breach, or other designated third party, provides such notification.

(b) **TACTICAL LIMITED DELAY.**—In the case of any notification required under subsection (a), if the information following the discovery of the breach has resulted in, or will result in, harm to the individuals whose sensitive personally identifiable information was subject to the security breach, the notification may be delayed without unreasonable delay following—

(1) the discovery by the agency or business entity of a security breach; and

(2) any measures necessary to determine the scope of the breach, prevent further disclosures, and restore the reasonable integrity of the data system.

(2) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—The agency, business entity, owner, or licensee required to provide notification under this section shall have the burden of demonstrating that all obligations required under this subtitle, including evidence demonstrating the necessity of any delay.

(d) **DELAY OF NOTIFICATION AUTHORIZED FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a law enforcement agency determines that the notification required under this section would impede a criminal investigation, such notification may be delayed upon the written request of the law enforcement agency.

(2) **EXEMPTION FROM NOTICE.**—If that notification required under subsection (a) is delayed pursuant to paragraph (1), an agency or business entity shall give notice 30 days after the delayed law enforcement follow-on invoked by law enforcement agency provides written notification that further delay is necessary.

SEC. 423. METHODS OF NOTICE.

(a) **EXEMPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 421 shall not apply to an agency if the head of the agency certifies, in writing, that notification of the security breach as required by section 421 reasonably could be expected to—

(A) cause damage to the national security; or

(B) hinder a law enforcement investigation or the ability of the agency to conduct law enforcement investigations.

(2) **LIMTS ON CERTIFICATIONS.**—The head of an agency may not execute a certification under paragraph (1) to—

(A) conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error;

(B) prevent embarrassment to a business entity, organization, or agency; or

(C) restrain competition.

(3) **NOTICE.**—In which a head of an agency issues a certification under paragraph (1), the certification, accompanied by a concise description of the factual basis for the certification, shall be immediately provided to the Congress.

(b) **RISK ASSESSMENT EXEMPTION.**—An agency or business entity shall be exempt from the notice requirements under section 421 if—

(1) a risk assessment concludes that there is a significant risk that the security breach has resulted in, or will result in, harm to the individuals whose sensitive personally identifiable information was subject to the security breach;

(2) without unreasonable delay, but not later than 45 days after the discovery of a security breach, unless extended by the United States Secret Service, the business entity notifies the United States Secret Service, in writing, of—

(A) the results of the risk assessment; and

(B) its decision to invoke the risk assessment exemption; and

(3) the United States Secret Service does not indicate, in writing, within 10 days from receipt of the decision, that notice should be given.

(c) **FINANCIAL FRAUD PREVENTION EXEMPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A business entity will be exempt from the notice requirement under section 421 if the business entity utilizes or participates in a security program that—

(A) is designed to block the use of the sensitive personally identifiable information to initiate unauthorized financial transactions before they are charged to the account of the individual involved, and

(B) provides for notice after a security breach that has resulted in fraud or unauthorized transactions.

The exemption by this subsection does not apply if the information subject to the security breach includes, in addition to an account number, sensitive personally identifiable information.

SEC. 423. METHODS OF NOTICE.

An agency, or business entity shall be in compliance with section 421 if it provides:

(1) **INDIVIDUAL NOTICE.**—

(A) Written notification to the last known home mailing address of the individual in the records of the agency or business entity; or

(B) E-mail notice, if the individual has asked to receive such notice and the notice is consistent with the provisions permitting electronic transmission of notices under section 101 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7001).

(2) **MEDIA NOTICE.**—If more than 5,000 residents of a State or jurisdiction are impacted, notice to major media outlets serving that State or jurisdiction.

SEC. 424. CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Regardless of the method by which notice is provided to individuals under this section, the notice shall include, to the extent possible—

(1) a description of the categories of sensitive personally identifiable information that was, or is reasonably believed to have been, acquired by an unauthorized person;

(2) a toll-free number—

(A) that the individual may use to contact the agency or business entity or the agent of the agency or business entity; and

(B) from which the individual may learn—

(i) what types of sensitive personally identifiable information the agency or business entity maintained about that individual or about individuals in general; and

(ii) whether or not the agency or business entity maintained sensitive personally identifiable information about that individual; and
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(3) the toll-free contact telephone numbers and addresses for the major credit reporting agencies.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONTENT.—Notwithstanding section 429, a State may require that a notice under subsection (a) shall also include information regarding victim protection assistance programs, procedures for obtaining identity theft reports, procedures for notification of a security breach, and other rights and remedies available under State, local, or agency law.

SEC. 425. COORDINATION OF NOTIFICATION WITH CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES.

If an agency or business entity is required to provide notification to more than 1,000 individuals, the agency or business entity shall notify, without unreasonable delay, all consumer reporting agencies that compile and maintain files on consumers on a nationwide basis (as defined in section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)) of the timing and distribution of the notices.

SEC. 426. NOTICE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) SECRET SERVICE.—Any business entity or agency required to give notice under section 421(a) shall also give notice to the United States Secret Service if the security breach impacts—

(1) more than 10,000 individuals nationwide;

(2) a database, networked or integrated databases, or other data system associated with the sensitive personally identifiable information on more than 1,000,000 individuals nationwide;

(3) databases owned by the Federal Government;

(4) primarily sensitive personally identifiable information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government involved in national security or law enforcement;

(b) NOTICE TO OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—The United States Secret Service shall be responsible for notifying—

(1) the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if the security breach involves espionage, foreign counterintelligence, information protected against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national defense or foreign relations, or Restricted Data (as that term is defined in section 11y of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y)), except for offenses affecting the duties of the United States Secret Service under section 3056(a) of title 18, United States Code; and

(B) the United States Postal Inspection Service, if the security breach involves mail fraud; and

(2) the attorney general of each State affected by the security breach.

(c) The notices to Federal law enforcement and the attorney general of each State affected by a security breach required under this section shall be delivered without unreasonable delay, but not later than 30 days after discovery of the events requiring notice.

SEC. 427. CIVIL REMEDIES.

(a) DAMAGES.—Any agency, or business entity engaged in interstate commerce, that violates this subtitle shall be subject to a fine of—

(1) not more than $1,000 per individual per day whose sensitive personally identifiable information was, or is reasonably believed to have been, acquired by an unauthorized person; or

(2) not more than $50,000 per day while the failure to give notice under this subtitle persists.

(b) EQUITABLE RELIEF.—Any agency or business entity that violates, proposes to violate, or has violated this subtitle may be enjoined and have other equitable remedies by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(c) OTHER RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies available under this subtitle are in addition to, and shall not affect any other rights and remedies available under law.

(d) FRAUD ALERT.—Section 605A(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1(b)(1)) is amended by inserting “,” or evidence that the consumer has received notice that the consumer’s financial information has or may have been compromised,” after “identity theft report.”

(e) INJUNCTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Whenever it appears that a business entity or agency to which this subtitle applies has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in any act or practice constituting a violation of this subtitle, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(1) enjoin such act or practice;

(2) enforce compliance with this subtitle;

(3) obtain damages, restitution, and other compensation on behalf of the affected residents of a State; and

(4) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 428. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In any case in which the attorney general of any State or local law enforcement agency authorized by the State attorney general or by State statute to institute a proceeding or action against an entity engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of this subtitle, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(b) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(1) is an inhabitant; or

(B) may be found.

(c) NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this subtitle establishes a private cause of action against a data broker for violation of any provision of this subtitle.

SEC. 429. EFFECT ON FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.

Nothing in this subtitle supercedes any other provision of Federal law or any provision of law of any State relating to notification of a security breach, except as provided in section 428.

SEC. 430. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 431. REPORTING ON RISK ASSESSMENT EXEMPTION.

Any action brought under subsection (a) of section 422 shall be delivered to the appropriate district court of the United States for service of the notices.

The United States Secret Service shall be responsible for notifying—

(1) the data privacy and security program of a State, or any State or local law enforcement agency authorized by the State attorney general or by State statute to institute a proceeding or action against an entity engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of this subtitle, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(1) enjoin such act or practice;

(2) enforce compliance with this subtitle;

(3) obtain damages, restitution, and other compensation on behalf of the affected residents of a State; and

(4) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 428. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In any case in which the attorney general of any State or local law enforcement agency authorized by the State attorney general or by State statute to institute a proceeding or action against an entity engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of this subtitle, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) obtain such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(b) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(1) is an inhabitant; or

(B) may be found.

(c) NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this subtitle establishes a private cause of action against a data broker for violation of any provision of this subtitle.

SEC. 429. EFFECT ON FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.

Nothing in this subtitle supercedes any other provision of Federal law or any provision of law of any State relating to notification of a security breach, except as provided in section 428.

SEC. 430. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out investigations and risk assessments of security breaches as required under this subtitle.

SEC. 431. REPORTING ON RISK ASSESSMENT EXEMPTION.

The United States Secret Service shall report to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and, upon the request by Congress thereafter, on the number and nature of the security breaches described in the notices filed by the data broker engaged in the risk assessment exemption under section 422(b) and the response of the United States Secret Service to those notices.

SEC. 432. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle shall take effect on the expiration of the date which is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO AND USE OF COMMERCIAL DATA

SEC. 501. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION REVIEW OF CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In considering contract awards involving more than $500,000 and entered into after the date of enactment of this Act with data brokers, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall evaluate—

(1) the data privacy and security program of a data broker to ensure the privacy and security of data containing personally identifiable information, and whether such program adequately addresses privacy and security threats created by malicious software or code, or the use of peer-to-peer file sharing software;

and

(2) the compliance of a data broker with such program;
(3) the extent to which the databases and systems containing personally identifiable information of a data broker have been compromised by security breaches; and

(4) the data broker’s ability to mitigate the impact of such breaches.

(b) COMPLIANCE SAFE HARBOR.—The data privacy and security program of a data broker shall be deemed sufficient for the purposes of subsection (a), if the data broker complies with or provides protection equal to industry standards, as identified by the Federal Trade Commission, that are applicable to the type of personally identifiable information involved in the ordinary course of business of such data broker.

(c) PENALTIES.—In awarding contracts with data brokers for products or services related to access, use, compilation, distribution, processing, analyzing, or evaluating personally identifiable information, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall—

(1) include monetary or other penalties—

(A) for failure to comply with subtitles A and B of title IV; or

(B) if a contractor knows or has reason to know that the personally identifiable information being provided is inaccurate, and provides such inaccurate information; and

(2) require a data broker that engages service providers not subject to subtitle A of title IV for responsibilities related to sensitive personally identifiable information to—

(A) exercise appropriate due diligence in selecting those service providers for responsibilities related to personally identifiable information;

(B) take reasonable steps to select and retain service providers that are capable of maintaining adequate safeguards for the security, privacy, and integrity of the personally identifiable information at issue; and

(C) require such service providers, by contract, to implement appropriate measures designed to meet the objectives and requirements in title IV.

(d) LIMITATION.—The penalties under subsection (c) shall not apply to a data broker providing information that is accurately and completely recorded from a public record source.

SEC. 501. REQUIREMENT TO AUDIT INFORMATION SECURITY PRACTICES OF CONTRACTORS AND THIRD PARTY BUSINESS ENTITIES.

Section 3546(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(C)(i), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(9) procedures for evaluating and auditing the information security practices of contractors or third party business entities supporting the information systems or operations of the data broker containing personally identifiable information (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005) and ensuring remedial action to address any significant deficiencies.".

SEC. 503. PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF GOVERNMENT USE OF COMMERCIAL DATABASES CONTAINING PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(b)(1) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking "or"; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking the period and inserting "; or"; and

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

"(iii) purchasing or subscribing for a fee to personally identifiable information from a data broker (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005);".

(c) LIMITATION ON PENALTIES.—The penalties under paragraph (3)(A) shall not apply to a data broker providing information that is accurately and completely recorded from a public record source.

(d) INDIVIDUAL SCREENING PROGRAMS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—If any other provision of law, commencing one year after the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal department or agency may use commercial databases or contract with a data broker to implement an individual screening program unless such program is—

(A) congressionally authorized; and

(B) subject to regulations developed by notice and comment that—

(i) establish a procedure to enable individuals, who suffer an adverse consequence because the screening system determined that they might pose a security threat, to appeal such determination and correct information contained in the system;

(ii) ensure that Federal and commercial databases that will be used to establish the identity of individuals or otherwise make assessments of individuals under the system will not produce false positives or unjustified adverse consequences;

(iii) ensure the efficacy and accuracy of all of the information the system relies on and ensure that the department or agency can make an accurate predictive assessment of those who may constitute a threat;

(iv) establish an internal oversight board to oversee and monitor the manner in which the system is being implemented;

(v) establish sufficient operational safeguards to reduce the opportunities for abuse; and

(vi) implement substantial security measures to protect the system from unauthorized access.

(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term "individual screening program"—

(A) means a system that relies on personally identifiable information from commercial databases to—

(i) evaluate all or most individuals seeking to exercise a particular right or privilege under Federal law; and

(ii) determine whether such individuals are on a terrorist watch list or otherwise pose a security threat; and

(B) does not include any program or system to grant security clearances.

(e) STUDY OF GOVERNMENT USE.—

(1) SCOPE OF STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and audit and prepare a report on Federal agency use of data brokers or commercial databases containing personally identifiable information, including the impact on privacy and security, and the extent to which Federal contracts include sufficient provisions to ensure privacy and security protections, and penalties for failures in privacy and security practices.

(2) REPORT.—A copy of the report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to Congress.

SEC. 504. IMPLEMENTATION OF CHIEF PRIVACY OFFICER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DESIGNATION OF CHIEF PRIVACY OFFICER.—Pursuant to the requirements under section 522 of the Transportation, Treasury,
Independent Agencies, and General Government Appropriations Act, 2006 (Division H of Public Law 109-44; 118 Stat. 3199) that each agency designate a Chief Privacy Officer, the Department shall implement such requirements by designating a department-wide Chief Privacy Officer, whose primary role shall be to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of Chief Privacy Officer, which shall report directly to the Deputy Attorney General.

(b) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHIEF PRIVACY OFFICER.—In addition to the duties and responsibilities outlined under section 522 of the Transportation, Treasury, Independent Agencies, and General Government Appropriations Act, 2005 (Division H of Public Law 108-447; 118 Stat. 3199), the Department of Justice Chief Privacy Officer shall—

(1) oversee the Department of Justice’s implementation of the requirements under section 603 to conduct privacy impact assessments of the use of commercial data containing personally identifiable information by the Department;

(2) promote the use of law enforcement technologies that sustain privacy protections, and assure that the implementation of such technologies establishes and implements, and disclosure of personally identifiable information preserve the privacy and security of such information; and

(3) serve on the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, established in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458), in implementing paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we reintroduce the Specter-Leahy Personal Data Privacy and Security Act of 2005.

Earlier this year, Senator SPECTER and I introduced a comprehensive bill to bring urgently needed reforms to protect Americans’ privacy and to secure their personal data. Chairman SPECTER has shown great leadership on this issue, and I appreciate his dedication to solving these challenging problems through his willingness to work together to enhance this legislation as we have deemed appropriate. Since initial introduction to the bill, we have worked with Senator FEINSTEIN and other members of the Judiciary Committee to address areas of concern and to perfect the bill. We have also worked closely with a wide variety of stakeholders and experts in these issues, which has also improved the bill.

I especially thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her dedication and resolve to address these difficult data security and privacy concerns. I commend her input and leadership, and I am pleased that she is joining as an original cosponsor of this revised bill. I also thank Senator FEINGOLD for his commitment to ensuring that the government also acts responsibly in its use of our personal information and appreciate his support as an original cosponsor. This is a good bill—carefully crafted to help remedy the problems we set out to address—and I look forward to continuing our efforts to pass effective legislation.

We coordinate with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and we augment our collective wisdom to sort through these issues with care and precision. We took the time needed to develop well-balanced, focused legislation that provides strong protections where necessary, and that offers strong penalties and consequences as disincentives for those who fail to protect Americans’ most personal information.

Reforms like these are long overdue. As we look toward the end of the year, these necessary reforms should be included in our domestic priorities so that we can achieve some positive changes in areas that affect the everyday lives of our families.

First, our bill requires data brokers to let people know what sensitive personal information they have about them, and to allow people to correct inaccurate information. These principles have precedent from the credit report context, and we have adapted them in a way that makes sense for the data brokering industry. This is a simple matter of fairness.

Second, we would require companies that have databases with sensitive personal information on Americans to establish and implement data privacy and security programs. In the digital age, any company that wants to be trusted by the public must earn that trust by vigilantly protecting the databases which contain Americans’ private data. They also have a responsibility in the next link in the security chain, to make sure that contractors hired to process data are adequately vetted to keep the personal information in these databases secure. This is increasingly important as Americans’ personal information more and more is outsourced for processing overseas and beyond U.S. laws.

Third, our bill requires notice when sensitive personal information has been compromised. The American people have a right to know when they are at risk because of corporate failures to protect their data, or when a criminal has infiltrated data systems. The notice rules in our bill were carefully crafted to ensure that the trigger for notice is tied to “significant risk of harm” with appropriate checks-and-balance, in order to make sure that companies do not underreport. We also recognize important fraud prevention techniques that already exist. But our priority has been to make sure that victims have critical information as a roadmap that offers the assistance necessary to safeguard their families and their financial well-being.

Finally, our bill addresses the government’s use of personal data. We are living in a world in which our government increasingly is turning to the private sector to get personal data the government could not legally collect on its own without oversight and appropriate protections. This bill would place privacy and security front and center in evaluating whether data brokers can be trusted with government contracts that involve sensitive information about the American people. It would require contract reviews that include these considerations, audits to ensure good practice, and contract penalties for failure to protect data privacy and security.

This legislation meets other key goals. It provides tough monetary and criminal penalties for compromising personal data or failing to provide necessary protections. There is an incentive for companies to protect personal information, especially when there is no commercial relationship between individuals and companies using their data. We also would authorize an additional $100 million over four years to help state law enforcement agencies fight misuse of personal information.

This is a solid bill—that not only deals with the need to provide Americans notice when they have already been hurt, but that also deals with the underlying problem of lax security and lack of accountability in dealing with the public’s most personal and private information.

I commend Senator SPECTER for his leadership on this problem.

Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator FEINGOLD have long recognized the importance of data privacy and security, and I appreciate their support in this effort and on this bill. Other members on the Banking Committee, such as Senator NELSON and Senator CANTWELL, and on the Banking Committee, have also taken great strides in these areas as well, and we look forward to working closely with them to pass legislation this year.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. HARKIN and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1739. A bill to extend certain apportionments to primary airports; to adopt the Telecommunications Act of 1996; and for other purposes.
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This legislation meets other key goals. It provides tough monetary and criminal penalties for compromising personal data or failing to provide necessary protections. There is an incentive for companies to protect personal information, especially when there is no commercial relationship between individuals and companies using their data. We also would authorize an additional $100 million over four years to help state law enforcement agencies fight misuse of personal information.

This is a solid bill—that not only deals with the need to provide Americans notice when they have already been hurt, but that also deals with the underlying problem of lax security and lack of accountability in dealing with the public’s most personal and private information.

I commend Senator SPECTER for his leadership on this problem.

Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator FEINGOLD have long recognized the importance of data privacy and security, and I appreciate their support in this effort and on this bill. Other members on the Banking Committee, such as Senator NELSON and Senator CANTWELL, and on the Banking Committee, have also taken great strides in these areas as well, and we look forward to working closely with them to pass legislation this year.
availability of scheduled air service. For small communities, airports often provide the critical link to the national and international transportation system.

Ensuring small communities have the resources they need to preserve this vital airport infrastructure in rural areas is the purpose of our bill.

Under current formulae for distributing Federal funds, every airport that has more than 10,000 annual passenger boardings is guaranteed an entitlement based on the Fiscal Year 2004 enplanements. List compiled from the preliminary FAA data.

The good news is a number of airports that were virtual primary airports in fiscal year 2005 have seen their annual boardings increase back above 10,000 per year. However, for this handful of airports that were still below 10,000 boardings in 2004, I believe it is appropriate that they have another year to regain their status as primary airports and not suffer the loss of 85 percent of their fiscal year 2006 annual entitlement grant for airport improvement projects.

Thus, our bill provides a simple one year extension of the existing law to preserve the airports' current level of federal funding and give these mostly rural communities a little breathing room while the airline industry recovers from the effects of 9/11.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter and resolution from the City of Roswell and the City of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN:
The purpose of this correspondence is to, on behalf of the City of Roswell, request your assistance on an extremely important matter. Your time, as well as that of your staff, particularly Dan Alpert, has been and will continue to be most appreciated.

Attached is a resolution passed by our City Council on Thursday, September 8th pertaining to the pending loss of our annual $1 million entitlement funds. Unless there is action involving extending the passenger boarding enplanement waiver as suggested, the City will only be eligible for $150,000 to use for airport improvement with the FY 2007 Budget. As far as we know we are the only Airport affected in the State of New Mexico, a fact that may have been mentioned to you by Councilor Judy Stubbins when she visited with you recently.

Our request of you is that if you can influence, beginning with the Senate Commerce and Transportation Committee, an amendment to the FY 06 Budget to extend the enplanement waiver through the FY 07 Budget, we would be most grateful. Sufficient is to say, the loss of almost $900,000 each year will be devastating to our Airport and our economy.

As is the case every time we approach you for assistance, we are grateful for your concern and whatever assistance you feel you can provide us. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

BILL B. OWEN,
Mayor

RESOLUTION NO. 05-27
A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING AN EXTENSION FOR PASSENGER BOARDING ENPLANEMENT waiver:

Whereas, current Federal legislation provides airports that have over 10,000 annual boardings $1 million per year, and airports with boardings less than 10,000 annually $150,000;

Whereas, in November 2001, the President signed P.L. 107-71 which allowed airports that had suffered declines in passenger boardings to use the greater of either the 2000 or 2001 boardings in calculating their FY2003 entitlements; and

Whereas, the Roswell International Air Center is one of over 50 airports in the United States that benefitted from P.L. 107-71, retaining its annual $1 million entitlement, even when passenger boardings dropped below 10,000; and

Whereas, Congress extended the exception for two additional years, FY2004 and FY2005 (P.L. 108-192, sec. 146); and

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. EXTENSION OF APPORTIONMENTS.

Section 47161(c)(1)(D) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and 2005” each place it appears in the heading and inserting “, and 2006”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1794 A bill to establish a Strategic Gasoline and Fuel Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 1794 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 2. STRATEGIC GASOLINE AND FUEL RESERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating part E (42 U.S.C. 6251 et seq.) as part F;

(2) by redesigning section 191 (42 U.S.C. 6251) as section 199; and

(3) by inserting after part D (42 U.S.C. 6250) as section 199.

SEC. 191. DEFINITIONS.

In this part—

(1) GASOLINE.—The term ‘‘gasoline’’ means regular unleaded gasoline.
(2) RESERVE.—The term ‘Reserve’ means the Strategic Gasoline and Fuel Reserve established under section 192(a).

SEC. 192. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall establish, maintain, and operate a Strategic Gasoline and Fuel Reserve.

(b) CONTENT OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.—The Reserve is not a component of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve established under part B.

(c) SECURITY.—The Reserve shall contain not more than—

(1) 40,000,000 barrels of gasoline; and

(2) 7,500,000 barrels of jet fuel.

(d) RESERVE SITES.—

(1) SITING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall determine not less than 3 Reserve sites, and not more than 5 Reserve sites, throughout the United States that are regionally strategic.

(2) OPERATION.—The Reserve sites described in paragraph (1) shall be operational not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) SECURITY.—In establishing the Reserve under section 192(b), the Secretary shall obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to physical security and operational security.

(f) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out this part, the Secretary may—

(1) purchase, contract for, lease, or otherwise acquire, in whole or in part, storage and related facilities and storage services;

(2) use, lease, maintain, sell, or otherwise dispose of storage and related facilities acquired under this part;

(3) require by purchase, exchange, lease, or other means gasoline and fuel for storage in the Reserve;

(4) store gasoline and fuel in facilities not owned by the United States; and

(5) sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of gasoline and fuel from the Reserve, including to maintain—

(A) the quality or quantity of the gasoline or fuel in the Reserve; or

(B) the operational capacity of the Reserve.

(g) FILL DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall complete the process of filling the Reserve under this section by March 1, 2008.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—The President may extend the deadline established under paragraph (1) if—

(A) the President determines that filling the Reserve within that deadline would cause an undue economic burden on the United States; and

(B) the President receives approval from Congress.

SEC. 193. RELEASE OF GASOLINE AND FUEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall release gasoline or fuel from the Reserve only if—

(1) the President finds that there is a severe fuel supply disruption by finding that—

(A) a regional or national supply shortage of gasoline or fuel of significant scope and duration has occurred;

(B) a substantial increase in the price of gasoline or fuel has resulted from the shortage;

(C) the price increase is likely to cause a significant adverse impact on the national economy; and

(D) releasing gasoline or fuel from the Reserve would assist directly and significantly in reducing the adverse impact of the shortage; or

(2) the Governor of a State submits to the Secretary a written request for a release from the Reserve that contains a finding that—

(i) a regional or statewide supply shortage of gasoline or fuel of significant scope and duration has occurred;

(ii) a substantial increase in the price of gasoline or fuel has resulted from the shortage; and

(iii) the price increase is likely to cause a significant adverse impact on the economy of the State; and

(B) the Secretary concurs with the findings of the Governor under subparagraph (A) and determines that—

(1) a release from the Reserve would mitigate gasoline or fuel price volatility in the State;

(2) a release from the Reserve would not have an adverse effect on the long-term economic viability of retail gasoline or fuel markets in the State and adjacent States; and

(3) a release from the Reserve would not suppress prices below long-term market trend levels.

(b) PROCEDURE.—

(1) RESPONSE OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall respond to a request submitted under subsection (a)(2) not later than 5 days after receipt of the request by—

(A) approving the request;

(B) denying the request; or

(C) requesting additional supporting information.

(2) RELEASE.—The Secretary shall establish procedures governing the release of gasoline or fuel from the Reserve in accordance with this subsection.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this paragraph, the term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that is customarily engaged in the sale or distribution of gasoline or fuel.

(B) SALE OR DISPOSAL FROM RESERVE.—The procedures established under this subsection shall provide that the Secretary may—

(i) sell gasoline or fuel from the Reserve to an eligible entity through a competitive process; or

(ii) enter into an exchange agreement with an eligible entity under which the Secretary receives a greater volume of gasoline or fuel as repayment from the eligible entity than the volume provided to the eligible entity.

(c) CONTINUING EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct a continuing evaluation of the drawdown and release procedures established under this section.

SEC. 194. REPORTS.

(a) GASOLINE AND FUEL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the feasibility of creating a natural gas and diesel reserve similar to the Reserve under this part.

(b) NATURAL GAS AND DIESEL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of establishing a natural gas and diesel reserve.

(c) GASOLINE AND FUEL RESERVE FUND.


There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this part, to remain available until expended.
By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. REED, and Ms. MIKULSKI).

S. 1795. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to protect Social Security cost-of-living adjustments (COLA); to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I am joined by several of my colleagues in the Senate to introduce the Social Security COLA Protection Act of 2005. This legislation will provide some relief to seniors from rising Medicare premiums, and ensure that their Social Security cost-of-living-adjustments or COLA available for other essential needs such as food and housing.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. REED, and Ms. MIKULSKI) in joining me in this effort. Last Congress several colleagues and I introduced this legislation. I am offering this bill based on what these courageous individuals have told me they need. Financial insecurity is a major factor in ongoing domestic violence. Too often, victims who are not economically self sufficient are forced to choose between protecting themselves and their children and keeping a roof over their heads. It is critical that we help guarantee the economic security of victims of domestic or sexual violence so that they can provide for themselves and their families and so that they are not forced, because of economic dependence, to stay in an abusive relationship.

In order to do this, we must ensure that the victims of domestic or sexual violence can seek the help they need without the fear of losing their jobs. Too many victims have been fired for missing work in order to find shelter or get a court restraining order. In order to keep their jobs, victims often must return to their abusers.

Unfortunately, some victims of domestic or sexual violence are forced to leave their jobs and relocate to protect themselves and their families. We must ensure the continued financial security of these victims through the use of unemployment benefits. Currently, a woman can receive unemployment benefits if she leaves her job because her husband was abusive, and can receive the same benefits. Currently, 28 States and the District of Columbia provide some type of unemployment assistance to victims of domestic or sexual violence. Our bill will ensure that this assistance is available in every State, so that no woman has to make the tragic choice of risking her safety to protect her livelihood.

Moreover, victims must not be made silent by the fear of discrimination in employment and insurance. Punishing victims for circumstances beyond their control is wrong and only helps abusers in their efforts to control their victims. Denying a woman employment...
because she is a victim of domestic violence robs her of the economic security she needs to escape a dangerous relationship. Making insurance coverage decisions based on a history of abuse only encourages women to lie about their victimization and avoid seeking help until it is too late. The SAFE Act prohibits discrimination in employment and insurance based on domestic or sexual violence, to ensure that victims are never punished for their abusers’ crimes.

Sadly, domestic violence and poverty are inextricably linked, and many victims of domestic or sexual violence are also recipients of Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF). Work requirements in this program often punish victims who must take time off to protect themselves and their children. In 1996, Senator Paul Wellstone and I offered an amendment to TANF called the Family Violence Option, which allows States to adjust TANF work requirements for victims of domestic violence. The SAFE act will strengthen the Family Violence Option, in order to protect some of the most economically vulnerable victims.

Despite the great progress that has been made, domestic violence is still a serious problem in our country. Domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to women, and over 5.3 million incidents occur every year. Domestic or sexual violence also continues to have severe economic consequences, costing businesses between 3 and 5 billion dollars each year in lost productivity. The SAFE Act will help victims to escape dangerous situations and prevent abuse from occurring. This will not only protect the lives of countless victims, it will allow them to be more productive members of the economy.

I am proud of the guidance we’ve received for this legislation. I want to thank them for their efforts and their commitment to breaking the cycle of violence. I want to particularly acknowledge the efforts of the advocates in Washington State who provided us invaluable input in drafting this legislation. The support and leadership of our communities will help us take this critical next step in passing SAFE.

Domestic violence, an abusive relationship can seem like a hopeless situation. Through VAWA, we have already provided new hope to millions of these victims. The SAFE Act is the crucial next step in ending the cycle of abuse. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and provide victims and their families with the tools they need for productive, independent and most importantly, safe futures.

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. 1796

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 “Security and Financial Empowerment Act” or the “SAFE Act.”
(b) Table of Contents.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:
Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ENTITLEMENT TO EMERGENCY LEAVE FOR ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING
Sec. 101. Purposes.
Sec. 102. Employment to emergency leave for addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
Sec. 103. Existing leave usable for addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
Sec. 104. Emergency benefits.
Sec. 105. Effect on other laws and employment benefits.
Sec. 106. Conforming amendment.
Sec. 107. Effective date.

TITLE II—ENTITLEMENT TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING
Sec. 201. Purposes.

TITLE III—VICTIMS’ EMPLOYMENT SUSTAINABILITY
Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Purposes.
Sec. 303. Prohibited discriminatory acts.
Sec. 304. Enforcement.
Sec. 305. Attorney’s fees.

TITLE IV—VICTIMS OF ABUSE INSURANCE PROTECTION
Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Definitions.
Sec. 403. Discriminatory acts prohibited.
Sec. 404. Insurance protocols for subjects of abuse.
Sec. 405. Remedies for adverse actions.
Sec. 406. Life insurance.
Sec. 407. Subrogation without consent prohibited.
Sec. 408. Enforcement.
Sec. 409. Effective date.

TITLE V—NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE AND RESOURCE CENTER ON DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE OR GRANT
Sec. 501. National clearinghouse and resource center on domestic and sexual violence in the workplace grant.

TITLE VI—SEVERABILITY
Sec. 601. Severability.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.
Congress makes the following findings:
(1) Domestic violence crimes account for approximately 15 percent of total crime costs in the United States each year.
(2) Violence against women has been reported to be the leading cause of physical injury to women. Such violence has a devastating impact on women’s physical and emotional health and financial security.
(3) According to a recent study by the National Institutes of Health and Disease Control and Prevention, each year there are 5,300,000 non-fatal violent victimizations committed by intimate partners against women. Female murder victims were substantially more likely than male murder victims to be killed by an intimate partner. About ¾ of female murder victims, and about 4 percent of male murder victims, were killed by an intimate partner.
(4) According to recent government estimates, approximately 987,400 rapes occur annually in the United States, 89 percent of the rapes perpetrated against female victims. Since 2001, rapes have actually increased by 4 percent.
(5) Approximately 10,200,000 people have been stalked at some time in their lives. Four out of every 5 stalking victims are women. Stalkers harass and terrorize their victims by spying on the victims, standing outside their places of work or homes, making unwanted phone calls, leaving unwanted letters or items, or vandalizing property.
(6) Employees in the United States who have been victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking too often suffer adverse consequences in the workplace as a result of their victimization.
(7) Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are particularly vulnerable to changes in employment, pay, and benefits as a result of their victimizations, and are, therefore, in need of legal protection.
(8) The prevalence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other violence against women at work is dramatic. About 36,500 individuals, 80 percent of whom are women, were raped or sexually assaulted in the workplace between 1993 through 1999. Half of all female victims of violent workplace crimes know their attackers. Nearly 1 out of 10 violent workplace incidents are committed by partners or spouses. Women who work for State and local governments suffer a higher incidence of workplace assaults, including rapes, than women who work in the private sector.
(9) Homicide is the leading cause of death for women on the job. Husbands, boyfriends, and ex-partners commit 15 percent of workplace homicides against women.
(10) Studies indicate that between 35 and 56 percent of employed battered women surveyed were harassed at work by their abusive partners.
(11) According to a 1998 report of the Government Accountability Office, between ¼ and ½ of domestic violence victims surveyed in 3 studies reported that the victims lost a job due, at least in part, to domestic violence.
(12) Women who have experienced domestic violence or dating violence are more likely than other women to be unemployed, to suffer from health problems that can affect employability and job performance, to report lower personal income, and to rely on welfare.
(13) Abusers frequently seek to control their partners by actively interfering with their ability to work, including preventing their partners from going to work, harassing their partners at work, limiting the access of their partners to cash or transportation, and sabotaging the child care arrangements of their partners.
(14) More than ¾ of women receiving welfare have been victims of domestic violence as adults and between ¼ and ½ reported being abused in the workplace.
(15) Victims of intimate partner violence lose 8,000,000 days of paid work each year, the equivalent of over 32,000 full-time jobs and 5,600,000 days of household productivity.
(16) Sexual assault, whether occurring in or out of the workplace, can impair an employee’s work performance, require time
away from work, and undermine the employee's ability to maintain a job. Almost 50 percent of sexual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit in the aftermath of the assault.

(17) More than 35 percent of stalking victims report losing time from work due to the stalking and 7 percent never return to work. (18) According to the National Institute of Justice, crime costs an estimated $450,000,000,000 annually in medical expenses, lost earnings, social service costs, pain, suffering, and reduced quality of life for victims, which harms the Nation's productivity and drains the Nation's resources.

(18) Violence accounts for $245,000,000,000 per year of this amount.

(19) Violent crime results in wage losses equivalent to 1 percent of all United States earnings, and causes 3 percent of the Nation's medical spending and 14 percent of the Nation's injury-related medical spending.

(20) The Bureau of National Affairs has estimated that domestic violence costs United States employers between $3,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000 annually in lost time and productivity. Other reports have estimated that domestic violence costs those employing between $3,500,000,000 and $13,000,000,000 annually.

(21) United States medical costs for domestic violence have been estimated to be $31,000,000,000 per year.

(22) Surveys of business executives and corporate security directors also underscore the heavy toll that workplace violence takes on women, businesses, and interstate commerce in the United States.

(23) Ninety-four percent of corporate security and safety directors at companies nationwide rank domestic violence as a high priority concern.

(24) Forty-nine percent of senior executives recently surveyed said domestic violence has a harmful effect on their company's productivity, 47 percent said domestic violence negatively affects attendance, and 44 percent said domestic violence increases health care costs.

(25) Only 28 States have laws that explicitly provide unemployment insurance to domestic violence victims in certain circumstances, and none of the laws explicitly cover sexual assault as a cause of unemployment.

(26) Only 6 States provide domestic violence victims with leave from work to go to court, to the doctor, or to take other steps to address domestic violence in their lives, and only Maine provides such leave to victims of sexual assault and stalking.

(27) No States prohibit employment discrimination against victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(28) Employees, including individuals participating in welfare to work programs, may need to take time during business hours to: (A) obtain orders of protection; (B) seek medical or legal assistance, counseling, or other services; or (C) look for housing in order to escape domestic violence or sexual assault.

(29) Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking have been subjected to discrimination by private and State employers, including discrimination motivated by stereotypical notions about women and other discrimination on the basis of sex.

(30) Domestic violence victims and third parties who help them have been subjected to discriminatory practices by health, life, disability, and property and casualty insurers, and employers who self-insure employee benefits, who have denied or canceled coverage, rejected claims, and raised rates based on or related to domestic violence. Some State legislatures have tried to address those practices, the scope of protection afforded by the laws adopted varies from State to State, with many failing to address the problem comprehensively. Moreover, Federal law prevents States from protecting the almost 40 percent of employees whose employers self-insure employee benefits.

(31) Existing Federal law does not explicitly—

(A) authorize victims of domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking to take leave from work to seek legal assistance and redress, counseling, or assistance with safety planning activities;

(B) address the eligibility of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking for unemployment compensation;

(C) prohibit employment discrimination against actual or perceived victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(D) prohibit employers and employers who self-insure employee benefits from—

(i) discriminating against domestic violence victims and those who help them in determining eligibility for coverage, rates charged, and standards for payment of claims; or

(ii) disclosing information about abuse and the location of the victims through insurance databases and other means.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, except as otherwise expressly provided:

(1) COMMERCE.—The terms “commerce” and “industry or activity affecting commerce” have the meanings given in section 3 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611).

(2) COURSE OF CONDUCT.—The term “course of conduct” means a course of repeatedly maintaining a visual or physical proximity to a person or conveying verbal or written threats, including threats conveyed through electronic communications, or threats implied by conduct.

(3) DATING VIOLENCE.—The term “dating violence” means the term defined in section 101 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611).

(4) DOMESTIC VIOLENT ACT.—The term “domestic violence” means the term “domestic violence” as defined in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)).

(5) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COALITION.—The term “domestic violence coalition” means an entity that—

(A) has the meaning given in subparagraph (A) of section 5(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13961). (B) collaborates and coordinates activities that—

(i) promote victim safety;

(ii) provide for the efficient delivery of services; and

(iii) are provided to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking by an entity that—

(A) collaborates with domestic violence programs and other organizations in providing services to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(B) collaborates and coordinates activities that—

(i) promote victim safety;

(ii) provide for the efficient delivery of services; and

(iii) are provided to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(C) has the meanings given the terms in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)).

(6) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM.—The term “domestic violence victim” means a person who has suffered conduct constituting domestic violence.

(7) EMPLOYER.—The terms “employ” and “State” have the meanings given in section 3 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2603).

(8) EMPLOYEE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “employee” means any person employed by an employer. In the case of an individual employed by a public agency, such term means any individual employed as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)).

(B) BASIS.—The term includes an employee employed as described in subparagraph (A) on a full-time or part-time basis, for a fixed time period, on a temporary basis, pursuant to a detail, as an independent contractor, or as a participant in a work assignment as a condition of receipt of Federal or State income-based public assistance.

(9) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer”—

(A) means any person engaged in commerce, or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more individuals; and

(B) includes any person acting directly or indirectly to authorize, direct, or participate in the employment of another individual for purposes of committing a fraud or otheruction in relation to an employee, and includes a public agency that employs individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 2603). (10) FAMILY OR HOUSEHOLD MEMBER.—The term “family or household member”, used with respect to a person, means a spouse, or person residing or formerly residing with the person in the same dwelling unit as the person.

(12) PARENT; SONS OR DAUGHTERS.—The terms “parent” and “son or daughter” have the meanings given in section 2 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2601).

(13) PERSON.—The term “person” has the meaning given the term defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(14) PUBLIC AGENCY.—The term “public agency” has the meaning given the term defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(15) PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.—The term “public assistance” includes cash, food stamps, medical assistance, housing assistance, and other benefits provided on the basis of income by a public agency.

(16) REDUCED WORK SCHEDULE.—The term “reduced work schedule” means a work schedule that reduces the usual number of hours per workweek, or hours per workday, of an employee.

(17) REPEATEDLY.—The term “repeatedly” means on 2 or more occasions.

(18) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.

(19) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term “sexual assault” has the meaning given the term defined in section 3(e)(2) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 1152).

(20) SEXUAL ASSAULT COALITION.—The term “sexual assault coalition” means a nonprofit, nongovernmental membership organization that—

(A) has the meanings given the terms in section 3(e)(2) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 1152).

(B) serves adult victims of sexual assault; and

(C) has the meanings given the terms in section 3(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(3)).
(B) collaborates and coordinates activities with Federal, State, and local entities to further the purposes of sexual assault intervention and prevention; and

(C) through such activities, provides training and technical assistance to entities carrying out sexual assault programs within a State, territory, political subdivision, or area under Federal priority.

(21) STALKING.—The term ‘‘stalking’’ means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress or to fear bodily injury, sexual assault, or death to the person, or the person’s family or household members, or to fear injury to the person’s property, by placing the person or any other person who regularly resides in the person’s household, if the conduct causes the specific person to have such distress or fear.

(22) VICTIM OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—The term ‘‘victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking’’ includes a person who has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and a person whose family or household member has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(23) VICTIM SERVICES ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘‘victim services organization’’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that provides assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and services for such victims, including a rape crisis center, an organization carrying out a domestic violence program, an organization operating a shelter or providing counseling services, or an organization providing assistance through the legal process.

TITLE II—ENTITLEMENT TO EMERGENCY LEAVE FOR ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are, pursuant to the affirmative power of Congress to enact legislation under the portions of section 8 of article I of the Constitution relating to providing for the general welfare and to regulation of commerce among the several States, and under section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

(1) to promote the national interest in reducing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by enabling victims to receive counseling, legal assistance, counseling, safety planning, or other assistance without penalty from their employers; and

(B) prohibiting employers from discriminating against actual or perceived victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, in a manner that accommodates the legitimate interests of employers and protects the safety of all persons in the workplace.

SEC. 102. ENTITLEMENT TO EMERGENCY LEAVE FOR ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

(a) LEAVE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) BASIS.—An employee who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking may take leave from work to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, by—

(A) seeking medical attention for, or recovering from, physical or psychological injuries caused by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

(B) obtaining services from a victim services organization for the employee or the employee’s family or household member;

(C) obtaining psychological or other counseling for the employee or the employee’s family or household member;

(D) participating in safety planning, temporarily or permanently relocating, or taking other actions to increase the safety of the employee or the employee’s family or household member from future domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking or ensure economic security; or

(E) seeking through remedies to ensure the health and safety of the employee or the employee’s family or household member, including preparing for or participating in any civil or criminal legal proceeding related to or derived from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) PERIOD.—An employee may take not more than 3 working days of leave described in paragraph (1), in any 12-month period.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Leave described in paragraph (1) may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule.

(c) NOTICE.—The employee shall provide the employer with reasonable notice of the intended duration of the leave, unless providing such notice is not practicable.

(d) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The employer may require the employee to provide certification to the employer, within a reasonable period after the employer requests the certification, that—

(A) the employee or the employee’s family or household member is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) the leave is for 1 of the purposes enumerated in subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONTENTS.—An employee may satisfy the certification requirement of paragraph (1) by providing to the employer—

(A) a sworn statement of the employee;

(B) documentation from an employee, an employee’s volunteer organization, or crisis organization, an attorney, a member of the clergy, or a medical or other professional, from whom the employee or the employee’s family or household member has sought assistance in addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(C) a police or court record; or

(D) other corroborating evidence.

(e) EMPLOYMENT AND BENEFITS.—

(1) RESTORATION TO POSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any employee who takes leave under this section for the intended purpose of the leave shall be entitled, on return from such leave—

(i) to be restored by the employer to the position of employment held by the employee when the leave commenced; or

(ii) to be restored to an equivalent position within the employer, with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment.

(B) LOSS OF BENEFITS.—The taking of leave under this section shall not result in the loss of any employment benefit accrued prior to the date on which the leave commenced.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to entitle any restored employee to—

(i) the accrual of any seniority or employment benefits during any period of leave; or

(ii) any right, benefit, or position of employment other than any right, benefit, or position to which the employee would have been entitled had the employee not taken the leave.

(D) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit an employer from requiring an employee on leave under this section to report periodically to the employer on the status and intention of the employee to return to work.

(2) EXEMPTION CONCERNING CERTAIN HIGHLY COMPENSATED EMPLOYEES.—

(A) DENIAL OF RESTORATION.—An employer may deny restoration under paragraph (1) to any employee described in subparagraph (B) if—

(i) such denial is necessary to prevent substantial and grievous economic injury to the operations of the employer;

(ii) such denial is the product of the intent of the employer to deny restoration on such basis at the time the employer

SEC. 103. AMENDMENTS TO THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(B) the term ‘‘family or household member’’ shall mean a person who is related by blood or marriage to the employee; and

(C) in section 3(4), by striking the last sentence.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

This section shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.
determines that such injury would occur; and
(iii) in any case in which the leave has commenced, the employee elects not to return to employment after receiving such notice.

(B) AFFECTED EMPLOYERS.—An employee referred to in subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(2) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(2) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.—
(A) COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during any period that an employer fails to maintain coverage under any group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for such employee at the level and under the conditions coverage would have been provided if the employee had continued in employment continuously for the duration of such leave.
(B) FAILURE TO RETURN FROM LEAVE.—The employer may recover the premium that the employer may otherwise be required to pay under the plan for the continuation of, recurrence of, or other corroborating evidence, and the fact that the employee is not returning to work because of a reason described in subparagraph (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A) is a salaried employee earning the highest paid 10 percent of the employees employed by the employer within 75 miles of the facility at which the employee is employed.
SEC. 103. EXISTING LEAVE USABLE FOR ADJUSTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

An employee who is entitled to take paid or unpaid leave (including family, medical, sick, annual, personal, or similar leave) from employment, pursuant to State or local law, a collective bargaining agreement, or an employment benefits program or plan, may elect to substitute any period of such leave for an equivalent period of leave provided under section 102.

SEC. 104. EMERGENCY BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State may use funds provided under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to provide nonrecurrent short-term emergency benefits to an individual for any period of leave the individual takes pursuant to section 102.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—In calculating the eligibility of an individual for such emergency benefits, the State shall count only the cash available or accessible to the individual.

(c) TIMING.—Applications—An individual seeking emergency benefits under subsection (a) from a State shall submit an application to the State.

(1) APPLICATIONS.—The State shall provide benefits to an eligible applicant under paragraph (1) on an expedited basis, and not later than 7 days after the applicant submits an application under paragraph (1).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 404 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 604) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY BENEFITS.—A State that receives a grant under section 404 may use the grant to provide nonrecurrent short-term emergency benefits, in accordance with section 104 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act, to individuals who take leave pursuant to section 102 to the extent it is determined whether the individuals receive assistance under the State program funded under this part.

SEC. 105. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS AND EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.

(a) MORE PROTECTIVE LAWS, AGREEMENTS, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede any provision of Federal, State, or local law, collective bargaining agreement, or employment benefits program or plan that provides—

(1) greater leave benefits for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking than the rights established under this title; or

(2) leave benefits for a larger population of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as defined in such law, agreement, program, or plan) than those provided under this title.

(b) LESS PROTECTIVE LAWS, AGREEMENTS, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS.—The rights established for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking under this title shall not be diminished by any State or local law, collective bargaining agreement, or employment benefits program or plan.

SEC. 106. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this title.

(b) LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—The Librarian of Congress shall prescribe the regulations described in subsection (a) with respect to employees of the Library of Congress. The regulations prescribed under this subsection shall, to the extent appropriate, be consistent with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a).

(c) CERTAIN PUBLIC AGENCY EMPLOYERS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe the regulations described in subsection (a) with respect to individuals described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)) (other than an individual employed by an entity of the legislative branch of the Federal Government). The regulations prescribed under this subsection shall, to the extent appropriate, be consistent with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a).

SEC. 107. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 1003(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 2004a-1(a)(1)) is amended to read "The Secretary under subsection (a)."

SECTION 908. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendment made by this title take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 201. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are, pursuant to the affirmative power of Congress to enact legislation under the portions of section 8 of article I of the Constitution relating to laying and collecting taxes, providing for the general welfare, and regulation of commerce among the several States, and under section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution—

(1) to promote the national interest in reducing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by enabling victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to maintain the financial independence necessary to leave abusive situations, achieve safety, and minimize the physical and emotional injuries from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and to reduce the devastating economic consequences of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to employers and employees;

(2) to promote the national interest in ensuring that victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking can recover from and cope with the effects of such victimization and participate in the criminal and civil justice processes without fear of adverse economic consequences;

(3) to minimize the negative impact on interstate commerce from dislocations of employees and harmful effects on productivity, loss of employment, health care costs, and employer costs, caused by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including intentional efforts to frustrate the ability of women to participate in employment and interstate commerce;

(4) to promote the purposes of the 14th amendment to the Constitution by preventing sex-based discrimination and discrimination against victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in unemployment insurance, by addressing the failure of existing laws to protect the employment rights of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, by protecting their civil and economic rights, and by furthering the equal opportunity of women for economic self-sufficiency and employment free from discrimination; and

(5) to accomplish the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (4) by providing unemployment insurance benefits to individuals separated from employment as a result of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, in a manner that accommodates the legitimate interests of employers and protects the safety of all persons in the workplace.

SEC. 202. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

(1) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to approval of State unemployment compensation laws amended—

(A) in paragraph (18), by striking "and" at the end; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (20).

(2) By inserting after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

"(19) compensation shall not be denied where an individual is separated from employment due to circumstances resulting.
from the individual’s experience of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, nor shall States impose additional conditions that restrict the individual’s eligibility for, or receipt of, such assistance without those required of other individuals who are forced to leave their jobs or are deemed to have good cause for voluntarily separating from their employers; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(19), the term ‘domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking’ includes: 

(i) the nature and dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act); 

(ii) methods of ascertaining and keeping confidential information about possible experiences of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined) to ensure that— 

(1) requests for unemployment compensation based on separations stemming from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined) are reliably screened, identified, and adjudicated; and 

(II) full confidentiality is provided for the individual’s claim and submitted evidence; and 

(iii) the nature and dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act); 

(3) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING DEFINED.—The terms "domestic violence," "dating violence," "sexual assault," and "stalking" have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act.

(b) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)) is amended by—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (10) as paragraphs (5) through (11), respectively; and 

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) Such methods of administration as will ensure that—

(A) applicants for unemployment compensation and individuals inquiring about such compensation are adequately notified of the provisions of subsections (a)(19) and (g) of section 303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the availability of unemployment compensation for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking); and

(B) claims reviewers and hearing personnel are adequately trained in—

(1) the nature and dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act); 

(2) ensuring that such training is delivered by the State to case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part and are adequately trained in—

(i) the nature and dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); 

(ii) State standards and procedures relating to the prevention of, and assistance to individuals who experience, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); and

(iii) methods of ascertaining and keeping confidential information about possible experiences of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); 

(C) if a State has elected to establish and enforce standards and procedures regarding the screening for and identification of domestic violence pursuant to paragraph (7), ensure that—

(i) applicants for assistance under the program and individuals inquiring about such assistance are granted the following options available under such standards and procedures;

(ii) case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are provided with adequate training regarding such standards and procedures and options available under such standards and procedures; and

(D) ensure that the training required under subparagraphs (B) and, if applicable, (C)(ii) of such paragraph is provided through a training program operated by an eligible entity as defined in section 302(k)(2) of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act.

(c) TANF PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) CERTIFICATION THAT THE STATE WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION TO VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—A certification by the chief officer of the State that the State has established and is enforcing standards and procedures to—

(A) ensure that applicants for assistance under the program and individuals inquiring about such assistance are adequately notified of—

(i) the provisions of subsections (a)(19) and (g) of section 303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the availability of unemployment compensation for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking); and

(ii) assistance made available by the State to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act); 

(B) ensure that case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are adequately trained in—

(i) the nature and dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); 

(ii) State standards and procedures relating to the prevention of, and assistance to individuals who experience, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); and

(iii) methods of ascertaining and keeping confidential information about possible experiences of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (as so defined); 

(C) if a State has elected to establish and enforce standards and procedures regarding the screening for and identification of domestic violence pursuant to paragraph (7), ensure that—

(i) applicants for assistance under the program and individuals inquiring about such assistance are granted the following options available under such standards and procedures;

(ii) case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are provided with adequate training regarding such standards and procedures and options available under such standards and procedures; and

(D) ensure that the training required under subparagraphs (B) and, if applicable, (C)(ii) of such paragraph is provided through a training program operated by an eligible entity as defined in section 302(k)(2) of the Security and Financial Empowerment Act.

(d) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the ‘‘Secretary’’) is authorized to award grants to a national victim services organization in order for such organization to—

(i) develop and disseminate a model training program (and related materials) for the training required under section 303(a)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (b), and under subparagraphs (B) and, if applicable, (C)(ii) of such section of the such Act, as added by subsection (c); and

(ii) provide technical assistance with respect to such model training program; and

(B) grants to State, tribal, or local agencies in order for such agencies to contract with eligible entities to provide State, tribal, or local case work or State, tribal, or local agency personnel responsible for administering the temporary assistance to needy families program established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act in a State or Indian reservation with the training required under subparagraphs (B) and, if applicable, (C)(ii) of such section of the such Act.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the term ‘‘eligible entity’’ means an entity that is—

(A) a State or tribal domestic violence coalition or sexual assault coalition; 

(B) a State or local victim services organization with recognized expertise in the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking whose primary mission is to provide services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, such as a rape crisis center or domestic violence program; or

(C) an organization with demonstrated expertise in State or county welfare laws and implementation of such laws and experience with disseminating information on such laws and implementation, but only if such organization will provide the required training in partnership with an entity described in clause (i) or (ii); and

(B) that—

(i) has demonstrated expertise in both domestic violence and sexual assault, such as a joint domestic violence and sexual assault coalition; or

(ii) will provide the required training in partnership with an entity described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) in order to comply with the dual domestic violence and sexual assault expertise requirement under clause (i).

(3) APPLICATION.—An entity seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form and manner, and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

(4) REPORTS.—

(A) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall annually submit a report to Congress on the grant program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination of the public of each report submitted under subparagraph (A). Such procedures shall include the use of the Internet to disseminate such reports.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(6) THREE-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF GRANT FUNDS.—Each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall return to the Secretary any
TITLE III—VICTIMS’ EMPLOYMENT SUSTAINABILITY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Victims’ Employment Sustainability Act”.

SEC. 302. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are, pursuant to the affirmative power of Congress to enact legislation under the portions of section 8 of article I of the Constitution relating to providing for the general welfare and to regulate of commerce among the several States, and under section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution:

(1) to promote the national interest in reducing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; by protecting victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and participate in criminal and civil justice processes, without fear of adverse economic consequences from their employment;

(2) to promote the national interest in ensuring that victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking can recover from and cope with the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and participate in criminal and civil justice processes, without fear of adverse economic consequences from their employment;

(3) to ensure that victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking can recover from and cope with the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and participate in criminal and civil justice processes, without fear of adverse economic consequences from their employment;

(4) to promote the purposes of the 14th amendment to the Constitution by preventing sex-based discrimination and discrimination against victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; by protecting victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; by protecting the civil and economic rights of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and by furthering the equal opportunity of women to economic self-sufficiency and employment free from discrimination;

(5) to promote the purposes of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(e)(2)); or

(6) to accomplish the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (5) by prohibiting employers from discriminating against actual or perceived victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, in a manner that accommodates the legitimate interests of employers and protects the employment relationship, and includes a reasonable accommodation.

SEC. 303. PROHIBITED DISCRIMINATORY ACTS.

(a) In General.—An employer shall not fail to hire, refuse to hire, discharge, or harass an applicant or employee because the applicant or employee is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 304. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.
(A) In general.—The term “undue hardship” means an action requiring significant difficulty or expense, when considered in light of the factors set forth in subparagraph (B).

(B) Factors to be considered.—In determining whether a reasonable accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the operations of the employer or public agency, factors to be considered include—

(i) the nature and cost of the reasonable accommodation needed under this section;

(ii) the financial resources of the facility involved in the provision of the reasonable accommodation, the number of persons employed at such facility, the effect on employment, or the impact otherwise of such accommodation on the operation of the facility;

(iii) the overall financial resources of the employer or public agency, the overall size of the business of an employer or public agency with respect to the number of employees of the employer or public agency, and the number, type, and location of the facilities of an employer or public agency; and

(iv) the type of operation of the employer or public agency, including the composition, structure, and functions of the workforce of the employer or public agency, the geographic separateness of the facility from the employer or public agency, and the administrative or fiscal relationship of the facility to the employer or public agency.

SEC. 304. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) Civil action by individuals.—

(1) In general.—Any employer that violates section 303 shall be liable to any individual affected for—

(A) damages equal to the amount of wages, salary, or other compensation denied or lost to such individual by reason of the violation, and the interest on that amount calculated at the prevailing rate;

(B) compensatory damages, including damages for future pecuniary losses, emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, and other nonpecuniary losses; and

(C) punitive damages, up to 3 times the amount of actual damages sustained, as the court determines in paragraph (2) shall determine to be appropriate; and

(D) such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, or promotion.

(2) Right of action.—An action to recover the damages or equitable relief prescribed in paragraph (1) may be maintained against any employer, Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any 1 or more individuals described in section 303.

(b) Action by Department of Justice.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction for recovery of the damages or equitable relief described in subsection (a).

(c) Certain public agency employers.—

(1) Agencies.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, in the case of a public agency that employs individuals as described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)) (other than an entity of the legislative branch of the Federal Government), paragraph (2) shall apply.

(2) Authority.—In the case described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the Librarian shall, by the powers, remedies, and procedures provided in (a) the case of a violation of section 2302(b)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code; to an employing agency, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 303(a) by the employing agency shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this section provides in the case of a violation of section 303 to that agency, that Office, that Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 303, respectively, against an employee who is such an individual.

(e) Public agencies providing public assistance.—Consistent with regulations prescribed under section 306(d), the President shall ensure that any public agency that violates section 303(a) by taking an action prohibited under section 303(a) against any individual with respect to the amount, terms, or conditions of public assistance, shall provide to any individual who receives a less favorable treatment under section 306(d), the President shall ensure that any public agency that violates section 303(a) by taking an action prohibited under section 303(a) against any individual with respect to the amount, terms, or conditions of public assistance, shall provide to any individual who receives a less favorable treatment under section 306(d) as a result of the violation—

(1)(A) the amount of any public assistance denied or lost to such individual by reason of the violation;

(B) the interest on the amount described in clause (1) calculated at the prevailing rate; and

(2) such equitable relief as may be appropriate.

SEC. 305. ATTORNEY FEES.

(a) In general.—Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this title.

(b) Library of Congress.—The Librarian of Congress shall prescribe the regulations described in subsection (a) with respect to employees of the Library of Congress. The regulations prescribed under this subsection shall, to the extent appropriate, be consistent with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a).

(c) Certain public agency employers.—

(1) The Librarian of Congress shall prescribe the regulations described in this section in consultation with the Attorney General. The Librarian of Congress shall provide in the case of a violation of section 2302(b)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code; to an employing agency, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 303(a) by the employing agency such an individual.

(b) Authorization.—In the case described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the Librarian shall, by the powers, remedies, and procedures provided in (a) the case of a violation of section 2302(b)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code; to an employing agency, the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 303(a) by the employing agency shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this section provides in the case of a violation of section 303 to that agency, that Office, that Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 303, respectively, against an employee who is such an individual.

(c) Public agencies providing public assistance.—Consistent with regulations prescribed under section 306(d), the President shall ensure that any public agency that violates section 303(a) by taking an action prohibited under section 303(a) against any individual with respect to the amount, terms, or conditions of public assistance, shall provide to any individual who receives a less favorable treatment under section 306(d) as a result of the violation—

(1)(A) the amount of any public assistance denied or lost to such individual by reason of the violation;

(B) the interest on the amount described in clause (1) calculated at the prevailing rate; and

(2) such equitable relief as may be appropriate.

SEC. 306. FEES.

(a) In general.—The term “fee” means an action requiring significant difficulty or expense, when considered in light of the factors set forth in subparagraph (B). The President shall ensure that any public agency that violates section 303(a) by taking an action prohibited under section 303(a) against any individual with respect to the amount, terms, or conditions of public assistance, shall provide to any individual who receives a less favorable treatment under section 306(d) as a result of the violation—

(1)(A) the amount of any public assistance denied or lost to such individual by reason of the violation;

(B) the interest on the amount described in clause (1) calculated at the prevailing rate; and

(2) such equitable relief as may be appropriate.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

(a) In general.—

(1) Assistance.—The term “assistance” means any aid, benefit, contribution, expenditure, grant, loan, or other transfer of value by any person, reciprocal exchange, inter insurer, Lloyds insurer, fraternal benefit society, or other legal entity engaged in the business of insurance, including agents, brokers, adjusters, and third-party administrators. The term includes employers who provide or make available employment benefits that are equivalent to a benefit plan, as defined in section 3301 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1051). The term also includes health carriers, health benefit plans, and life, disability, and property and casualty insurers.

(2) Policy.—The term “policy” means a contract of insurance, certificate, indemnity, bond, or other written agreement providing for insurance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.

(b) Subject of abuse.—

(1) Abuser.—The term “abuser” means a person who, directly or indirectly, engages in any of the following acts or practices on the basis that the applicant or insured, or any person purchasing any benefit plan, proposed for issuance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.

(b) Subject of abuse.—

(1) Abuser.—The term “abuser” means a person who, directly or indirectly, engages in any of the following acts or practices on the basis that the applicant or insured, or any person purchasing any benefit plan, proposed for issuance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.

(b) Subject of abuse.—

(1) Abuser.—The term “abuser” means a person who, directly or indirectly, engages in any of the following acts or practices on the basis that the applicant or insured, or any person purchasing any benefit plan, proposed for issuance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.

(b) Subject of abuse.—

(1) Abuser.—The term “abuser” means a person who, directly or indirectly, engages in any of the following acts or practices on the basis that the applicant or insured, or any person purchasing any benefit plan, proposed for issuance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.

(b) Subject of abuse.—

(1) Abuser.—The term “abuser” means a person who, directly or indirectly, engages in any of the following acts or practices on the basis that the applicant or insured, or any person purchasing any benefit plan, proposed for issuance, or intended for issuance by an insurer, including endorsements or riders to an insurance policy or contract.
(1) Denying, refusing to issue, renew, or reissue, or canceling or otherwise terminating an insurance policy or health benefit plan.

(2) Restricting, excluding, or limiting in substance or effect, losses or denials in a claim, except as otherwise permitted or required by State laws relating to life insurance beneficiaries.

(3) Adding a premium differential to any insurance policy or health benefit plan.

(b) Prohibition on limitation of claims.—

No insurer may, directly or indirectly, deny or limit payment to an insured who is a subject of abuse and is not the beneficiary of the policy.

(c) Prohibition on termination.—

(1) An insurer or health carrier may terminate health coverage for a subject of abuse because coverage was originally issued in the name of the abuser and the abuser has divorced, separated from, or lost custody of the subject of abuse or the abuser’s coverage has terminated voluntarily or involuntarily and the subject of abuse does not qualify for an extension of coverage under part 6 of subpart B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1161 et seq.) or section 980B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 provided to a subject of abuse and is not the beneficiary of the policy.

(2) Payment of premiums.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit the insurer from requiring that the subject of abuse pay a premium for the subject’s coverage under the health plan if the requirements are applied to all insured of the health carrier.

(3) Exception.—An insurer may terminate group coverage to which this subsection applies after the continuation coverage period required by this subsection has been in force for 180 days if the conversion is to an equivalent individual plan.

(4) Continuation coverage.—The continuation of health coverage required by this subsection shall be satisfied by any extension of coverage under part 6 of subpart B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1161 et seq.) or section 980B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 provided to a subject of abuse and is not intended to be in addition to any extension of coverage otherwise provided for under such part 6 or section 980B.

(d) Use of information.—

(1) Limitation.—

(A) In general.—In order to protect the safety of an insured, an insurer may disclose information relating to abuse status, acts of abuse, abuse-related medical conditions, or the applicant’s or insured’s status as a family member, employer, associate, or person in a relationship with a subject of abuse for any purpose not related to the direct provision of health care services unless such use, disclosure, or transfer is required by an order of a court having authority to regulate insurance or by an order of a court of competent jurisdiction;

(B) in order to assist the insurer to establish a safe reporting system;

(C) to an agent or employee of the insurer who is required to assist the insurer to establish a safe reporting system;

(D) in order to provide continuing coverage to a subject of abuse.

(2) Rule of construction.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit or preclude an insurer from relying on the subject’s own insurance records from an insurer.

(2) Authority of subject of abuse.—A subject of abuse, at the absolute discretion of the subject of abuse, may provide evidence of abuse to an insurer for the limited purpose of facilitating treatment and of an abuse-related condition or demonstrating that a condition is abuse-related. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing an insurer or health carrier to disregard such provided evidence.

SEC. 404. INSURANCE POLICIES FOR SUBJECTS OF ABUSE.

Insurers shall adhere to written policies specifying procedures to be followed by employees, contractors, producers, agents, and brokers for the purpose of protecting the subject of abuse and otherwise implementing this title when taking an application, investigating a claim, or taking any other action relating to a policy or claim involving a subject of abuse.

SEC. 405. REASONS FOR ADVERSE ACTIONS.

An insurer that takes an action that adversely affects a subject of abuse, shall advise the applicant or insured who is the subject of abuse of the specific reasons for the action in writing. For purposes of this section, in taking action under this section, the standards, practices, or guidelines shall not constitute a specific reason.

SEC. 406. LIFE INSURANCE.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit a life insurer from declining to issue a life insurance policy if the applicant or prospective owner of the policy is or would be designated as a beneficiary of the policy and—

(1) the applicant or prospective owner of the policy lacks an insurable interest in the insured;

(2) the applicant or prospective owner of the policy is required in order to provide insurance to an insured who is the subject of abuse of the specific reasons for the action in writing.

(3) Exception.—A life insurer may issue a policy that otherwise complies with this title if the policy lacks an insurable interest in the insured.

SEC. 407. SUBROGATION WITHOUT CONSENT PROHIBITED.

Subrogation of claims resulting from abuse is prohibited without the informed consent of the subject of abuse.

SEC. 408. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) Federal Trade Commission.—Any act or practice prohibited by this title shall be treated as an unfair and deceptive act or practice pursuant to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) and the Federal Trade Commission may take such action as is necessary to enforce this title in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this title, including issuing a cease and desist order granting any individual, partnership, or corporation relief under the circumstances, including temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief and compensatory damages.

(b) Private Cause of Action.

(1) In general.—An applicant or insured who believes that the applicant or insured has been adversely affected by an act or practice of an insurer in violation of this title may maintain an action against the insurer in a Federal or State court of original jurisdiction.

(2) Relief.—Upon proof of such conduct by a preponderance of the evidence in an action described in paragraph (1), the court may award appropriate relief, including temporary, permanent injunctive relief and compensatory and punitive damages, as well as the costs of suit and reasonable fees for the aggrieved individual’s attorney or the attorney of any party assisting the plaintiff in that party’s own insurance records from an insurer.

(3) Statutory Damages.—With respect to compensatory damages in an action described in paragraph (1), the aggrieved individual may elect, at any time prior to the rendering of final judgment, to recover in lieu of actual damages, an award of statutory damages in the amount of $5,000 for each violation.

(c) Effective Date.

This title shall apply with respect to any action taken on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE AND RESOURCE CENTER ON DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE GRANT

SEC. 501. NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE AND RESOURCE CENTER ON DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE GRANT.

(a) Authority.—The Attorney General may award grants in accordance with this section to a private, nonprofit entity or tribal organization that meets the requirements of subsection (b), in order to provide for the establishment and operation of a national clearinghouse and resource center to provide information and assistance to employers, labor organizations, and advocates on behalf of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, to aid in their efforts to develop and implement appropriate responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to assist those victims.

(b) Applications.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity or organization shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require, including—

(A) information that demonstrates that the applicant—

(i) has nationally recognized expertise in the area of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(ii) will provide matching funds from non-Federal sources in an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the grant funds awarded under this subsection.

(2) a plan to maximize, to the extent practicable, outreach—

(A) to employers (including private companies, public entities such as public institutions of higher education and State and local governments) and labor organizations in developing and implementing appropriate responses to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) to advocates described in subsection (a), in developing and implementing appropriate responses to assist victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(3) a grant amount—

(A) In general.—Any grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the grant funds awarded under this subsection.

(2) a plan to maximize, to the extent practicable, outreach—

(A) to employers (including private companies, public entities such as public institutions of higher education and State and local governments) and labor organizations in developing and implementing appropriate responses to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) to advocates described in subsection (a), in developing and implementing appropriate responses to assist victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(3) a use of grant amount—

(A) In general.—An entity or organization that receives a grant under this section may use the funds made available through the grant for staff salaries, travel expenses, equipment, printing, and other reasonable expenses necessary to develop, maintain, and disseminate to employers, labor organizations, and advocates on behalf of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) to advocate described in subsection (a), in developing and implementing appropriate responses to assist victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(3) a use of grant amount—

(A) In general.—Any grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the grant funds awarded under this subsection.

(2) a plan to maximize, to the extent practicable, outreach—

(A) to employers (including private companies, public entities such as public institutions of higher education and State and local governments) and labor organizations in developing and implementing appropriate responses to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) to advocate described in subsection (a), in developing and implementing appropriate responses to assist victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.;
JOHNSON and LAUTENBERG. I thank my colleagues for their support of this important legislation.

Beginning this Saturday, October 1, private insurance plans offering Medicare prescription drug coverage will begin marketing their products to Medicare beneficiaries.

Depending on which Medicare region they live in, beneficiaries will be confronted with selecting from as many as 20 stand-alone prescription different plans. In New Jersey, beneficiaries will choose among 17 different plans. Under current law, these plans can both send mail to and call seniors and people with disabilities who are eligible to enroll in the Medicare Part D benefit. As a result, in addition to being flooded with written materials and phone calls, beneficiaries may be called repeatedly.

I am extremely concerned that permitting plans to telemarket creates great potential for unscrupulous individuals and businesses to defraud this vulnerable population. Even if the plans themselves are honest brokers, it may be difficult for a senior or disabled beneficiary to distinguish between who is honest and who is not.

I am very concerned that such individuals and entities will take advantage of this vulnerable population. Unless we act now, there will be an endless potential for fraud and identity theft within the Medicare Part D plan.

Beneficiaries are already confused about what their rights are with respect to the new prescription drug benefit. A senior who is told that she must pay a $2 copayment for each prescription drug she takes may be confused about what their rights are with respect to the new prescription drug benefit. A senior who is told that she must pay a $2 copayment for each prescription drug she takes may be confused about what their rights are with respect to the new prescription drug benefit.

There are better ways to educate seniors and disabled about the prescription drug benefit. The Medicare Do Not Call Act provides additional resources—$2 per Medicare beneficiary—to the State Health Insurance Counseling and Assistance Program (SHIP) to provide enrollment assistance services to Medicare beneficiaries. SHIPs provide valuable objective information to beneficiaries and can provide tremendous assistance in helping beneficiaries select the plan that best suits their needs.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. By prohibiting these un-invited calls we can protect seniors from being sold prescriptions they may not need, and we can prevent identity theft.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 2. TELEMARKETING PROHIBITED.

(a) PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS. — Section 1861(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–104(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(r) PROHIBITION ON TELEMARKETING. —

"(1) IN GENERAL. — Except as provided in clause (ii), for purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘outbound call telemarketing’ means a telephone call initiated by a telemarketer to:

"(I) to induce the purchase of goods or services; or

"(II) to solicit a charitable contribution.

"(ii) CATALOG MAILINGS NOT INCLUDED IN DEFINITION OF OUTBOUND CALL TELEMARKETING. — Such term does not include—

"(I) the mailing of a catalog; or

"(II) the receipt or return of a telephone call initiated by a customer in response to a catalog.

(b) MEDICARE ADVANTAGE ORGANIZATIONS. —

Section 1851(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–21(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) PROHIBITION ON TELEMARKETING. —

A Medicare Advantage organization offering a Medicare Advantage plan that is prohibited from conducting outbound call telemarketing (as defined in section 1860D–4(a)(5)(B)) for purposes of enrolling beneficiaries into such a plan under this part.

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FRAUDULENT TELEMARKETING. —

Section 11208 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7b) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"(g) Whoever knowingly and willfully engages in deceptive or abusive telemarketing acts or practices (as defined in part 310.3 and part 310.4, respectively, of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations), or makes any false statement or representation of a material fact while conducting outbound call telemarketing (as defined in section 1860D–4(a)(5)(B)) with respect to a prescription drug plan offered by a PDP sponsor under part D of title XVIII, a Medicare Advantage plan offered by a Medicare Advantage organization under part C of such title, or who falsely alleges to be conducting outbound call telemarketing (as so defined) with respect to either such plan, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $25,000 and/or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE. — The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INCREASED FUNDING FOR STATE HEALTH INSURANCE COUNSELING AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL. — There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") an amount equal to $2 multiplied by the total number of individuals eligible for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.). Such funds shall—

"(1) be used by the Secretary to award grants to States under section 450 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 1396b–4); and

"(2) remain available until expended.

(b) ALLOCATION OF GRANT FUNDS. —

The Secretary shall ensure that funds appropriated under this section are allocated to States in an amount equal to the proportion of the number of residents of such State who are eligible for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) in
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relating to the total number of individuals eligible for such benefits under such title.

SEC. 4. INFORMING BENEFICIARIES OF THE HHS TIPS HOT-LINE.

The Secretary shall take appropriate measures to inform individuals eligible for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) of the availability of the tips kept under such program, by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services for the reporting of fraud, waste, and I abuse in the Medicare program.

by Ms. Mikulski (for herself, Mr. Voinovich, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Biden, Mr. Dorgan, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Harkin, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Schumer, and Mr. Warner):

S. 1799. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in Social Security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. Mikulski. Mr. President, I rise today on an issue that is very important to me, very important to my constituents in Maryland and very important to government workers and retirees across the Nation. I am introducing a bill to modify a cruel rule, a cruel rule that is unfair and prevents current workers from enjoying the benefits of their hard work during retirement. My bill has bipartisan support and had 29 cosponsors last year. With this strong bipartisan support, I hope that we can correct this cruel rule of government this year.

Under current law, a Social Security spousal benefit is reduced or entirely eliminated if the surviving spouse is eligible for a pension from a local, State or Federal Government job that was not covered by Social Security. This policy is known as the Government Pension Offset.

This is how the current law works. Consider a surviving spouse who retires from government service and receives a government pension of $600 a month. She also qualifies for a Social Security spousal benefit of $645 a month. Because of the Pension Offset law, which reduces her Social Security benefit by 2/3 of her government retirement and spousal benefit is reduced to $245 a month. So instead of $1,245, she will receive only $885 a month. That is $400 a month less to pay the rent, purchase a prescription medication, or buy groceries. I think that is wrong.

My bill does not repeal the government pension offset entirely, but it will allow retirees to keep more of what they deserve. It guarantees that those subject to the offset can keep at least $1,200 a month in combined retirement income. The 2/3 offset would apply only to the combined benefit that exceeds $1,200 a month. So, in the example above, the surviving spouse would face only a $30 offset, allowing her to keep $1,215 in monthly income.

Unfortunately, the current law disproportionately affects women. Women are more likely to receive Social Security spousal benefits and to have worked in low-paying or short-term government positions while they were raising families. It is also true that women receive smaller government pensions because of their lower earnings, and receive Social Security benefits to a greater degree. My modification will allow these women who have contributed years of important government service and family service to rely on a larger amount of retirement income.

Why do we punish people who have committed a significant portion of their lives to government service? We are talking about workers who provide some of the most important services to our community—teachers, firefighters, and many others. Some have already retired. Others are currently working and looking forward to a deserved retirement. These individuals deserve better than the reduced monthly benefits that the Pension Offset currently requires.

Government employees work hard in service to our Nation, and I work hard for them. I do not want to see them penalized simply because they have chosen to work in the public sector, rather than for a private employer, and often at lower salaries and sometimes fewer benefits. If a retired worker in the private sector received a pension, and also received a spousal Social Security benefit, they would not be subject to the Offset. I think we should be looking for ways to reward government service, not the other way around. I believe that people who work hard and play by the rules should not be penalized by arcane, legislative technicalities.

Frankly, I would like to repeal the offset altogether. But, I realize that budget considerations make that unlikely. As a compromise, I hope we can agree that retirees who have worked hard all their lives should not have this offset applied until their combined monthly benefit, both government pension and Social Security spousal benefit, exceeds $1,200.

I also strongly believe that we should ensure that retirees buying power keeps up with the cost of living. That’s why I have also included a provision in this legislation to index the $1,200 amount to inflation so retirees will see their minimum benefits increase along with the cost of living.

The Social Security Administration recently estimated that enacting the provisions in this bill would have a minimal long-term impact on the Social Security Trust Fund—about 0.01 percent of taxable payroll.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort and support my legislation to modify the Government Pension Offset. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
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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 “Government Pension Offset Reform Act”.

SECTION 2. LIMITATION ON REDUCTIONS IN BENEFITS FOR SPONOS AND SURVIVING SPOUSES RECEIVING GOVERNMENT PENSIONS.

(a) INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(k)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(k)(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and the” after “two-thirds of”; and

(2) by inserting “exceeds the amount described in paragraph (6) for such month,” before “if”.

(b) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—Section 202(k) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The amount described in this paragraph is, for months in each 12-month period beginning in December of 2005, and each succeeding calendar year, the greater of—

(A) $1,200; or

(B) the amount applicable for months in the preceding 12-month period, increased by the inflation-adjusting factor for such period determined for an annuity under section 8840 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to any other provision of law).”.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON REDUCTIONS IN BENEFITS.—Section 202(k) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(k)), as amended by subsection (b), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) For any month after December 2005, in no event shall an individual receive a reduction in a benefit under paragraph (5)(A) for the month that is more than the reduction in such benefit that would have applied for such month under such paragraph as in effect on December 1, 2001.”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2 shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 2005.

By Ms. Snowe (for herself, Mr. Rockefeller, and Mr. Bunning):

S. 1800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. Snowe. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation that would reauthorize the New Markets Tax Credit for five additional years. I’d like to thank the Senator from West Virginia, Jay Rockefeller, for cosponsoring this legislation, as well as Senator Jim Bunning. Their strong support is appreciated, and I trust this program will help revitalize many communities all across America.

The New Markets Tax Credit was enacted in December 2000 as part of the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act and offers a seven-year, 39 percent Federal credit to private investment vehicles known as Community Development Entities (CDEs). CDEs combine private investment dollars with capital
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raised through the incentive to make loans to or investments in businesses in low-income communities.

In its brief period of existence, the New Markets Tax Credit has had a tremendous success in strengthening and revitalizing communities. In Maine, Coastal Enterprises, Inc. issued a $31.5 million long-term NMTC loan to Katahdin Forest Management, which provided additional working capital for two large pulp and paper mills. These investments in the direct employment of 650 people and potential jobs for another 200. The Katahdin Project has helped to diversify the area economy through the development of new, high-value wood processing enterprises and recreational tourism.

CDFIs have also invested in a new child care facility on Chicago’s west side, the first new supermarket and shopping center in inner-city Cleveland in 30 years and a new aero space facility in rural Oklahoma.

All of these projects demonstrate the revitalization and strengthening of communities that the Credit is helping to make possible. In only 3 years, CDFIs have raised $12.5 billion of capital for direct investment in economically distressed communities across the Nation. This impressive activity over a short period of time points to the need and opportunity for such investment in low-income communities.

Unfortunately, as effective as the New Markets Tax Credit has been, demand for the incentive has far exceeded supply. In fact, the average demand in the first three rounds was staggering 10 times the amount of available credits. The Treasury Department awarded the first round of $2.5 billion in tax credits in March 2003, a second round of $3.5 billion in May 2004, and a third round worth $2 billion in May 2005.

Despite the track record of the New Markets Tax Credit and continued demand for the incentive, it will expire at the end of 2007. Congress must reauthorize this Credit to ensure investment capital continues to flow to our most disadvantaged communities. Our bill renews this valuable incentive for 5 years beginning after December 31, 2007.

By Mr. REED, for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Ms. Camps, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BOND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. CHAFFEE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. CLINTON, and Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1801. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to reauthorize the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I introduce, along with Senators ALLARD, COLLINS, SARBANES, BOND, MURRAY, CHAFFEE, MIKULSKI, DODD, AKAKA, SCHUMER, CORZINE, LANDRIEU, and CLINTON, the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005 (CEPHEA). This legislation would reauthorize and amend the housing titles of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987. Specifically, our bill would realign the incentives behind the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s homelessness assistance programs to accomplish the goals of preventing and ending long-term homelessness.

During the past several weeks, stark pictures of the reality faced by many in the wake of Hurricane Katrina have made more of the country aware of the day-to-day pressures faced by those who are homeless. Unfortunately, as many as 3.5 million Americans experience homelessness each year. Ten to 20 percent are homeless for long periods of time. Many Americans have severe disabilities. Many have worn a uniform for our country, with the Veterans Administration estimating that at least 500,000 veterans experience homelessness over the course of a year. Statistics regarding the number of children who experience homelessness are especially troubling. More than one million children experience homelessness each year; that is one in ten poor children in the United States. We have learned that children who are homeless are in poorer health, have developmental delays, and achieve less in school than children who have homes.

Many of those who are homeless have a severe disability. They cannot afford housing. Using the most recent census data, 56 percent of extremely low-income families are paying more than half their income for housing. Between 1990 and 2000, shortages of affordable housing for these families worsened in 44 of the 50 States. In 2000, it was estimated that 4.6 million units of low-income housing would need to be created in order to take care of this problem. As rents have soared and affordable housing units have disappeared from the market during these years, even more working Americans have been left unable to afford housing.

So why should the Federal Government work to help prevent and end homelessness? Simply put, we cannot afford not to solve this problem. Homelessness leads to untold costs, including expenses for emergency rooms, jails and shelters, foster care, detoxification, and emergency mental health treatment. It has been almost twenty years since the passage of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, and we have learned a lot about the problem of homelessness since then.

There is a growing consensus on ways to help communities break the cycle of repeated and prolonged homelessness. If we combine Federal dollars with the right incentives to local communities, we can end long-term homelessness. This bipartisan legislation will do just that. It will reward communities for initiatives that prevent homelessness, provide the development of permanent supportive housing, and optimize self-sufficiency.

The Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005 will set us on the path to meeting an important national goal. I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this bill and other homelessness prevention efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005 be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1801

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 “New Markets Tax Credit Reauthorization Act of 2005.”

SECTION 2. EXTENSION OF NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT. (a) EXTENSION.— (1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45D(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to new markets tax credit) is amended to read as follows: ‘‘(1) In general.—Paragraph (1) of section 45D(f) of such Code is amended by striking ‘‘2014’’ and inserting ‘‘2019’’. (b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (f) of section 45D of such Code is amended by inserting at the end the following new paragraph: ‘‘(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.— (A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2008, the dollar amount in paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to — (i) such dollar amount, multiplied by (ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2007’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof; and (B) BOUNDING RULE.—If a dollar amount in paragraph (1), as increased under subparagraph (A), is not a multiple of $1,000,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000,000.’’. (c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2007.

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 “New Markets Tax Credit Reauthorization Act of 2005.”
SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.
Section 102 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 102. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.
(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the United States faces a crisis of individuals and families who lack basic affordable housing and appropriate shelter;
(2) persons experiencing homelessness are an important factor in the success of efforts by State and local governments and the private sector to address the problem of homelessness in a comprehensive manner;
(3) there are several Federal Government programs to assist persons experiencing homelessness, including programs for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, having disabilities, veterans, children, and youth;
(4) homeless assistance programs must be evaluated on the basis of their effectiveness in reducing homelessness, transitioning individuals and families to permanent housing and stability, and optimizing their self-sufficiency;
(5) States and units of general local government receiving Federal block grant and other Federal grant funds must be evaluated on the basis of their effectiveness in reducing homelessness, transitioning individuals and families to permanent housing and stability, and optimizing their self-sufficiency;
(6) States, or the designee of the Attorney General of the United States.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act—
(1) to create a unified and performance-based process for allocating and administering funds under title IV;
(2) to encourage comprehensive, collaborative, and coordinated local planning and services, including programs for persons experiencing homelessness;
(3) to focus the resources and efforts of the public and private partners on ending and preventing homelessness;
(4) to provide funds for programs to assist individuals and families in the transition from homelessness, and to prevent homelessness for those vulnerable to homelessness;
(5) to consolidate the separate homeless assistance programs carried out under title IV (consisting of the supportive housing program and related innovative programs, the shelter plus care program, the section 8 assistance provided for implementation of programs carried out under this Act and other programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness, and mainstream funding, and the rural homeless assistance program) into a single program with specific eligible activities;
(6) to allow flexibility and creativity in re-thinking solutions to homelessness, including alternative housing strategies, outcome-effective service delivery, and the involvement of persons experiencing homelessness in decision making regarding opportunities for their long-term stability, growth, well-being, and optimum self-sufficiency; and
(7) to ensure that multiple Federal agencies are involved in the provision of housing, health care, human services, employment, and educational services (and for the missions of the agencies, to persons experiencing homelessness), through the funding provided for implementation of programs carried out under this Act and other programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness, and mainstream funding, and to promote coordination among those Federal agencies, including providing funding for a United States Interagency Council on Homelessness to advance such coordination.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS.

"Title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311 et seq.) is amended—
(1) by inserting at the end of section 201 (42 U.S.C. 11311) the following:

"(A) Implementing plans to appropriately discharge individuals to and from mainstream service systems; and
(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) to encourage comprehensive, collaborative, and coordinated local planning and services, including programs for persons experiencing homelessness;
(3) to focus the resources and efforts of the public and private partners on ending and preventing homelessness;
(4) to provide funds for programs to assist individuals and families in the transition from homelessness, and to prevent homelessness for those vulnerable to homelessness;
(5) to consolidate the separate homeless assistance programs carried out under title IV (consisting of the supportive housing program and related innovative programs, the shelter plus care program, thesection 8 assistance provided for implementation of programs carried out under this Act and other programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness, and mainstream funding, and the rural homeless assistance program) into a single program with specific eligible activities;
(6) to allow flexibility and creativity in re-thinking solutions to homelessness, including alternative housing strategies, outcome-effective service delivery, and the involvement of persons experiencing homelessness in decision making regarding opportunities for their long-term stability, growth, well-being, and optimum self-sufficiency; and
(7) to ensure that multiple Federal agencies are involved in the provision of housing, health care, human services, employment, and educational services (and for the missions of the agencies, to persons experiencing homelessness), through the funding provided for implementation of programs carried out under this Act and other programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness, and mainstream funding, and to promote coordination among those Federal agencies, including providing funding for a United States Interagency Council on Homelessness to advance such coordination.

SEC. 4. HOUSING ASSISTANCE GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Subtitle A of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11361 et seq.) is amended—
(1) by striking the subtitle heading and inserting the following:

"Subtitle A—General Provisions"
(2) by redesigning section 401 (42 U.S.C. 11361) as section 403; and
(3) by redesigning section 402 (42 U.S.C. 11362) as section 404;

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.
In this title:
(a) "Chronically Homeless.—" (A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘chronically homeless’, used with respect to an individual or family, means an individual or family who—
(1) is homeless;
"(11) OPERATING COSTS.—The term ‘operating costs’ means expenses incurred by a project sponsor operating:

(A) transitional or permanent housing under this title with respect to:

(i) the administration, maintenance, repair, and security of such housing;

(ii) utilities or furnishings, and equipment for such housing; or

(iii) conducting an assessment under section 126(h).

(B) supportive housing, for homeless individuals or families that include such an individual, under this title with respect to:

(i) the matters described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A); and

(ii) coordination of services as needed to ensure long-term housing stability.

(C) described in paragraphs (1) through (4)

(10) NEW.—The term ‘new’, used with respect to housing, means for the full period of the participation, or the first year of the participation, or the Secretary to support approved projects described in the application; and

(C)(i) serves as a project sponsor for the project; or

(ii) awards the funds to project sponsors to carry out the projects.

SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(21) SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL.—The term ‘seriously mentally ill’ means having a severe and persistent mental illness or emotional impairment that seriously limits a person’s ability to live independently.

(22) STATE.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(23) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.—The term ‘supportive housing’ means housing that—

(A) helps individuals experiencing homelessness and families experiencing homelessness to transition from homelessness to living independently; and

(B) provides supportive services and housing which are provided on either an emergency or permanent basis, as determined by the identified abilities and needs of the program participants.

(24) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The term ‘supportive services’—

(A) through the end of the final determination year (as described in section 423(a)(6)), means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(C)(ii), the services means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(A), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(B) after that final determination year, means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(B), as permitted under section 423(a)(6)(C), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(25) TENANT-BASED.—The term ‘tenant-based’, used with respect to rental assistance provided pursuant to a contract that—

(A) is between

(i) a project sponsor; and

(ii) an owner of a structure that exists as of the date the contract is entered into; and

(B) provides that rental assistance payments shall be made to the owner and that the units in the structure shall be occupied by eligible persons for not less than the terms of the contract.

(18) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term ‘project sponsor’, used with respect to proposed eligibility activities, means the organization directly responsible for the proposed eligibility activities.

(19) RECIPIENT.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘recipient’ means an eligible entity who—

(A) submits an application for a grant under section 422 that is approved by the Secretary;

(B) receives the direct funds from the Secretary to support approved projects described in the application; and

(C)(i) serves as a project sponsor for the project; or

(ii) awards the funds to project sponsors to carry out the projects.

(20) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(21) SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL.—The term ‘seriously mentally ill’ means having a severe and persistent mental illness or emotional impairment that seriously limits a person’s ability to live independently.

(22) STATE.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(23) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.—The term ‘supportive housing’ means housing that—

(A) helps individuals experiencing homelessness and families experiencing homelessness to transition from homelessness to living independently; and

(B) provides supportive services and housing which are provided on either an emergency or permanent basis, as determined by the identified abilities and needs of the program participants.

(24) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The term ‘supportive services’—

(A) through the end of the final determination year (as described in section 423(a)(6)), means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(C)(ii), the services means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(A), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(B) after that final determination year, means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(B), as permitted under section 423(a)(6)(C), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(25) TENANT-BASED.—The term ‘tenant-based’, used with respect to rental assistance provided pursuant to a contract that—

(A) is between

(i) a project sponsor; and

(ii) an owner of a structure that exists as of the date the contract is entered into; and

(B) provides that rental assistance payments shall be made to the owner and that the units in the structure shall be occupied by eligible persons for not less than the terms of the contract.

(18) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term ‘project sponsor’, used with respect to proposed eligibility activities, means the organization directly responsible for the proposed eligibility activities.

(19) RECIPIENT.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘recipient’ means an eligible entity who—

(A) submits an application for a grant under section 422 that is approved by the Secretary;

(B) receives the direct funds from the Secretary to support approved projects described in the application; and

(C)(i) serves as a project sponsor for the project; or

(ii) awards the funds to project sponsors to carry out the projects.

SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(20) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(21) SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL.—The term ‘seriously mentally ill’ means having a severe and persistent mental illness or emotional impairment that seriously limits a person’s ability to live independently.

(22) STATE.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(23) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.—The term ‘supportive housing’ means housing that—

(A) helps individuals experiencing homelessness and families experiencing homelessness to transition from homelessness to living independently; and

(B) provides supportive services and housing which are provided on either an emergency or permanent basis, as determined by the identified abilities and needs of the program participants.

(24) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The term ‘supportive services’—

(A) through the end of the final determination year (as described in section 423(a)(6)), means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(C)(ii), the services means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(A), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(B) after that final determination year, means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(B), as permitted under section 423(a)(6)(C), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(25) TENANT-BASED.—The term ‘tenant-based’, used with respect to rental assistance provided pursuant to a contract that—

(A) is between

(i) a project sponsor; and

(ii) an owner of a structure that exists as of the date the contract is entered into; and

(B) provides that rental assistance payments shall be made to the owner and that the units in the structure shall be occupied by eligible persons for not less than the terms of the contract.

(18) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term ‘project sponsor’, used with respect to proposed eligibility activities, means the organization directly responsible for the proposed eligibility activities.

(19) RECIPIENT.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘recipient’ means an eligible entity who—

(A) submits an application for a grant under section 422 that is approved by the Secretary;

(B) receives the direct funds from the Secretary to support approved projects described in the application; and

(C)(i) serves as a project sponsor for the project; or

(ii) awards the funds to project sponsors to carry out the projects.

SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(20) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(21) SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL.—The term ‘seriously mentally ill’ means having a severe and persistent mental illness or emotional impairment that seriously limits a person’s ability to live independently.

(22) STATE.—Except as used in subtitle B, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(23) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.—The term ‘supportive housing’ means housing that—

(A) helps individuals experiencing homelessness and families experiencing homelessness to transition from homelessness to living independently; and

(B) provides supportive services and housing which are provided on either an emergency or permanent basis, as determined by the identified abilities and needs of the program participants.

(24) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The term ‘supportive services’—

(A) through the end of the final determination year (as described in section 423(a)(6)), means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(C)(ii), the services means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(A), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(B) after that final determination year, means the services described in section 423(a)(6)(B), as permitted under section 423(a)(6)(C), for both new projects and projects receiving renewal funding; and

(25) TENANT-BASED.—The term ‘tenant-based’, used with respect to rental assistance provided pursuant to a contract that—

(A) is between

(i) a project sponsor; and

(ii) an owner of a structure that exists as of the date the contract is entered into; and

(B) provides that rental assistance payments shall be made to the owner and that the units in the structure shall be occupied by eligible persons for not less than the terms of the contract.

(18) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term ‘project sponsor’, used with respect to proposed eligibility activities, means the organization directly responsible for the proposed eligibility activities.
SEC. 402. COLLABORATIVE APPLICANTS.

(a) Establishment and designation.—A collaborative applicant shall be established for a geographic area by the relevant parties in that geographic area or designated for a geographic area by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (d), to lead a collaborative planning process to design and evaluate programs and practices to prevent and end homelessness.

(b) Membership of Established Collaborative Applicant.—A collaborative applicant established under subsection (a) shall be composed of persons from a particular geographic area who are—

(1) persons who are experiencing or have experienced homelessness (with not fewer than 2 persons being individuals who are experiencing or have experienced homelessness);

(2) persons who act as advocates for the diverse subpopulations of persons experiencing homelessness;

(3) representatives of organizations who provide assistance to the variety of individuals and families experiencing homelessness; and

(4) representatives of individuals experiencing homelessness;

(5) government agency officials, particularly those officials responsible for administering funds under programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness and other programs for which persons experiencing homelessness are eligible, including mainstream programs identified by the Government Accountability Office in the 2 reports described in section 102(a)(5)(B);

(6) 1 or more local educational agency officials designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii), or their designees;—

(7) members of the business community;

(8) members of neighborhood advocacy organizations, and

(9) members of philanthropic organizations that contribute to preventing and ending homelessness in the geographic area of the collaborative applicant.

(c) Rotation of Membership of Established or Designated Collaborative Applicant.—The parties establishing or designating a collaborative applicant under subsection (a) shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the collaborative applicant rotates its membership to ensure that representatives of all agencies, businesses, and organizations who are described in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (b) and invested in developing and implementing strategies to prevent and end homelessness are able to participate as decisionmaking members of the collaborative applicant.

(d) Existing Planning Bodies.—The Secretary may designate a collaborative applicant if such entity—

(1) prior to the date of enactment of the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2000, had in place a comprehensive local homeless housing and services planning and applied for Federal funding to provide homeless assistance; and

(2) membership includes persons described in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (b).

(e) Tax Exempt Organizations.—An entity may be designated as a collaborative applicant under this section without being a legal entity. If a collaborative applicant is a legal entity, the collaborative applicant may only receive funds directly from the Secretary under this title, and may only apply for funds to conduct the activities described in section 423(a)(7).

(f) Remedial Action.—If the Secretary finds that a collaborative applicant for a geographic area does not meet the requirements of this section, the Secretary may remediate action to ensure fair distribution of grant amounts under subtitle C to eligible entities within that area. Such measures may include designating another body as a collaborative applicant, or permitting other eligible entities to apply directly for grants.

(g) Construction.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require, limit, or alter the interest or government fair practices laws, or their equivalent, that govern applicants for grant amounts under subtitles B and C.

(h) Duties.—A collaborative applicant shall—

(1) design a collaborative process, established jointly and compiled with its members, for evaluating, reviewing, prioritizing, awarding, and monitoring projects and applications submitted by project sponsors under subtitle C, and for evaluating the outcomes of programs for which funds are awarded under subtitle B, in such a manner as to ensure that the entities involved are implementing and managing effective and comprehensive strategies to prevent and end homelessness, and optimizing self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness, in the geographic area involved;

(2) (I) review relevant policies and practices in place and planned of public and private entities in the geographic area served by the collaborative applicant to determine if the policies and practices further or impede the goal described in subparagraph (A);—

(II) in conducting the review, give priority to—

(aa) the discharge planning and service termination policies and practices of publicly funded facilities or institutions (such as health care or treatment facilities or institutions, foster care or youth facilities, or juvenile or adult correctional institutions), and entities carrying out publicly funded housing, health care or treatment programs, the programs of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), child welfare or youth programs, or juvenile or adult correctional programs), to ensure that such a discharge or term releases persons from immediate homelessness for the persons involved;

(bb) the access and utilization policies and practices of the entities carrying out the programs identified by the Government Accountability Office in the 2 reports described in subsection (a)(5)(B), to ensure that persons experiencing homelessness are able to utilize the programs;

(cc) local policies and practices relating to zoning and enforcement of local statutes, to ensure that the policies and practices allow reasonable inclusion and distribution in the geographic area of special needs populations and families with children and the facilities that serve the populations and families;

(dd) policies and practices relating to the school selection and enrollment of homeless children and youths (as defined in section 722) to ensure that homeless children and youths, and their parents, are able to exercise their educational rights under subtitle B of title VII; and

(ee) local policies and practices relating to the placement of families with homeless children and youths (as so defined) in emergency or transitional shelters, to ensure that the children and youths are placed as close to their school of origin in order to facilitate continuity of, and prevent disruption of, their educational plans;—

(iii) in conducting the review, determine the modifications and corrective actions that need to be taken, and by whom, to ensure that the relevant practices do not stimulate, or prolong, homelessness in the geographic area;

(ii) inform the appropriate entities of the determinations described in clause (i), in the form of an exhibit entitled ‘‘Assessment of Relevant Policies and Practices, and Needed Corrective Actions to End and Prevent Homelessness’’; and

(C) if the collaborative applicant designs and carries out the projects, design and carry out the projects in such a manner as to further the goal described in subparagraph (A);

(2)(A) require, consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and amendments made by that Act, that recipients and project sponsors who are funded by grants received under subtitle C implement and maintain adequate accounting of their projects that measures effective and timely delivery of housing or services and whether provision of such housing or services results in preventing or ending homelessness for the persons that such recipients and project sponsors serve; and

(B) request that States and local governments that distribute funds under subtitle B submit information and comments on the administration of activities under subtitle B to enable the collaborative applicant to plan and carry out full continuum of care for persons experiencing homelessness;

(3) require, consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and amendments made by that Act, outcome-based evaluation of the homeless assistance planning process of the collaborative applicant to measure the performance of the collaborative applicant in preventing or ending the homelessness of persons in the geographic area of the collaborative applicant.

(4) participate in the Consolidated Plan for the geographic area served by the collaborative applicant; and

(5)(A) require each project sponsor who is funded by a grant received under subtitle C to establish such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds awarded to the project sponsor under subtitle C in order to ensure that all financial transactions carried out under subtitle C are accurately documented and maintained, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; and

(B) arrange for an annual survey, audit, or evaluation of the financial records of each project carried out by a project sponsor funded by a grant received under subtitle C.

(5) Conflict of Interest.—No member of a collaborative applicant may participate in the determination of the collaborative applicant concerning the award of a grant, or provision of other financial benefits, to such member or the organization that such member represents.

(6) Homeless Management Information System.—

(A) In General.—In accordance with standards established by the Secretary, each collaborative applicant shall ensure consistent participation by project sponsors in a
community-wide homeless management information system. The collaborative applicant shall ensure the participation for purposes of collecting unduplicated counts of individuals experiencing homelessness, analyzing patterns of use of assistance provided under subparts B and C for the geographic area involved, implementing an effective information referral system, and providing information for the needs analysis and funding priorities of collaborative applicants.

(2) A collaborative applicant may apply for funds under this title to establish, continue, carry out, or ensure consistent participation by project sponsors in a homeless management information system, if the applicant is a legal entity; and

(4) by inserting after section 403 (as redesignated in paragraph (2)) the following:

SEC. 404. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PROJECT SPONSORS.—The Secretary shall make effective technical assistance available to private nonprofit organizations and other nongovernmental entities, States, metropolitan cities, urban counties, and counties that are not urban counties that are potential project sponsors, to implement planning processes for preventing and ending homelessness, to optimize self-sufficiency among individuals experiencing homelessness and to improve their capacity to become project sponsors.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COLLABORATIVE APPLICANTS.—The Secretary shall make effective technical assistance available to collaborative applicants to improve their ability to carry out the provisions of this title, and to design and execute outcome-effective strategies for preventing and ending homelessness in their geographic areas consistent with the provisions of this title.

(c) RESERVATION.—The Secretary may reserve or transfer the portion of the funds made available for any fiscal year for carrying out subparts B and C, to make available technical assistance under subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 405. PERFORMANCE REPORTS AND MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A collaborative applicant shall prepare an annual performance report regarding the activities carried out with grant amounts received under subparts B and C in the geographic area or subparts B and C, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary determines to be reasonable.

(b) CONTENT.—The performance report described in paragraph (a) shall—

(1) describe the number of persons provided homeless prevention assistance (including the number of such persons who were discharged or whose services were terminated as described in section 422(c)(1)(B)(i)(I)(bb), and the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness who were provided shelter, housing, or support services, with the grant amounts awarded in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the report was submitted, including measurements of the number of persons experiencing homelessness who—

(A) entered permanent housing, and the length of time such persons resided in that housing, if known;

(B) entered transitional housing, and the length of time such persons resided in that housing, if known;

(C) obtained or retained jobs;

(D) increased their income, including increasing income through the receipt of government assistance; and

(E) received mental health or substance abuse treatment in an institutional setting and now receive that assistance in a less restrictive, community-based setting;

(2) describe the number of persons provided emergency, transitional, or permanent housing services;

(3) describe additional physical, mental, or emotional health care;

(4) were children under the age of 18 during the year at issue, including the number of—

(i) children who were not younger than 2 and not older than 4, or were infants or toddlers with disabilities (as defined in section 632 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.));

(ii) children described in clause (i) who were enrolled in preschool or were receiving services under part C of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.);

(iii) children who were not younger than 5 and not older than 17;

(5) describe how the collaborative applicant and entities served by the collaborative applicant and entities will assess the consistency and coordination between the programs funded under subparts B and C in the fiscal year in which the report was submitted, including measurements of the number of collaborative applicants and entities to apply directly for grants under subpart C, except that amounts already expended on eligible activities under this title may not be recaptured by the Secretary; and

(6) assess the consistency and coordination between the programs funded under subparts B and C in the fiscal year in which the report was submitted, including measurements of the number of collaborative applicants and entities to apply directly for grants under subpart C, except that amounts already expended on eligible activities under this title may not be recaptured by the Secretary; and

(7) include updates to the exhibits described in section 402(h)(1)(B)(iii) that were included in applications—

(A) under section 422 by collaborative applicants; and

(B) approved by the Secretary;
(5) by inserting after section 406 (as redesignated in paragraph (2)) the following:

SEC. 407. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. 

There are authorized to be appropriated to counties II and III, and the District of Columbia, $300,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

SEC. 5. EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11371 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking sections 412 (42 U.S.C. 11372) and inserting the following:

SEC. 412. GRANT ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary shall make grants to States and local governments (and to private nonprofit organizations providing assistance to persons experiencing homelessness, in such essential services cases of grants made with reallocated amounts) for the purpose of carrying out activities described in section 414.

SEC. 412A. ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available to carry out this subtitle and subtitle C, the Secretary shall make grants not more than 15 percent of such amount for activities described in section 414.

(b) ALLOCATION.—An entity that receives a grant under section 412, and serves an area that includes 1 or more geographic areas (or portions thereof) served by collaborative applicants that submit applications under subtitle C, shall allocate the funds made available through the grant to carry out activities described in section 414, in consultation with the collaborative applicants;

(2) by striking sections 421 through 423 (42 U.S.C. 11373(b)), by inserting the following:

SEC. 421. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) to promote the implementation of activities that can prevent vulnerable individuals and families from becoming homeless;

(2) to promote the development of transitional and permanent housing, including low-demand housing;

(3) to promote access to and effective utilization of mainstream programs identified by the Government Accountability Office in the 2 reports described in section 102(a)(5)(B) and programs funded with State or local resources; and

(4) to optimize self-sufficiency among individuals experiencing homelessness.

SEC. 422. COORDINATING HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to collaborative applicants to carry out prevention and intervention projects, either directly or by awarding funds to project sponsors to carry out the projects.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall release a Notification of Funding Availability for grants awarded under this subtitle for a fiscal year not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of the appropriate Act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year.

(c) APPLICATIONS.

(1) SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY.—To receive a grant under subsection (a), a collaborative applicant shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, and containing—

(A) the information described in subsections (a) and (c) of section 426; and

(B) other information that shall—

(i) describe the establishment (or designa-
tion) and function of the collaborative appli-
cant, including—

(II) the designation or function of the collaborative applicant;

(III) all meetings between representatives of the collaborative applicant, and persons responsible for administering the Consolidated Plan;

(ii) outline the range of housing and serv-
ices programs available to persons experi-
encing homelessness or chronically homeless individuals and describe the unmet needs that remain in the geographic area for which the collaborative applicant seeks funding regarding—

(aa) making mortgage, rent, or utility payments; or

(bb) accessing permanent housing and transi-
tional housing for individuals (and families that include the individuals) who are being discharged from a publicly funded facility, program, or system of care, or whose services (from such a facility, program, or system of care) are being termi-
nated.

(II) outreach activities to assess the needs and conditions of persons experiencing homelessness, including significant sub-
jects of such persons, including indi-
viduals with disabilities, veterans, victims of domestic violence, homeless children and youth (as defined in section 725), and chronic
ly homeless individuals;

(III) emergency shelters, including the supportive and referral services the shelters provide;

(IV) transitional housing with appro-
site supportive services to help persons ex-
periencing homelessness who are not yet prepared to make the transition to permanent housing and independent living;

(V) permanent housing to help meet the long-term needs of individuals and families experiencing homelessness; and

(VI) needed supportive services, including services for children;

(III) prioritize the projects for which the collaborative applicant seeks funding according to the unmet needs in the fiscal year for which the applicant submits the application as described in clause (ii);

(IV) identify funds from private and public sources, other than funds received under subtitles B and C, that the State, units of local government, recipients, project sponsors, and other entities supporting persons experiencing homelessness, outreach, emergency shelter, supportive services, transitional housing, and permanent housing, that will be integrated with the assistance provided under subtitles B and C;

(v) identify funds provided by the State and grants of general local government under programs targeted for persons experiencing homelessness, and other programs for which persons experiencing homelessness are eligible, including mainstream programs identified by the Government Accountability Office in the 2 reports described in section 102(a)(5)(B); and

(vi) explain—

(I) how the collaborative applicant will meet the housing and service needs of indi-
viduals and families experiencing homeless-
ness in the applicant’s area;

(II) how the collaborative applicant will integrate the activities described in the appli-
cation with the services of the State, units of local government, and private entities in the geographic area over the next 5 years to prevent and end homelessness, as part of that strategy, a work plan for the fiscal years;

(vii) report on the outcome-based per-
formance of the homeless programs within the geographic area served by the collabo-
rate applicant that were funded under this title in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the application is submitted;

(ix) include any relevant required agree-
ments under subtitle C;

(cix) contain a certification of consistency with the Consolidated Plan pursuant to sec-
tion 406.

(cx) include an exhibit described in section 402(b)(1)(B)(xii) and prepared by the collaborative applicant in accordance with that section.

(cxii) contain a certification that project sponsors for all programs for which the collaborative applicant seeks funding through this program will establish and maintain practic-
tices that are consistent with, and do not re-
strict the exercise of rights provided by, sub-
title B of title VII, and other laws relating to the provision of educational and related services to individuals experiencing home-
lessness.

(cxiii) include an exhibit described in section 402(b)(1)(B)(xii) and prepared by the collaborative applicant in accordance with that section.
"(2) CONSIDERATION.—In outlining the programs and describing the needs referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), the collaborative applicant shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the most recently completed annual assessments, conducted pursuant to section 2034 of title 38, United States Code, of the Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers or regional beneficiary committees whose service areas include the geographic area described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

"(3) ANNOUNCEMENT OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall, within 4 months after the last date for the submission of applications described in this subsection for a fiscal year, the grants conditionally awarded under subsection (a) for that fiscal year.

"(4) OBLIGATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND UTILIZATION OF FUNDS.—

(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR OBLIGATION.—

(i) In general.—Not later than 9 months after the announcement referred to in paragraph (3), each recipient of a grant announced under paragraph (3) shall, with respect to a project to be funded through such grant, meet, or cause the project sponsor to meet, all requirements for the obligation of funds for such project, including site control, matching funds, and environmental review requirements, except as provided in clause (ii).

(ii) Acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction completed within 15 months after the announcement referred to in paragraph (3), each recipient or project sponsor seeking the obligation of funds for acquisition of housing, rehabilitation of housing, or construction of new housing for a grant announced under paragraph (3) shall meet all requirements for the obligation of those funds, including site control, matching funds and environmental review requirements.

(B) EXTENSIONS.—At the discretion of the Secretary, and in compelling circumstances, the Secretary may extend the date by which a recipient shall or shall cause a project sponsor to meet the requirements described in clause (i) if the Secretary determines that compliance with the requirements was delayed due to factors beyond the reasonable control of the recipient or project sponsor.

Such factors may include difficulties in obtaining site control for a proposed project, completing the process of obtaining secure financing for the project, or completing the technical submission requirements for the project.

(C) DISTRIBUTION.—A recipient that receives a grant—

(i) shall distribute the funds to project sponsors (in advance of expenditures by the project sponsors); and

(ii) shall distribute the appropriate portion of the funds to a project sponsor not later than 45 days after receiving a request for such distribution from the project sponsor.

(D) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may establish a date by which funds made available through a grant announced under this title (and in the case of a homeless assistance and prevention project shall be entirely expended by the recipient or project sponsors involved. The Secretary shall recapture the funds for such a grant if, after such date, the Secretary shall reallocate the funds for another homeless assistance and prevention project that meets the requirements of this subtitle to be eligible and appropriate, in the same geographic area as the area served through the original grant.

"(4) NOTIFICATION OF PRO RATA ESTIMATED NEED AMOUNTS.—

(1) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall inform each collaborative applicant, at a time consistent with the release of the Notice of Funding Availability for the grants, of the pro rata estimated need amount under this subtitle for the geographic area represented by the collaborative applicant.

(2) AMOUNT.—

(A) BASIS.—Such estimated need amount shall be based on a percentage of the total funds estimated to be available, to carry out this subtitle for any fiscal year that is equal to the percentage of the total estimated material amount in section 206 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306) for the prior fiscal year that—

(i) was allocated to all metropolitan cities and urban counties within the geographic area represented by the collaborative applicant; or

(ii) would have been distributed to all counties within such geographic area that are not urban counties, if the 30 percent portion of the allocation to the State involved in section 413 for the fiscal year described in clause (i) of that section (106) for that year had been distributed among the counties that are not urban counties in the State in accordance with the formula specified in that section (with references in that subsection to non-urban areas considered to be references to those counties).

(B) RULE.—In computing the estimated need amount, the Secretary shall adjust the estimated need amount determined pursuant to subparagraph (A) to ensure that—

(i) 75 percent of the total funds available, or estimated to be available, to carry out this subtitle for any fiscal year are allocated to the cities and urban counties that received a direct allocation of funds under section 413 for the prior fiscal year; and

(ii) 25 percent of the total funds available, or estimated to be available, to carry out this subtitle for any fiscal year are allocated—

(I) to the metropolitan cities and urban counties that did not receive a direct allocation of funds under section 413 for the prior fiscal year; and

(II) to counties that are not urban counties.

(C) COMBINATIONS OR CONSORTIA.—For a collaborative applicant that represents a combination of cities or counties, the estimated need amount shall be the sum of the estimated need amounts for the cities or counties represented by the collaborative applicant.

(D) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary may increase the estimated need amount for a geographic area if necessary to promote the use of funds under this subtitle for the purposes described in section 413 for the fiscal year.

(e) APPEALS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005 (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘‘initial year’’), the Government Accountability Office, after consultation with the committees with jurisdiction over the services referred to in this paragraph, shall determine—

(i) the amount of Federal funds (other than those made available under this fiscal year’s subtitle) that were made available to fund the supportive services described in section 425(c), other than the services described in subparagraph (B) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘‘outside supportive services amount’’) for that initial year; and

(ii) the amount of Federal funds made available under this subtitle for the fiscal year referred to in this paragraph as the ‘‘outside supportive services amount’’ for that initial year.

(2) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT DETERMINATION.—The Secretary (either at the Secretary’s initiative or on the basis of a dispute concerning support services) may direct the Government Accountability Office, after consultation with the committees with jurisdiction over the services referred to in this paragraph, to determine the outside supportive services amount.

(f) AUTHORITY TO REALLOCATE FUNDS.—The Secretary shall, if the Secretary determines that the Secretary is in the best interest of the recipients or project sponsors, reallocate the funds for a collaborative applicant that does not meet the requirements of this subtitle.

(1) When reallocation is necessary.—The Secretary shall reallocate the funds for a collaborative applicant that does not meet the requirements of this subtitle for the geographic area represented by the collaborative applicant if the Secretary determines that the Secretary is in the best interest of the recipients or project sponsors.

(2) Reimbursement.—The Secretary shall, if the Secretary determines that the Secretary is in the best interest of the recipients or project sponsors, reallocate the funds for a collaborative applicant that does not meet the requirements of this subtitle for the geographic area represented by the collaborative applicant.

(g) AUTHORITY TO REALLOCATE FUNDS.—The Secretary, after consultation with the committees described in clause (i), shall—

(i) determine the outside supportive services amount for that fiscal year for each collaborative applicant;

(ii) calculate the increase in the outside supportive services amount, by subtracting...
the outside supportive services amount for the initial year from the outside supportive services amount for that determination year; (III) make—

(1) on receipt of a report regarding a determination year that contains a positive or negative determination, to the Secretary; (ii) the eviction, foreclosure, or termination of utility services if, in the determination notices, foreclosure notices, or notices provided under this subtitle is utilized; and (iii) providing family support services that promote reunification of—

(i) youth exiting homelessness, with their families; and

(ii) children or youth involved with the child welfare or juvenile justice systems, with their families, and

(iii) who have plans, developed collaboratively by the public entities involved and the individuals and families, for securing or maintaining housing after any funds provided under this subtitle are utilized; and

(iv) if the Secretary does not issue a final order under clause (iii), subparagraph (A) shall apply for subsequent fiscal years.

(5) In this subsection, the term ‘nonelderly family’ means a family that does not have an adult head of household with a disabling condition.

(6) A project that consists of activities described in paragraphs (3) through (8) of subsection (a) shall be operated for the purpose specified in the application submitted for the project under section 422 for not less than 15 years.

(7) (A) In the case of a collaborative applicant that is a legal entity, payment of administrative costs related to planning, administration, grants, awards for monitoring, and evaluating projects, and ensuring compliance with homelessness management information system requirements described in section 402(g)(2), for which the collaborative applicant may use not more than 6 percent of the total funds made available through the grant for such administrative costs.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, monitoring and evaluating shall include—

(i) measuring the outcomes of the homeless assistance planning process of a collaborative applicant for preventing and ending homelessness;

(ii) the effective and timely implementation of activities funded under this subtitle, relative to projected outcomes; and

(iii) in the case of a housing project funded under section (a), compliance with appropriate standards of housing quality and habitability as determined by the Secretary.

(8) Prevention activities (for which a collaborative applicant may use not more than an additional 5 percent of the total funds made available through the grant for such administrative costs). (A) Providing financial assistance to individual or families who have received eviction notices, foreclosure notices, or notices of termination of utility services if, in the case of such an individual or family—

(i) the individual or family to make the required payments is due to a sudden reduction in income;

(ii) the assistance is necessary to avoid the eviction, foreclosure, or termination of services; and

(iii) there is a reasonable prospect that the individual or family will be able to resume the payments within a reasonable period of time;

(B) carrying out relocation activities (including providing security or utility deposits, rental assistance for a final month at a location, assistance with moving costs, or rental assistance for not more than 3 months) for moving into transitional or permanent housing for individuals and families that include such individuals—

(i) who lack housing;

(ii) who are being discharged from a publicly funded acute care or long-term care facility, program, or system of care, or whose services (from such a facility, program, or system of care) have been terminated; and

(iii) who have plans, developed collaboratively by the public entities involved and the individuals and families, for securing or maintaining housing after any funds provided under this subtitle are utilized; and

(C) providing family support services that promote reunification of—

(i) youth exiting homelessness, with their families; and

(ii) children or youth involved with the child welfare or juvenile justice systems, with their families, and

(iii) who have plans, developed collaboratively by the public entities involved and the individuals and families, for securing or maintaining housing after any funds provided under this subtitle are utilized; and

(iv) (A) If a recipient (or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) fails to carry out a project that consists of activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) and the project ceases to provide transitional or permanent housing—

(A) the recipient (or the project sponsor) shall forfeit 100 percent of the funds received from the recipient to repay 100 percent of the assistance; or

(B) the project sponsor shall forfeit 50 percent of the funds received from the recipient to repay 50 percent of the assistance.

(B) ASSISTANCE.—A collaborative applicant that receives assistance under section 422 to implement a project that involves the construction, or acquisition and rehabilitation, of new permanent housing units described in paragraph (1), for individuals and families described in paragraph (1)(A)(i), shall also receive, as part of the grant, incentives consisting of—

(i) funds sufficient to provide not more than 10 years of rental assistance, renewable in accordance with section 423;

(ii) a bonus in an amount to be determined by the Secretary to carry out activities described in this section; and

(iii) the technical assistance needed to ensure the financial viability and programmatic effectiveness of the project.

(B) NONELDERLY FAMILIES.—A collaborative applicant that receives assistance under section 422—

(A) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to carry out activities to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.

(B) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.

(C) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.

(D) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.

(E) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.

(F) To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle to create new permanent housing stock for individuals and families described in paragraph (1), an applicant shall be a collaborative applicant as described in this subtitle, a private nonprofit or for-profit organization, a public-private partnership, a public housing agency, or an instrumentality of a State or local government.
“(2) PREVENTION OF UNDUE BENEFITS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if any property is used for a project that receives assistance under subsection (a) and consists of activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), and the sale or other disposition of the property occurs before the expiration of the 15-year period beginning on the date of the initiation of the project begins, the recipient (or the project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) who received the assistance shall comply with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to prevent the recipient (or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) from unduly benefitting from such sale or disposition.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—A recipient (or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) shall not be required to make the repayments, and comply with the terms and conditions, required under paragraph (1) or (2) if—

“(A) the sale or disposition of the property used for the project results in the use of the property for the direct benefit of very low-income persons; or

“(B) all of the proceeds of the sale or disposition are used to provide transitional or permanent housing, in accordance with the provisions of this subtitle.

“(4) (c) SERVICES.—Subject to section 423(a)(8), by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) SERVICES.—Subject to section 423(a)(8),—

“(2) establishing and operating a child care services program for families experiencing homelessness;

“(3) demonstrating the capacity of the applicant based on the past performance and management of the applicant;

“(4) if applicable, previous performance regarding homelessness prevention, housing, and services programs funded in any fiscal year prior to the date of submission of the application;

“(5) the plan by which—

“(A) access to appropriate permanent housing will be secured if the proposed project does not include permanent housing; and

“(B) access to outcome-effective supportive services will be secured for residents or consumers served by the project who are willing to use the services;

“(6) if applicable, the extent to which an evaluation for the project will—

“(A) use periodically collected information and analysis to determine whether the project has resulted in enhanced stability and well-being of the residents or consumers served by the project;

“(B) include evaluations obtained directly from the individuals or families served by the project; and

“(C) be submitted by the project sponsors for the grant, to the collaborative applicant, for review and use in assessments, conducted by the collaborative applicant, consistent with the duty of the collaborative applicant to ensure effective outcomes that contribute to the goal of preventing and ending homelessness in the geographic area served by the collaborative applicant.

“(7) the need for the type of project proposed in the geographic area to be served and the extent to which prioritized programs meet unmet need;

“(8) the extent to which the amount of assistance to be provided under this subtitle will be supplemented with resources from other public and private sources, including mainstream programs identified by the Government Accountability Office in the 2 reports described in section 423(a)(8); and

“(9) demonstrated coordination with the other Federal, State, local, private, and public benefit claim denials and resolving outstanding warrants that interfere with the individual’s ability to obtain and retain housing.

“(8) providing—

“(A) transportation services that facilitate an individual’s ability to obtain and maintain employment;

“(B) income assistance;

“(C) health care; and

“(D) services necessary to obtain and maintain housing; and

“(9) providing other services determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the recipient (or a project sponsor) of supportive housing (including mental health benefits, employment counseling, and medical assistance, but not including major medical equipment);

“(10) services for purposes including requesting reconsiderations and appeals of veterans and public benefit claim denials and resolving outstanding warrants that interfere with an individual’s ability to obtain and retain housing;

“(9) providing—

“(A) transportation services that facilitate an individual’s ability to obtain and maintain employment;

“(B) income assistance;

“(C) health care; and

“(D) services necessary to obtain and maintain housing; and

“(9) providing other services determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the recipient (or a project sponsor) of supportive housing (including mental health benefits, employment counseling, and medical assistance, but not including major medical equipment);

“(10) services for purposes including requesting reconsiderations and appeals of veterans and public benefit claim denials and resolving outstanding warrants that interfere with an individual’s ability to obtain and retain housing.

“(c) REQUIRED AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may not provide assistance for a proposed project under this subtitle unless the collaborative applicant involved agrees—

“(1) to establish and operate a child care services program for families experiencing homelessness;

“(2) to ensure to the maximum extent practicable, that individuals and families experiencing homelessness are involved, through employment, provision of volunteer services, or otherwise, in constructing, rehabilitating, maintaining, and operating facilities for the project and in providing supportive services for the project;

“(3) to comply with such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may establish to carry out this subtitle in an effective and efficient manner.

“(d) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by striking “recipient” and inserting “recipient or project sponsor”;

“(5) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h), as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

“(6) in subsection (f) (as redesignated in subparagraph (E)), by redesignating the paragraphs as paragraphs (1) through (7) respectively;

“(7) in subsection (g) (as redesignated in subparagraph (E)), by redesignating the paragraphs as paragraphs (1) through (7) respectively;

“SEC. 427. ALLOCATION AMOUNTS AND INCENTIVES FOR SPECIFIC ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The Secretary shall promote—

“(1) permanent housing development activities for—

“(A) homeless individuals with disabilities and very low-income families that include such an individual; and

“(B) non-disabled homeless families; and

“(2) prevention activities described in section 426(b); and

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘non-disabled homeless family’ means a homeless family that does not include a homeless individual with a disability.

“(c) ANNUAL PORTION OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—

“(1) DISABLED HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amount made available to carry out this subtitle for a fiscal year, a portion equal to not less than 30 percent of the sums made available to carry
out subtitle B and this subtitle for that fiscal year shall be used for activities to develop new permanent housing, in order to help create affordable permanent housing for homeless groups with disabilities and homeless families that include such an individual who is an adult.

(b) Calculation.—In calculating the portion described in paragraph (A) that is used for activities described in subparagraph (a), the Secretary shall not count funds made available to renew contracts for permanent housing projects (in existence on the date of the renewal) under section 428.

(2) Prevention activities.—From the amount made available to carry out this subtitle, the portion equal to not more than 5 percent of the sums described in paragraph (1) shall be used for prevention activities described in section 423(a)(6).

(d) Funding for Acquisition, Construction, and Rehabilitation of Permanent or Transitional Housing.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to establish a limit on the amount of funding that an applicant may request under this subtitle for acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation activities for the development of permanent housing or transitional housing.

SEC. 428. RENEWAL FUNDING AND TERMS OF ASSTISTANCE FOR PERMANENT HOUSING.

(a) In General.—Of the total amount available for use in connection with this subtitle, such sums as may be necessary shall be designated for the purpose of renewing existing contracts for permanent housing, within the account referred to as the ‘‘Homeless Assistance Grants Account’’ on the date of enactment of the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005.

(b) Renewals.—Such sums shall be available for the renewal of contracts for a 1-year term for increments and housing operation costs associated with permanent housing projects funded under this subtitle, or under subtitle C or F as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005. The Secretary shall determine whether to renew a contract for such a permanent housing project on the basis of demonstrated need for the project and the compliance of the entity carrying out the project with appropriate standards of housing quality and habitability determined by the Secretary.

(c) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the Secretary from renewing contracts under this subtitle in accordance with criteria set forth in a provision of this subtitle other than this section.

SEC. 429. MATCHING FUNDING.

(a) In General.—A recipient of a grant (including a renewed grant) under this subtitle shall make available contributions, in cash, in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the Federal funds provided under the grant.

(b) Application.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a grant for activities consisting of the payment of operating costs associated with permanent housing renewal grants described in section 428 that fund the operation of permanent housing.

(c) Matching funds provided by states whose incomes are 50 percent or less of the median income for an individual or family, respectively, in the geographic area involved; and

(d) Federal or State funds from a source other than this subtitle.

SEC. 430. APPEAL PROCEDURE.

(a) In General.—With respect to funding under this subtitle, if certification of consistency with the Consolidated Plan is withheld from an applicant who has submitted an application for that certification, such applicant may appeal such decision to the Secretary.

(b) Procedure.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure to process the appeals described in subsection (a).

(c) Determination.—Not later than 45 days after the date of receipt of an appeal described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall determine if certification was unreasonably withheld. If such certification was unreasonably withheld, the Secretary shall review such application and determine if such applicant shall receive funding under this subtitle.

SEC. 7. REPEALS AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Repeals.—Subtitles D, E, F, and G of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11391 et seq., 11401 et seq., 11402 et seq., and 11408 et seq.) are repealed.

(b) Conforming Amendments.—

(1) United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.—Section 366(b)(3)(F) of title 38, United States Code and section 506(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa-5a) are amended by striking ‘‘Interagency Council on the Homeless’’ and inserting ‘‘United States Interagency Council on Homelessness’’.

(2) Consolidated Plan.—Section 403(1) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as redesignated in section 4(2), is amended—

(A) by striking ‘‘current housing affordability strategy’’ and inserting ‘‘Consolidated Plan’’; and

(B) by inserting before the comma the following: ‘‘(referred to in that section as a ‘comprehensive housing affordability strategy’’).’’

(3) Persons experiencing homelessness.—Section 105 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(d) Persons experiencing homelessness.—References in this Act to homeless individuals (including homeless persons) or homeless groups (including the homeless) shall be considered to include, and to refer to, individuals experiencing homelessness or groups experiencing homelessness, respectively.’’

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Community Partnership to End Homeless Act of 2005. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation because I believe that this bill will greatly assist the Nation’s efforts on ending the long-standing tragedy of homelessness. I applaud the hard work of the chairmen and ranking member of the Senate Banking Committee’s Housing Subcommittee, Senators ALLARD and REED for developing this important legislation.

As a former member of the Banking Committee, former chair of the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, and now the current chair of the Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, HUD, and Related Agencies (TTHUD) Appropriations Subcommittee, the issue of homelessness has been one of my main priorities. During the time I have served on those Appropriations subcommittees, I have learned a great deal about the causes of homelessness. The causes are varied ranging from the lack of affordable housing to mental or physical ailments to unforeseen economic problems.

The good news is that since the Congress first created the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in 1987, there has been a great push on the part of the Fed and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act that required HUD to spend at least 30 percent of the homeless assistance grant funds on permanent housing.

Re-focusing HUD on permanent housing was something that senators on both sides of the aisle strongly and rightfully support. The 30 percent permanent housing set-aside requirement was established because HUD was not producing enough housing for homeless individuals. This problem is because HUD is the only federal agency that provides permanent housing.

By 1998, just prior to the enactment of the 30 percent set-aside, only 13 percent of HUD homeless grant funds were being spent on permanent housing. Therefore, the 30 percent set-aside was created to re-balance HUD’s homeless programs so that permanent housing was being provided. And, the set-aside has not hurt funding for supportive services since we have continually increased the HUD homeless account and the Administration has worked with other agencies, such as HHS and VA, to ensure that they are providing services to homeless people. In the Senate’s fiscal year 2006 TTHUD bill, we have provided a $174 million increase over fiscal year 2005 for the HUD homeless account.

The focus on permanent housing was backed by sound research that demonstrated the cost-effectiveness of this approach. By focusing on permanent housing and especially those who were chronically homeless, HUD’s programs became correctly focused on those most needy of this assistance, such as disabled homeless veterans. For those reasons, I am extremely pleased and supportive of the bill’s provision that requires HUD to use at least 30 percent of funds for permanent housing activities. This provision is probably the most important piece of this legislation.

In addition to the permanent housing requirement, I strongly support the bill’s provisions that require outcome-based performance evaluations, promote access to mainstream resources for supportive services, and consolidate HUD’s competitive grant programs. I especially support the bill’s efforts to encourage localities and grantees to participate and use the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), which was initiated by Senator MIKULSKI and me in the fiscal year 2001 VA-HUD and Independent Appropriations Act.
of continuum-of-care grantees have implemented the HMIS. This system is absolutely critical for developing an unduplicated count of homeless people and an analysis of their patterns of use of federal assistance programs.

This bill is supported by members on both sides of the aisle. I hope that the Senate and the Congress can pass important legislation because this bill will help eliminate the tragedy of homelessness. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. ENZI:
S. 1802. All to provide for appropriate waivers, suspensions, or exemptions from provisions of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to individual account plans affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita; read the first time.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Pension Flexibility in Natural Disasters Act of 2005. The bill provides appropriate waivers, suspensions or exemptions from the provisions of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, with respect to individual account plans affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita have brought terrible devastation in the gulf coast. Not only have so many homes in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Texas been destroyed but many businesses have been destroyed as well.

Any business that maintains a pension or retirement plan for their workers is subject to certain reporting, disclosure and fiduciary provisions of ERISA as well as being subject to the pertinent provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. ERISA sets up many requirements and deadlines that businesses simply cannot meet due to the devastation to homes and businesses and the destruction of all of their records.

This bill postpones reporting requirements for businesses that have been adversely affected by storms in these presidentially-declared disaster areas. It also will facilitate getting individuals access to their retirement savings in the form of hardship loans or distributions by allowing plan fiduciaries flexibility in making those distributions in view of these terrible disasters.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. President, 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. 1802
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 “Pension Flexibility in Natural Disasters Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AND THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION.
The Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Executive Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation shall exercise their authority under section 518 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1148) and section 7903(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to postpone certain deadlines by reason of the Presidentially declared disaster areas in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and elsewhere due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina or Rita. The Secretaries and the Executive Director of the Corporation shall issue guidance as soon as is practicable to plan sponsors, administrators, fiduciaries, service providers, or other person with respect to such plan, affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita or any service provider or other person dealing with such plan, that the Secretary, notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, prescribe, by notice or otherwise, a waiver, suspension, or exemption from any provision of such title which is under the regulatory authority of such Secretary, or from regulations issued under any such provision, that is under the regulatory authority of such Secretary, if appropriate to facilitate the distribution or loan of assets from such plan to participants and beneficiaries of such plan.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE GUIDANCE BY REASON OF THE PRESIDENTIALLY DECLARED DISASTER CAUSED BY HURRICANE KATRINA OR RITA.

(a) WAIVERS, SUSPENSIONS, OR EXEMPTIONS.—In the case of any pension plan which is an individual account plan, or any participant or beneficiary, plan sponsor, administrator, fiduciary, service provider, or other person with respect to such plan, affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita, or any service provider or other person dealing with such plan, that the Secretary, notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, prescribe, by notice or otherwise, a waiver, suspension, or exemption from any provision of such title which is under the regulatory authority of such Secretary, or from regulations issued under any such provision, if appropriate to facilitate the distribution or loan of assets from such plan to participants and beneficiaries of such plan.

(b) EXEMPTION FROM LIABILITY FOR ACTS OR OMISSIONS COVERED BY WAIVER, SUSPENSION, OR EXEMPTION.—No person shall be liable for any violation of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or of any regulations issued under such title, based upon any act or omission covered by a waiver, suspension, or exemption issued under subsection (a) if such act or omission is in compliance with the terms of the waiver, suspension, or exemption.

(c) PLAN TERMS SUBJECT TO WAIVER, SUSPENSION, OR EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any provision of the plan to the contrary and to the extent that a waiver, suspension, or exemption issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to subsection (a), no plan shall be treated as failing to be operated in accordance with its terms solely as a result of acts or omissions which are consistent with such waiver, suspension, or exemption.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—This section shall apply only with respect to waivers, suspensions, or exemptions issued by the Secretary of Labor during the 1-year period following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section shall have the meanings provided such terms in section 3 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1102).

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY IN THE EVENT OF PRESIDENTIALLY DECLARED DISASTER OR TERRORISTIC OR MILITARY ACTIONS.
Section 518 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1148) is amended by inserting “under any plan provision” after “under this Act”.

Mr. BidEN (for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. HAGEl, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Republic of Azerbaijan is scheduled to hold elections for its parliament, the Milli Majlis, in November 2005; and Whereas Azerbaijan has enjoyed a strong relationship with the United States since its independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991; and Whereas international observers monitoring Azerbaijan’s October 2003 presidential election found that the pre-election, election day, and post-election environments fell well short of international standards; and Whereas the International Election Observation Mission (IEOM) in Baku, Azerbaijan, and the International Parliamentary Group for Cooperation with the Council of Europe (OSCE) and the Council of Europe, found that there were numerous instances of violence by both government and opposition forces; and Whereas the international election observers also found inequality and irregularities in campaign and election conditions, including intimidation against opposition supporters, restrictions on political rallies by opposition candidates, and voting fraud; and Whereas, following the 2003 presidential election, the Council of Europe adopted Resolution 1358 (2004) demanding that the Government of Azerbaijan immediately implement a series of steps that included the release of political prisoners, investigation of election fraud, and the creation of public service television to allow all political parties to better communicate with the people of Azerbaijan;

Whereas, since the 2003 presidential election, the Government of Azerbaijan has taken some positive steps by releasing some political prisoners and working to create public service television; and Whereas the United States supports the promotion of democracy and transparent, free, and fair elections consistent with the commitments of Azerbaijan as a participating State of the OSCE;

Whereas the United States is working with the Government of Azerbaijan, the political opposition, civil society, the OSCE, the Council of Europe, and other countries to strengthen the political and economic conditions for a series of commitments on democracy, human rights, and the rule of law when that country joined the OSCE as a participating State in 1992; and Whereas, following the 2003 presidential election, the Council of Europe adopted Resolution 1358 (2004) demanding that the Government of Azerbaijan immediately implement a series of steps that included the release of political prisoners, investigation of election fraud, and the creation of public service television to allow all political parties to better communicate with the people of Azerbaijan;

The Senate resolution was adopted by a voice vote and sent to the House.
Whereas a genuinely free and fair election requires government and public authorities to ensure that candidates and political parties enjoy equal treatment before the law and that their resources are not employed to the advantage of individual candidates or political parties; and

Whereas the establishment of a transparent election process in Azerbaijan is crucial to the success of the 2006 parliamentary elections and an important step in Azerbaijan’s progress toward full integration into the democratic community of nations; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan to hold orderly, peaceful, and free and fair parliamentary elections in November 2005 in order to ensure the long-term growth and stability of the country;

(2) calls upon the Government of Azerbaijan to guarantee the full participation of opposition parties in the upcoming elections, including members of opposition parties arrested in the months leading up to the November 2005 parliamentary elections;

(3) calls upon the opposition parties to fully and peacefully participate in the November 2005 parliamentary elections, and calls on the Government of Azerbaijan to create the conditions for the participation on equal grounds of all viable candidates;

(4) believes it critical that the November 2005 elections be judged by the people of Azerbaijan as free and fair, and that all sides refrain from violence during the campaign, on election day, and following the election;

(5) calls upon the Government of Azerbaijan to guarantee election monitors from the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Azeri political parties, representatives of candidates, nongovernmental organizations, and other private institutions and organizations, both foreign and domestic, unimpeded access to all aspects of the election process;

(6) supports recommendations made by the Council of Europe on amendments to the Unified Election Code of Azerbaijan, specifically to ensure equitable representation of opposition and pro-government forces in all election commissions;

(7) urges the international community and domestic nongovernmental organizations to provide a greater number of election observers to ensure credible monitoring and reporting of the November 2005 parliamentary elections;

(8) recognizes the need for the establishment of an independent media and assurance by the Government of Azerbaijan that freedom of the press will be guaranteed and (9) calls upon the Government of Azerbaijan to guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CRISIS OF HURRICANE KATRINA SHOULD NOT BE USED TO WAKE, WAIVE, OR ROLL BACK FEDERAL PUBLIC HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RHEI). Mrs. OBAMA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CANTWELL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. Res. 261

Whereas Hurricane Katrina made landfall in the Gulf Region on August 29, 2005, destroying property, causing massive floods, and resulting in more than $35,000,000,000 in insured property losses and approximately 1,200 deaths;

Whereas expeditiously rebuilding those areas affected by Hurricane Katrina and providing the victims of the storm with normalcy and relief must be the top priorities for Congress;

Whereas Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff recently commented, ‘We are going to probably see the greatest environmental mess we have ever seen in the country as a result of Hurricane Katrina’;

Whereas Hurricane Katrina demonstrates the connection between the health and safety of communities and the health of natural resources;

Whereas many of the hardest hit areas in New Orleans and the Gulf Coast from Hurricane Katrina were low-income and minority communities already facing decades of environmental injustices;

Whereas at least 9 major oil spills, and scores of smaller oil and hazardous substance spills, leaks, and other releases have occurred;

Whereas 60 underground storage tanks, hazardous waste storage facilities, and industrial and other facilities in New Orleans were hit by Hurricane Katrina, yet monitoring reported to date has only been conducted at a handful of sites for a limited number of contaminants;

Whereas nearly 1,000 drinking-water systems were disabled or impaired because of power outages or structural damage, many people have been told to boil their water, and safe drinking water may not be available for the entire population for years to come;

Whereas the Environmental Protection Agency’s initial water quality tests found that flood water in New Orleans contains 10 times more E. Coli bacteria than the Agency considers safe for human contact and lead concentrations that exceed drinking water standards, and the mix of contaminants poses a serious disease risk to those wading through the filthy water;

Whereas pre-existing implementation and enforcement of Federal public health and environmental regulations are necessary to protect human health, especially among vulnerable communities, and are necessary in times of emergency to ensure that the response to a disaster does not exacerbate the initial impact;

Whereas major industrial facilities and toxic waste sites disproportionately impact low-income individuals, minorities, children, the elderly, and all underserved communities;

Whereas more than 1 in 4 Americans, including 10,000,000 children, live within 4 miles of a Superfund site, which poses serious health threats if not cleaned up adequately and in a timely manner;

Whereas the health of low-income and minority communities continues to suffer, largely because of the cumulative impact of all sources of pollution on public health in the acute impact area and the failure to consider cumulative impacts upon siting of new industrial facilities and cleanup of existing toxic communities;

Whereas the addition of poor environmental protection and existing health vulnerabilities has only exacerbated the conditions in these communities, which often suffer from higher rates of illness and death with middle-class, suburban, and more affluent communities;

Whereas Federal public health and environmental laws provide many opportunities to address environmental risks and hazards in minority and low-income communities if appropriately applied and implemented;

Whereas Executive Order 12898 states that each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying, and addressing, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations;

Whereas in 2005, the Congress passed and President Bush signed into law (Public Law 109-54) language prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency from appropriating funds to work in contravention of Executive Order 12898 and further delay the implementation of this Order, which is critical to achieving environmental and health equity across all community lines;

Whereas environmental cleanup of affected areas must be done in an effective and timely manner to ensure the victims of Hurricane Katrina can return to their homes without enduring preventable environmental or health risks; and

Whereas weakening, waiving, and rolling back Federal public health and environmental protections would further threaten the already damaged area of the Gulf Coast, with negative impacts on the public health of the already most-affected communities, and put public health and the environment at greater future risk at the expense of all communities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the crisis of Hurricane Katrina and other such disasters should not be used to weaken, waive, or roll back Federal public health, environmental, and environmental justice laws and regulations;

(2) State, local, and regional authorities must retain their authority for compliance and permitting of industrial and other facilities, and their role in enforcing and implementing monitoring and cleanup regulations;

(3) testing, monitoring, cleanup, and recovery in the region hit by Hurricane Katrina and other areas of national emergency—

(A) should be completed in a manner designed to protect public health and the environment and ensure that the region and mitigate against the effects of future storms; and

(B) should be carried out in compliance with Executive Order 12898 and

(4) the Federal rebuilding of communities and the economy of the Gulf Region should be a model of the integrated, diverse, and sustainable society that all people in the United States desire and deserve.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 55—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE CONDITIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES TO BECOME A SIGNATORY TO ANY MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE RESULTING FROM THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION’S DOHA DEVELOPMENT AGENDA ROUND

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAucus, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. McCAIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KIOL, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SHELBY, Ms.
WHEREAS members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) are currently engaged in a round of trade negotiations known as the Doha Development Agenda (Doha Round); Whereupon it appears that the negotiations have put forward proposals that would substantially weaken United States law or practice, including proposals that make it more difficult to prove injury; and
Whereas chronic violators of fair trade disciplines have put forward proposals that would substantially weaken United States trade remedy laws and practices, including mandating that unfair trade orders terminate after a set number of years even if unfair trade and injury are likely to recur; and
Whereas chronic violators of fair trade disciplines have put forward proposals that would substantially weaken United States trade remedy laws and practices, including mandating that unfair trade orders terminate after a set number of years even if unfair trade and injury are likely to recur; and
Whereas chronic violators of fair trade disciplines have put forward proposals that would substantially weaken United States trade remedy laws and practices, including mandating that unfair trade orders terminate after a set number of years even if unfair trade and injury are likely to recur; and

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1882. Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1883. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. BURDIX) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1884. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1885. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1886. Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. O哈MA, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DODD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mrs. MURkowski) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1887. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1888. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1889. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1890. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1891. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1892. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1893. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1894. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAHSLY and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1778, to extend medicare cost-sharing for qualifying individuals through September 2006, to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, transitional medical assistance under the Medicaid program, and related programs through March 31, 2006, and for other purposes.

SA 1895. Mr. RINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1896. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1897. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropri-ations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1898. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1899. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1900. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1901. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. TALENT, and Ms. LANDREI) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2863, supra.

SA 1902. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1903. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1904. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1905. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1906. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1907. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1908. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. MUKULSKI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LUTZENBERG, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

SA 1909. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1910. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1911. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1912. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1913. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1914. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1915. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1916. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1917. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1918. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1919. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SEC. 1073. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTER-CONTINENTAL BALISTIC MISSILE FORCE.

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

(1) Consistent with warhead levels agreed to in the Moscow Treaty, the United States is modifying the capacity of the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) from its prior capability to carry up to 3 intercontinental reentry vehicles as few as a single reentry vehicle, a process known as downgrading.

(2) A series of Department of Defense studies of United States strategic forces, including the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review, has confirmed the continued need for 500 intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(3) In a potential nuclear crisis it is important that the nuclear weapons systems of the United States be configured so as to discourage other nations from making a first strike.

(4) The intercontinental ballistic missile force is currently being considered as part of the deliberations of the Department of Defense for the Quadrennial Defense Review.

(b) STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to continue to deploy a force of 500 intercontinental ballistic missiles, provided that unannounced strategic reductions may compel the United States to make changes to this force structure in the future.

(c) MOSCOW TREATY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Moscow Treaty’ means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Strategic Offensive Reductions, done at Moscow on May 24, 2002.

SA 1884. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1044. REPORT ON USE OF SPACE RADAR FOR TOPOGRAPHICAL MAPPING FOR SCIENTIFIC AND CIVIL PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15, 2006, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and advisability of utilizing the Space Radar for purposes of coastal zone management, topographical mapping information, and related information, to the scientific community and other elements of the private sector for scientific and civil purposes.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description and evaluation of any uses of the Space Radar for scientific or civil purposes that are identified by the Secretary for purposes of the report.

(2) A description and evaluation of any additions or modifications to the Space Radar identified by the Secretary for purposes of the report.
scientific or civil purposes, including the utilization of additional frequencies, the development or enhancement of ground systems, and the enhancement of operations.

(3) The costs of any additions or modifications identified pursuant to paragraph (2).

(4) A description and evaluation of processes for developing requirements for the Space Radar, and on the development of the Space Radar, of the use of the Space Radar for scientific or civil purposes.

(5) A description of the process for developing requirements for the Space Radar, including the involvement of the Civil Applications Committee.

SA 1885. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following:

SEC. 320. WELFARE OF SPECIAL CATEGORY RESIDENTS AT NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may provide for the general welfare, including the care of any person at Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who is designated by the Secretary, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, as a so-called “special category resident.”

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.—The authorization in subsection (a) is amended to include an authorization for the construction of new housing facilities or medical treatment facilities.

(c) FUNDING OF FUNDING OF FUNDS.—The provisions of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, are hereby deemed not to have applied to the obligation or expenditure of funds before the date of the enactment of this Act for the general welfare of persons described in subsection (a).

SA 1886. Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DODD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mrs. MURRAY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 219, at the appropriate place at the end of Title IX, insert the following:

TITLE

SECTION 161.

(a) From the money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated or appropriated, there are appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention $3,913,000,000 for activities relating to avian flu epidemic during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, which shall be available until expended.

(b) Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a)—

(1) $3,080,000,000 shall be for the stockpiling of antivirals and medical supplies;

(2) $33,000,000 shall be for global surveillance relating to avian flu;

(3) $125,000,000 shall be to increase the national investment in vaccine infrastructure including development and research;

(4) $600,000,000 shall be for additional grants to state and local public health agencies for emergency preparedness, to increase funding for emergency preparedness centers, and to expand hospital surge capacity; and

(5) $75,000,000 shall be for risk communication and outreach to providers, businesses, and to the American public.

(c) The amount appropriated under subsection (a)—

(1) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 802 of H.R. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress); and

(2) shall remain available until expended.

(d) This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1887. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,” $2,000,000 may be made available for weapons and munitions advanced technology for applied emergency hypothermia for advanced combat casualty life support.

SA 1889. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,” $2,000,000 may be made available for weapons and munitions advanced technology for trained emergency hypothermia for advanced combat casualty life support.

SA 1890. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,” $2,000,000 may be made available for weapons and munitions advanced technology for trained emergency hypothermia for advanced combat casualty life support.

SA 1891. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. PROHIBITION ON TORTURE AND CRUEL, INHUMAN, OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT.

(a) In General.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be obligated or expended to subject any person in the custody or under the physical control of the United States to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(b) Limitations.—As used in this section—

(1) the term "torture" has the meaning given that term in section 2340(1) of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) the term "cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment," means conduct that would constitute cruel, unusual, and inhumane treatment or punishment prohibited by the fifth amendment, eighth amendment, or fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States if the conduct took place in the United States.

SA 1892. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 4. RESTRICTION ON COVERED DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.

(a) Exclusion Under Medicaid Beginning in 2007.—Section 1902(a)(19) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u(a)(19)) is amended by inserting "and, on and after October 1, 2006, other than sub-paragraph (K) (relating to agents used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, unless such agents are used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration)" after "agents.".

(b) Restriction Under Medicaid.—

(1) In General.—Section 1927(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(K) Agents used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, except that such exclusion or other restriction shall not apply in the case of such agents when used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration.".

(2) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to drugs dispensed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Clarification of No Effect on Determination of Baseline Expenditures.—Section 1906(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I)) is amended by inserting "including drugs described in sub-paragraph (K) of section 1927(d)(2)(" after "1927(d)(2)".

SA 1895. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 8163. IMPLEMENTATION OF IMT-2000 3G COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.—

(1) Additional amount for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.—The amount appropriated by title III under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force," is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) Availability of amount.—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available to the United States Northern Command for the purposes of implementing IMT-2000 3G Standards Based Communications Information Extension capabilities for the Gulf States and key entities within the Northern Command Area of Responsibility (AOR).

(3) Construction of amount.—The amount available under paragraph (2) for the purpose set forth in that paragraph is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for that purpose.

SA 1894. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1778, to extend Medicare cost-sharing for qualifying individuals through September 2006, to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, transitional medical assistance under the Medicaid Program, and related programs through March 31, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. RESTRICTION ON COVERED DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.

(a) Exclusion Under Medicaid Beginning in 2007.—Section 1902(a)(19) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u(a)(19)) is amended by inserting "and, on and after October 1, 2006, other than sub-paragraph (K) (relating to agents used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, unless such agents are used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration)" after "agents.".

(b) Restriction Under Medicaid.—

(1) In General.—Section 1927(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(K) Agents used to treat sexual or erectile dysfunction, except that such exclusion or other restriction shall not apply in the case of such agents when used to treat a condition, other than sexual or erectile dysfunction, for which the agent has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration.".

(2) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to drugs dispensed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Clarification of No Effect on Determination of Baseline Expenditures.—Section 1906(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I)) is amended by inserting "including drugs described in sub-paragraph (K) of section 1927(d)(2)" after "1927(d)(2)".

SA 1896. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount appropriated by title II under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide," is hereby increased by $100,000,000.

(b) Availability for Child and Family Assistance Benefits.—Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", as increased by subsection (a), $120,000,000 may be available as follows:

(1) $100,000,000 may be available for childcare services for families of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) $20,000,000 may be available for family assistance centers that primarily serve members of the Armed Forces and their families.

(c) Offset.—

(1) In General.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby reduced by $120,000,000.

(2) Availability.—The amount shall not be derived from amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Missile Defense Agency and available for missile defense programs and activities of the Army.

SA 1879. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, making appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 213. WARHEAD/GRENADE SCIENTIFIC BASED MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) Additional Amount for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Department of Defense.—The amount appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.

(b) Availability.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.
which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 379, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 3102. AUTHORIZATION FOR DISPOSAL OF TUNGSTEN ORES AND CONCENTRATES.

(a) DISPOSAL AUTHORIZED.—The President may dispose of up to 6,000,000 pounds of contained tungsten ores and concentrates from the National Defense Stockpile in fiscal year 2006.

(b) CERTAIN SALES AUTHORIZED.—The tungsten ores and concentrates disposed under subsection (a) may be sold to entities with conversion or tungsten carbide manufacturing or processing capabilities in the United States.

SA 1899. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 8101. FUNDING FOR PARTICIPATION OF VET CENTERS IN TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, $10,000,000 shall be used for the participation of Vet centers in the transition assistance programs of the Department of Defense for members of the Armed Forces.

(b) VET CENTERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘‘Vet centers’’ means centers for the provision of readjustment counseling and related mental health services under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1900. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. APPLICATIONS FOR IMPACT AND AID PAYMENT.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8005(d) of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702(d)) and (3), the Secretary of Education shall treat as timely filed, and shall process for payment, an application under section 8002 or section 8003 for fiscal year 2005 from a local educational agency—

(1) that, for each of the fiscal year 2000 through 2004, submitted an application by the date specified by the Secretary of Education under section 8005(c) of such Act for the fiscal year;

(2) for which a reduction of more than $1,000,000 was made under section 8005(d)(2) of such Act by the Secretary of Education as a result of the agency’s failure to file a timely application under section 8002 or 8003 of such Act for fiscal year 2005; and

(3) that submits an application for fiscal year 2006 during the period beginning on February 2, 2004, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1904. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 222, after line 4 and 5, insert the following:

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for ‘‘NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT’’—$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended:

Provided, That the amount available under this heading shall be available for obligations to support homeland security emergency response equipment; Provided further, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 492 of the conference report on accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress).

SA 1902. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert: REPORT

SEC. 2. Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations with the following information:

(a) Whether records of civilian casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq are kept by United States Armed Forces, and if so, how and from what sources this information is collected, where it is kept, and who is responsible for maintaining such records.

Whether such records contain (1) any information relating to the circumstances under which the casualties occurred and whether they were fatalities or injuries; (2) if an individual was paid compensation or assistance was provided to the victim or to the victim’s family; and (3) any other information relating to the casualties.

SA 1903. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 220, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 8116. APPLICATIONS FOR IMPACT AND AID PAYMENT.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8005(d) of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702(d)) and (3), the Secretary of Education shall treat as timely filed, and shall process for payment, an application under section 8002 or section 8003 for fiscal year 2005 from a local educational agency—

(1) that, for each of the fiscal year 2000 through 2004, submitted an application by the date specified by the Secretary of Education under section 8005(c) of such Act for the fiscal year;

(2) for which a reduction of more than $1,000,000 was made under section 8005(d)(2) of such Act by the Secretary of Education as a result of the agency’s failure to file a timely application under section 8002 or 8003 of such Act for fiscal year 2005; and

(3) that submits an application for fiscal year 2006 during the period beginning on February 2, 2004, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1904. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 222, after line 4 and 5, insert the following:

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for ‘‘NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT’’—$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended:

Provided, That the amount available under this heading shall be available for obligations to support homeland security emergency response equipment; Provided further, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 492 of the conference report on accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress).

SA 1902. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert: REPORT

SEC. 2. Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations with the following information:

(a) Whether records of civilian casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq are kept by United States Armed Forces, and if so, how and from what sources this information is collected, where it is kept, and who is responsible for maintaining such records.

Whether such records contain (1) any information relating to the circumstances under which the casualties occurred and whether they were fatalities or injuries; (2) if an individual was paid compensation or assistance was provided to the victim or to the victim’s family; and (3) any other information relating to the casualties.
1026 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13), is amended by striking subsection (a) and (e). (d) Codification of Reporting Requirement.—Section 411h of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection: "(e) If the amount of travel and transportation allowances provided in a fiscal year under clause (i) of subsection (a)(2)(B) exceeds $20,000,000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report specifying the total amount of travel and transportation allowances provided under such clause in such fiscal year.

SA 1906. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. PILOT PROJECT FOR CIVILIAN LANGUAGE RESERVE CORPS. (a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chairman of the National Security Education Board, shall, during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, carry out a pilot program to establish a civilian linguist reserve corps, comprised of United States citizens with advanced levels of proficiency in foreign languages, who would be available, upon request from the President, to perform translation and other services or duties with respect to foreign languages for the Federal Government.

(b) Implementation.—In establishing the Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps, the Secretary, after reviewing the findings and recommendations reported in the report required under section 325 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–30, 116 Stat. 2393), shall:

(1) identify several foreign languages in which proficiency by United States citizens is critical for the national security interests of the United States and the relative importance of such proficiency in each such language;

(2) identify United States citizens with advanced levels of proficiency in each foreign language identified under paragraph (1) who would be available to perform the services and duties referred to in subsection (a);

(3) cooperate with other Federal agencies with national security responsibilities to implement a procedure for securing the performance of the services and duties referred to in subsection (a) by the citizens identified under paragraph (2); and

(4) invite individuals identified under paragraph (2) to participate in the civilian linguist reserve corps.

(c) Contract Authority.—In establishing the civilian linguist reserve corps, the Secretary may enter into contracts with appropriate agencies or entities.

(d) Feasibility Study.—During the course of the pilot program established under this section, the Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing the civilian linguist reserve corps, including practices regarding—

(1) administrative structure;

(2) languages that will be available;

(3) the number of language specialists needed for each language;

(4) the Federal agencies that may need language services;

(5) compensation and other operating costs;

(6) certification standards and procedures;

(7) security clearances;

(8) skill maintenance and training; and

(9) the use of private contractors to supply language specialists.

(e) Reports.—(1) Evaluation Reports.—(A) In General.—Not later than 1 year after the completion of the pilot project, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report summarizing the lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations for full implementation of a civilian linguist reserve corps.

(B) Funding.—Of the amount appropriated under the heading ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’ in title II, $3,100,000 shall be available to carry out the pilot program under this section.

SA 1907. Mr. DeWINE submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 167, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(c) Additional Death Gratuity.—In the case of an active duty member of the armed forces who died between October 7, 2001, and May 11, 2005, and was not eligible for an additional death gratuity under section 1478(e) of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 1022(b) of Public Law 109–13), the eligible survivors of such decedent shall receive, in addition to the death gratuity available to such survivors under section 1478(a) of such title, an additional death gratuity of $150,000 under the same conditions as provided under such section 1478(e).

SA 1908. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. McCaskill, Mr. Corzine, Mr. Salazar, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Biden, Mr. Nelson of Florida, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. Chafee and Mr. Kerry) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(a) Short Title.—This section may be cited as the ‘‘Reservists Pay Security Act of 2005’’.

(b) In General.—Subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter 13:

‘‘§5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard

‘‘(a) An employee who is absent from a position of employment with the Federal Government in order to perform duty in the uniformed services pursuant to a call or order to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(A) or section 505 of title 10, is entitled, while serving on active duty, to receive, for each pay period described in subsection (b), an amount equal to the amount by which—

(1) the amount of basic pay which would otherwise have been payable to such employee for such pay period if such employee’s civilian employment with the Government had not been interrupted by that service, exceeds (if at all)

(2) the amount of pay and allowances which (as determined under subsection (d))—

(A) is payable to such employee for that service; and

(B) is allocable to such pay period.

(b) Amounts under this section shall be payable with respect to each pay period (which would otherwise apply if the employee’s civilian employment had not been interrupted—

(1) during which such employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38 with respect to the position from which such employee is absent (as referred to in subsection (a)); and

(2) for which such employee does not otherwise receive basic pay (including by taking any annual, military, or other paid leave) to which such employee is entitled by virtue of such employee’s civilian employment with the Government.

(2) For purposes of this section, the period during which an employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38—

(A) shall be determined disregarding the provisions of section 4312(d) of title 38; and

(B) shall include any period of time specified in section 4312(e) of title 38 within which such employee may receive employment or reemployment following completion of service on active duty to which called or ordered as described in subsection (a).

(3) Any amount payable under this section to an employee shall be—

(1) by such employee’s employing agency;

(2) from the appropriation or fund which would otherwise have paid such employee if such employee were in a pay status; and

(3) to the extent practicable, at the same time and in the same manner as basic pay if such employee were in a pay status; and

(4) the Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with Secretary of Defense, prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out the preceding provisions of this section.

(e) The head of each agency referred to in section 2302(a)(2)(C)(i) shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of such agency.

(f) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of that agency.

(3) For purposes of this section—
the bill H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. Of the amount appropriated by this Act under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE” shall be available for the rapid mobilization of the New England Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative to meet Department of Defense supply shortages and surge demands for parts and equipment.

SA 1912. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 114. TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES.

SEC. 801. ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT.
ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, and such other matters as justice may require.

"(b) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.

(1) Section 301 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT BY OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES TO COINCIDE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL BE ENFORCED UNDER:

"(1) section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, and Federal branches and agencies of foreign banks; and

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), branches and agencies of foreign banks (other than Federal branches, Federal agencies, and insured State branches of foreign banks), commercial lending companies owned or controlled by foreign banks, and organization operating under section 25 or 25A of the Federal Reserve Act, and bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System) and insured State branches of foreign banks, any subsidiaries of such entities (except brokers, dealers, persons providing insurance, investment companies, and investment advisers) by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

"(2) Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by the Financial Modernization Act of 1999) shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by this section with respect to any provision of this Act.
of the action together with reasonable attorneys fees as determined by the court.

"(3) ATTORNEY FEES.—On a finding by the court that an unsuccessfulpleading, motion, or other paper filed in connection with an action under this section was filed in bad faith or for the purposes of harassment, the court shall award to the prevailing party attorney fees in amounts that is reasonable in light to the work expended in responding to such pleading, motion, or other paper."

(6) Section 307(c) of that Act (50 U.S.C. App. 577) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) CIVIL LIABILITY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Any party (other than a servicemember or dependent) who fails to comply with any requirement imposed by this section with respect to a servicemember or dependent is liable to such servicemember or dependent in an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) any actual damages sustained by such servicemember or dependent as a result of the failure;

"(B) such amount of punitive damages as the court may allow;

"(C) a reasonable amount of consequential damages as the court may allow;

"(D) such additional damages as the court may allow, in an amount not less than $100 or more than $10,000, as determined by the court, for each violation; and

"(E) in the case of any successful action to enforce liability under this section, the cost of the action, together with reasonable attorneys fees as determined by the court.

(3) ATTORNEY FEES.—On a finding by the court that an unsuccessful pleading, motion, or other paper filed in connection with an action under this section was filed in bad faith or for the purposes of harassment, the court shall award to the prevailing party attorney fees in amounts reasonable in relation to the work expended in responding to such pleading, motion, or other paper.

SEC. . OUTFREACH TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS ON THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) Outreach to Members of the Armed Forces.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary concerned shall provide to each member of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary pertinent information on the rights and protections available to servicemembers and their dependents under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.).

(2) TIME OF PROVISION.—Information shall be provided to a member of the Armed Forces under paragraph (1) at times as follows:

(A) During initial entry training.

(B) In the case of a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces, during initial entry training and when the member is mobilized for service and individually called to active duty for a period of more than one year.

(C) At such other times as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate.

(b) Outreach to Dependents.—The Secretary concerned may provide to the adult dependents of members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary pertinent information on the rights and protections available to servicemembers and their dependents under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

(c) Definitions.—In this section, the terms "dependents" and "Secretary concerned" have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501).

SEC. . SERVICEMEMBERS RIGHTS UNDER THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968.

(a) In General.—Sections 1701x(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x(c)(5)(A)(i)) are amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking "" and inserting "";

(2) in subclause (III), by striking the period after "" and inserting "";

(3) by adding at the end the following:

""(IV) notify the homeowner by a statement or notice, written in plain English by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury, explaining the mortgage and foreclosure rights of servicemembers, and the dependents of such servicemembers, under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.), including the toll-free military one source number to call if servicemembers, or the dependents of such servicemembers, require further assistance."";

(b) No Effect on Other Laws.—Nothing in this section shall relieve any person of any obligation imposed by any other Federal, State, or local law.

(c) Disclosure Form.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue a final disclosure form to fulfill the requirements of section 1701x(c)(5)(A)(iv) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x(c)(5)(A)(i)).

(d) Effective Date.—The amendments made under subsection (a) shall take effect 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. . OUTFREACH TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS ON THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

SEC. . SERVICEMEMBERS RIGHTS UNDER THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE III UNDER THE HEADING ""OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE,"" up to $1,500,000 may be made available for the Halvorsen Loader.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE III UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Florida Supply Chain Program.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Surface Sonar Dome Win.

Program.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Florida Supply Chain Program.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE III UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Florida Supply Chain Program.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.

SEC. . OF THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED IN TITLE IV UNDER THE HEADING ""RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY,"" up to $1,000,000 may be made available for the Miami Children's Hospital Pediatric Brain Tumor and Neurological Disease Institute.
during the session of the Senate on September 29, 2005, at 11:45 a.m., to conduct a vote on the nomination of Mr. Keith E. Gottfried, of California, to be General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Mr. Israel, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service; Mr. Darryl W. Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Ms. Kim Kendrick, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Mr. Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade; Mr. David H. McCormick, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration; Mr. Keith A. Nelson, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Ms. Darlene F. Williams, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Mr. Emil Henry Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions; and Mr. Patrick O’Brien, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., on Communications in Disaster, in SD 502.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCY, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 10 a.m., on Communications in Disaster, in SD 502.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on pending matters.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on "Judicial Nominations" on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 2 p.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building room 226.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 2005, for a committee hearing to consider the follow nominations: 1. William F. Tuerk, Under Sec for Memorial Affairs, VA 2. Robert J. Henke, Asst Sec for Management, VA 3. John M. Molino, Asst Sec of Policy and Planning, VA 4. Lisette M. Mondello, Asst Sec for Intergovernmental Affairs, VA 5. George J. Opfer, Inspector General, VA.

The hearing will take place in Room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

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

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., for a hearing entitled “The Defense Travel System: Boon or Boondoggle?”

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet Thursday, September 29, 2005 from 10 a.m. in Hart 216 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on U.S.-Japan Relations.

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

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 3 p.m. for a hearing regarding “GSA II: The Procurement Process from Start to Finish.”

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the floor be granted to Mr. David Bann, a detailed with Senator Gregg’s office, during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill, for a motion to reconsider this? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the floor be granted to Mr. David Bann, a detailed with Senator Gregg’s office, during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill, for a motion to reconsider this? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Susan Ball be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the floor be granted to Mr. David Bann, a detailed with Senator Gregg’s office, during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill, for a motion to reconsider this? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Susan Ball be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Donnie Walker, a fellow serving in Senator Craig’s office, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Donnie Walker, a fellow serving in Senator Craig’s office, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Kennedy, I ask unanimous consent that Douglas Thompson, a Navy fellow in his office, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of H.R. 2863, the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Andrew Schulman, a legislative fellow on Senator DOMENICI’s staff, be given floor privileges for the duration of the debate on H.R. 2863.

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

JOINT REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, be referred jointly to the Committee on Finance and Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1802

Mr. FRIST. I understand there is a bill at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1802) to provide for appropriate waivers, suspensions or exemptions from provisions of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, with respect to individual account plans affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita.

Mr. FRIST. I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 30. 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 there be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow is the last day of the fiscal year. During tomorrow’s session, we will need to pass the continuing resolution, which is at the desk. Tomorrow morning, we will turn to that joint resolution and we expect a rolcall vote. We hope to have that vote by 10:15 in the morning. Senators should adjust their schedules accordingly.

After we complete the continuing resolution tomorrow, we will return to the Defense appropriations bill. Senators will be able to offer amendments at that time. On Friday, we will update all Members as to next week’s schedule.

CONCLUSION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Thursday, September 29, 2005:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES.
Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement in November 2005, we rise to thank Mr. Frank Milasi for 28 years of distinguished service to the United States House of Representatives. Frank has served this great institution as a valuable employee at House Information Resources (HIR), in the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Throughout his career with HIR, Frank has held many positions of increasing responsibility. He began his tenure with the United States House of Representatives on August 1, 1977 as a Senior Programmer. While serving in HIR, Frank addressed long needed automation and reporting issues in each area of benefits administration, which enabled compliance with all House reporting and auditing requirements. Due to his development of the computer generated Revised Substitute Standard Form 2010 “Notice of Change in Health Benefits Enrollment,” the United States House of Representatives became one of the first Federal Agencies to have this form approved for use.

Frank displayed great passion for his work by personally dedicating himself to ensuring that the Financial Management System (FMS) met the needs of the U.S. House of Representatives’ payroll and Human Resources requirements. As a Senior Software Engineer, he applied his exceptional analytical and programming technical skills to the development, design and implementation of many payroll services provided to the House community. Included in these services is the NFC Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). Frank’s work enabled the House to be one of only three government agencies that provided this benefit on time and correctly. Frank’s expertise in FMS with over 900,000 lines of code has resulted in more than 3.5 million payroll payments. In addition, as he prepared to retire, Frank played a major role in the implementation of the new payroll and benefits system, HR Pay Links.

His standard of excellence, dedication to passionate customer service, professionalism and ability to get the job done earned him three Distinguished Service Awards, the Chief Administrative Officer’s highest honor. He is admired by the people he led and appreciated by those he served. May he always look back on his accomplishments with pride.

On behalf of the entire House community, we extend congratulations to Frank for many years of dedication and outstanding contributions to the United States House of Representatives. We wish Frank many wonderful years in fulfilling his retirement dreams.

---

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize a great American patriot and good friend, retiring Major General Thomas P. Maguire, for his extraordinary accomplishments throughout a distinguished career.

As GEN Maguire steps down as New York’s Adjutant General, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of New York and a grateful Nation to express our gratitude for his diligence and exceptional leadership throughout our State’s most trying times.

GEN Maguire assumed command of New York’s National Guard in August 2001, just one month before the terrorist attack on the Pentagon and World Trade Center. Under his command, the National Guard was thrust into unprecedented responsibilities in contributing to and strengthening our homeland security. His leadership was a critical component of restoring the safety and way of life for New Yorkers after September 11th.

It is for these reasons, and many others, that General Maguire should be recognized as a patriot and a great man. Tom graduated from Holy Cross College in 1969, just as I began my college career at the same school. He left with a Degree in History and as a distinguished graduate of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Program.

In 1970, he earned his wings, beginning a long and distinguished career that included 250 combat flights during his tour of duty in Vietnam. His military decorations included the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with nine oak leaf clusters.

Upon his return, GEN Maguire served as a flight instructor before joining the New York Air National Guard’s 137th Tactical Air Support Squadron in 1974. In the years that followed, GEN Maguire excelled in various commands and as a forward air controller, brigade liaison officer, the Federal Air Operations Officer, Deputy Commander for Operations and Vice Commander before assuming command of the 137th in 1994. He is also a veteran of Operation Desert Storm.

Under GEN Maguire’s command, New York’s National Guard has not only performed its military missions with excellence, but it has also been an integral part of our state’s emergency response force and contributed to many international disaster relief missions.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all New Yorkers, I thank and congratulate Major General Maguire for his outstanding service and a highly distinguished career. We wish him and his family continued success and a bright future in the years ahead.

---

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House rejected legislation naming a post office after longtime Berkeley, Councilwoman Maudelle Shirek. I cosponsored this legislation, and I believe strongly that the Federal Government should honor Maudelle Shirek for her many civic contributions.

This vote became a news sensation. My colleague, Rep. STEVE KING, told one newspaper that “if BARBARA LEE would read the history of Joe McCarthy, she would realize that he was a hero for America.”

I could not disagree more, and I am alarmed that my colleague would exalt such a mean, vindictive, tyrant.

Senator McCarthy blindly accused his enemies of communism and homosexuality without any evidence or genuinely patriotic motive. This corrupt bully exploited the fears of the American people to boost his own political career.

Senator McCarthy’s only achievement was inspiring an anti-communist hysteria that ruined the lives of thousands of innocent Americans. As a Japanese American, I know the devastating effects of mass fear and hysteria.

I am alarmed that my colleague would exalt such a mean, vindictive, tyrant.

At a time like this, I am reminded of the words of Special Counsel for the Army Joseph Welch, who in a 1954 hearing poignantly asked of Senator McCarthy, “Have you no sense of decency, sir, at long last?”

---

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement in September 2005, we rise to thank Mr. John Mang for 30 years of outstanding service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

John began his career at the House on September 15, 1975, working as a Programmer Analyst in House Information Systems for the Committee on House Administration. John was a key player in the development of the Financial Management System (FMS). In addition, John contributed to the Client Support System, the Parking Office Permits System, the Lobby Act Support System, the Office of Telecommunications Management Information System, the House Recording Studio system, the Legislative Information Management System, and others.

---

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

Matter set in **boldface** indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
As a Senior Software Engineer in the House Information Resources Information Management Directorate’s Applications Support Branch, John made significant contributions as a team member in the implementation and enhancement of the Fixed Assets and Inventory Management System (FAIMS). FAIMS is a mission critical system used by the Chief Administrative Officer to collect, record and report official financial information on fixed assets, generate related payments, and report on Accounts Payable, Purchasing and General Ledger activities.

John has been a valuable, loyal, hard-working and customer-oriented employee, who takes pride in consistently delivering quality products to customers. His great attention to detail and passion for his work have resulted in special recognition for his work on FAIMS and FMS. John has dedicated himself to ensuring that the needs of his customers in the Office of Finance, House Support Services, the Sergeant at Arms, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Clerk, and the Committees are met. John’s adaptability, his extensive knowledge of software engineering, and his excellent relationship with his customers were invaluable to deploying and enhancing FAIMS.

On behalf of the entire House community, we extend congratulations to John for his many years of dedication and outstanding contributions to the House of Representatives. We wish John many wonderful years in fulfilling his retirement dreams.

HONORING PAUL SIDNEY
HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a good friend, neighbor and constituent, Mr. Paul Sidney, for his extraordinary accomplishments, which are being celebrated and honored by winning this year’s Long Island Lifetime Achievement Award.

Everyone on Long Island knows Paul Sidney is the man behind the music. He is the president, general manager and program director of radio station WLNG, owned by the independent Main Street Broadcasting Company and based in Sag Harbor in my district on eastern Long Island.

Paul Sidney’s broadcasts can be heard from Mastic to Montauk. The signal even reaches parts of Rhode Island and Connecticut. Listeners tuning into 92.1 FM are almost always certain to hear sounds that were the standards when Paul was growing up in Brooklyn.

After graduating from NYU with a communications degree, Paul launched his career playing oldies for WLIS-FM in Old Saybrook, Connecticut. While the radio industry nationwide and locally has witnessed considerable change in that time, WLNG established its signature style long ago with Paul leading the way and building a loyal, ever-growing fan base on Long Island that continues to feed off his charisma and his familiar, swift-talking voice.

Paul and WLNG have been in business for 41 years. He has worked tirelessly to solidarity ties to local businesses, including advertisers ranging from Lamplighter Wines in Southampton to Hildreth’s Department Store in the East End to Suffolk County National Bank. The station hosts some 250 live remote broadcasts each year from local stores, street fairs, antique auctions, car shows, and sporting events. It even broadcast live from the Cole Brothers Circus, when it appeared in Southampton and Greenport.

At most of these remote broadcasts, Paul works from the mobile control room, and one or two of the other D.J.’s host live on-the-air interviews in the crowd. When not broadcasting from a remote location, Mr. Sidney and his staff work out of their modest studio on Redwood Road, by the waterfront of Sag Harbor Cove.

The station reflects Paul’s style by still embracing old-fashioned radio favorites. Listeners also regularly receive a big dose of local news, weather and information, like birth announcements, birthday and anniversary wishes and reports of missing pets. Perhaps the most important trait of his radio station was best summed up when Paul recently said, “if someone loses their puppy, we treat it as a big deal. . . This is radio the way it used to be, being with the community, talking to them.”

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of his devoted listeners on Long Island, it is with great pride that I recognize one of Long Island’s trade-mark personalities and congratulate Paul Sidney for winning this year’s Lifetime Achievement Award. We look forward to hearing him on the radio well into the future and wish him and his family well.

HONORING THE EXCELLENCE OF WEST VIRGINIA IN HOSPITALS
HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to three West Virginia hospitals that have been commemorated by the AARP, as being three of the Best Employers for Workers over the Age of 50. The well deserving hospitals include St. Mary’s Hospital in Huntington, Cabell Huntington Hospital and West Virginia University Hospitals in Morgantown.

The AARP is among the premier advocacy groups for adults over 50. The award in question was quite competitive: the AARP received over 145 applicants from across the nation. Only 50 winners were chosen, including the three West Virginia hospitals. Criteria used for selecting the winning employers included employee development opportunities, health benefits for employees and retirees, age of employee’s workforce, alternative work arrangements, and retirement benefits. Nineteen percent of West Virginians age 65 and older are still in the work force.

These institutions have a proven track record of accomplishment. Over the years, they have proven their commitment to both their patients and employees alike. St. Mary’s received the award for the third year and West Virginia University Hospitals were recognized for the second year. We in the Mountain State take pride in all our citizens. We are all thankful for the exemplary institutions that give individuals an opportunity to showcase their talents and I am very pleased that AARP has recognized West Virginia’s role in what is the best healthcare in the world.

THANKING LYDIA BROWN FOR HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE
HON. ROBERT W. NEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of her retirement in September 2005, we rise to thank Lydia R. Brown for 21 years of outstanding service to the United States House of Representatives.

Lydia started in 1984 as an administrative assistant in the Office of Telecommunications under the Clerk of the House. Her fearless initiative and hard work allowed her responsibilities to expand to include paying district telephone bills. In 1997, Lydia transferred to the House Information Resources division of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer. She became an inventory management specialist for HIR, performing a wide range of duties that included receiving equipment and supplies for HIR, requesting furniture and repairs, assisting with payment processing, ordering, and distributing water for five locations in the Ford Building, and inventorying equipment. Lydia maintained the property records for HIR meticulously, bar coding all new equipment and ensuring that old equipment was disposed of properly. Lydia was an energetic worker for HIR who was willing to perform a variety of tasks.

In 2002, Lydia transferred to House Support Services under the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, working for the Vendor Management division. Lydia’s assignments included the payment of purchase orders for equipment, supplies, and furniture for Members, Committees, Officers, and Support offices of the House of Representatives. She made the transition from HIR inventory specialist to Vendor Management counselor swiftly and successfully. Lydia’s energy, conscientiousness, and knowledge of the policies and procedures enabled her to be an industrious worker, providing passionate customer service for the House community. During the October 2001 anthrax incident, as Members and staff were relocated to an off-site location, Lydia worked tirelessly to coordinate and ensure delivery of equipment and supplies to House offices at the alternate location. Lydia has worked since she was 14 years old; she served her country in the Army reserves, and she also obtained degrees in Accounting and Business Administration. In her long career, Lydia has frequently gone above and beyond the call of duty. Today we commend her dedication, initiative, and hard work, and wish her many happy years of retirement.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2009

SPEECH OF
HON. MELISSA A. HART
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union had under consideration H.R. 3492 to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and for other purposes:

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, in 1994, Congress took a significant step forward in the fight against domestic violence by enacting the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Today, as part of the DOJ reauthorization, we are considering the reauthorization of VAWA (VAWA (2005)), making it a stronger and more effective tool in the struggle to end domestic violence.

I have met with many of the domestic violence shelters and advocates in my district who tell me that VAWA is working. Victim Outreach Intervention Center provides services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and other violent crimes. On an average year, VOICE provides services to over 3,000 people in Butler County.

The VAWA funding they receive has made a tremendous improvement in both the types of services they provide and also to the scale on which they are able to serve. Their counseling and advocacy services are substantially funded by VAWA. Without this money, VOICE would be unable to serve survivors at current levels; a waiting list for direct services, which could contain 20–25 survivors at a time, would have to be established.

In order to provide that basic level of service, VOICE would have to substantially decrease or eliminate programs, such as their Prevention/Education programming. Without the re-authorization of VAWA, the past 28 years of progress they have made in service to survivors would be set back tenfold.

Nearly one in four women experiences at least one physical assault by a partner during adulthood. As resources become stronger, more victims gain the courage to seek help. Now is not the time to retreat. The work at the state and local level has become more, not less, complex.

The programs and provisions of VAWA will continue the progress made over the past 10 years in three ways.

First, VAWA 2005 reinforces existing core programs like the STOP grants which have brought communities together to solve the problem of domestic violence. VAWA programs have provided training for hundreds of law enforcement officers on the dynamics of domestic violence and VAWA 2005 will attempt to solve the problem attrition among domestic violence professionals.

Second, with VAWA 2005 we ensure that the needs of uniquely vulnerable communities are met. One of the lessons we have learned over the past 10 years is that many victims face unique obstacles. VAWA has helped fund specialized services to improve victim safety in rural areas, such as paying for “attorneys on wheels” to help rural women get to court or effective outreach programs in remote communities.

VAWA 2005 also addresses the unique challenges faced by persons with disabilities and elder victims of abuse, by offering services tailored to their circumstances and by educating their communities on how to best provide services.

Third, VAWA 2005 provides greater opportunities for victims to rebuild their lives. While domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are fundamentally criminal justice problems, the solutions are not to be found in the criminal justice system alone.

VAWA 2005 will help victims rebuild their lives and create long term security for themselves and their children. It works to educate domestic violence prevention professionals, child welfare workers, and home visitors on how to identify and serve victims of domestic violence. Further, it provides guidance on preventing violence, rather than reacting to it.

We’ve come a long way since 1994, but people from my district tell me that our shelters are full and our hotlines are ringing off the hook. We need to continue with our mission to end violence against women and children.

VAWA 2005 is an important step in that mission.

PASS THE CORPORATE PATRIOT ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2005

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today marks the third time in as many Congresses that I have introduced the Corporate Patriot Enforcement Act. This legislation is designed to slam the door shut on a truly disgraceful corporate tax shelter.

Over the years, dozens of American companies have filed papers to trade in their U.S. corporate citizenship for citizenship in tax haven countries like Bermuda. By using their U.S. citizenship, they are able to stop paying taxes on their foreign profits, draining more than $4 billion out of U.S. coffers.

The companies themselves don’t move physically—their operations, their factories, and their workforce remain wherever they were before. They continue to earn their profits in this country. They’ve simply discovered a technicality that they can exploit to rid themselves of their fair share of taxes, leaving the rest of us to pay for the services that they consume.

Right now, we’re struggling to fight two wars and rebuild a hurricane-ravaged Gulf coast, on the heels of five enormous tax cuts. The rainy day has come, and we’ve spent the rainy day fund. Our Nation has never been deeper in debt. We need to take a sober look at our Nation’s finances, and this is an excellent place to start. Eventually all of us will have to sacrifice a little to pull our Nation through this time; we’ve done it before and we’ll have to do it again.

When the rest of the country is contemplating additional sacrifices, it’s only fair to require that these wealthy corporations start to meet the responsibilities that they have so far succeeded at shirking.

I am proud to sponsor the Corporate Patriot Enforcement Act, and I would urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

IN MEMORY OF RAY R. POLIAKOFF

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Ray R. Poliakoff, a wonderful man and a friend to the community of Denton, Texas. Mr. Poliakoff passed away on Saturday, September 2, 2005 at Baylor Regional Medical in Plano, Ray was 86.

Ray R. Poliakoff was born March 12, 1919 and spent his life serving our country, committing his life to continuing education and working vigorously. He was a member of the United States Army in a Reconnaissance Intelligence Unit in Europe during World War II and was twice wounded in battle. After the war, he graduated from Indiana University with bachelor of law and doctor of jurisprudence degrees. He also received a Master of Arts degree in humanities from the University of Evansville, Indiana.

Throughout the years, Ray was very active in oil, gas and coal exploration and development. He held various executive positions in Northern Illinois Coal Corporation, Sentry Royalty Company, Sinclair Coal Company, Peabody Coal Company, AMAX Coal Company, Data Tech Corporation, and even independently produced oil for 12 years. During the period of 1949 to 1989, he also worked with various national and international concerns and individuals in coal, oil and gas, and other natural resource ventures and concessions in the U.S., Alaska, Canada, Europe, Australia, the Middle East and the Far East. Even though Ray retired in 1984 and in 1988 went on inactive status as an Indiana attorney in good standing, he remained a long-standing member of the American Bar Association and was, until recently, a member of the ABA Section on Natural Resources, Energy, and Environmental Law; Science and Technology; and Individual Rights and Responsibilities.

Today, I would like to recognize and celebrate Mr. Poliakoffs life. He was intelligent, thoughtful and a true American. Ray leaves behind his lovely wife, Dr. Ann Stuart, Chancellor of Texas Woman’s University in Denton, his children and grandchildren. They are all in my thoughts and prayers. Ray will be deeply missed by his family and the community of North Texas.

ROCKVILLE MARYLAND’S COMMUNICATIONS TEAM

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rockville, Maryland’s Communications Team for its recent award in recognition of excellence in government programming.
The Rockville Channel, TRC 11, was recognized in 5 different categories at the awards banquet of the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors. The Rockville Channel consistently produces outstanding programming for the Rockville area and has often been recognized for excellence over the last 11 years.

I am pleased that the City’s Divisions of Graphics and Printing and Public Information recently combined to win two national awards at the City-County Communications and Marketing Association Conference in Atlanta. The Rockville Communications Teams provide a valuable public service and play a key role in my congressional district in keeping the public informed.

I applaud all members of the Rockville Communications Team for their outstanding efforts.

HOUSTON POLICE OFFICER MUZAFFAR SIDDIQI

HON. TED POE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 2005, the National Association of Police Organizations will honor law enforcement agencies and officers at the 12th Annual Top Cops Awards Ceremony here in Washington, DC. Officer Muzaffar Siddiqi of the Houston Police Department, a great man whom I have the privilege of knowing personally, is receiving an award at this prestigious event, and I join the city of Houston and all Texans in honoring this outstanding achievement.

As a former prosecutor and criminal court judge in Houston, TX, I have had a long-standing relationship with the Houston Police Department. I have witnessed many great works by police officers in Houston and the surrounding communities, and I can say without hesitation that Officer Siddiqi’s record of service is exemplary. Having previously been named Houston Police Department Officer of the Year, Officer Siddiqi has received high honors throughout his career. His service has been recognized at all levels: city, State and Federal.

Before working for the Houston Police Department, Officer Siddiqi served as a police officer in Karachi, Pakistan. Since joining HPD, he has been a great asset in building positive relationships between law enforcement and Houston’s South Asian and Middle Eastern communities. His work has been invaluable, and the people of Houston are fortunate to have a public servant of his caliber in uniform. As he honors the city of Houston with his service, Mr. Speaker, we must honor the selfless work of Officer Muzaffar Siddiqi.

JEAN D. MATHIS RETIREMENT: SEPTEMBER 30, 2005

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the retirement of Jean D. Mathis whose contributions to the United States Drug Enforcement Administration have been unparalleled.

Ms. Mathis was born on March 3, 1950 in Washington, DC. She attended DC public schools (Anthony Bowen Elementary, Randall Junior High and Dunbar High) and graduated from Howard University in 1972.

Ms. Mathis worked throughout her junior high, high school and college years and was introduced at an early age to work in government service.

Immediately following her graduation from college, she began her first full-time employment in the Federal Service with the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, where she worked until 1975. In October 1975, she began her employment with the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). Ms. Mathis distinguished herself from the beginning and quickly advanced through the ranks of the Operational Support Division. In 1990, Ms. Mathis was appointed as the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Personnel, becoming one of the first two women to enter DEA’s Senior Executive Service (SES) and the first African-American woman promoted to the rank of SES. In 1994, Ms. Mathis was promoted to Assistant Administrator for Human Resources becoming DEA’s first female Assistant Administrator.

Ms. Mathis’s stellar career is marked by numerous accomplishments. Under her direction, the DEA instituted validated testing for senior law enforcement personnel, drug testing for employees and applicants, and psychological testing for Special Agents. In 1999, she played a vital leadership role in the opening of DEA’s state-of-the-art training facility in Quantico, Virginia. Ms. Mathis is a long-standing member of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), and served as a member of the Training and Education Committee. She also chaired this committee for 2 years.

Ms. Mathis’ outstanding work ethic and diligence have been recognized with a plethora of awards and commendations over the years. Moreover, her DEA accomplishments have been recognized government-wide as she distinguished herself and the DEA as a two-time recipient of the Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Performance in 1995 and 2001.

Over the years, Ms. Mathis has participated in extensive training programs including Management Training at the John F. Kennedy Management Institute, and has been recognized with government-wide as she distinguished herself and the DEA as a two-time recipient of the Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Performance in 1995 and 2001.

In summary, the essence of Ms. Mathis’s career was captured in a number of performance award justifications over the years, including several DEA Administrators for whom she worked directly. Among them was former DEA Administrator Thomas A. Constantine who stated, “Ms. Mathis leads by example, demanding high ethical standards and conscientious work. Her outstanding work ethic and diligence inspire and challenge her staff.” Ms. Mathis has inspired all of those who were fortunate enough to work for or with her. Ms. Mathis’s tenacious spirit and pursuit of excellence will be missed at DEA and will continue to inspire those who engage her throughout her retirement and personal endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF J. GEORGE MITNICK

HON. ARTUR DAVIS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a tribute to Mr. J. George Mitnick.

Jasper, Alabama was not George Mitnick’s first home—he was a Connecticut Yankee who migrated south—but Jasper was where George made his fortune and found his wife. Jasper is also a city that he shaped for over 5 decades: his footsteps include the presidency of the local Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club; the Mitnick Wilderness Boot Camp for troubled teenagers; and of course, his role in founding Top Dollar, a retail chain of over 250 stores in 11 states.

George Mitnick helped make modern Jasper, but what made George Mitnick, above all, was the days he spent as an army captain helping to liberate Nazis death camps. George was a committed Jew before he entered those camps, but the degradation that he saw there alerted him to an existential threat to his people, and to the capacity of humans to violate each other.

Those camps never left George Mitnick’s soul. They made him a vigilant defender of Israel’s future and of American politicians who understood how essential Israel’s future was to any vision of a just world. The death camps made him an activist—and I am honored that his activism led him to embrace my candidacy against a foe of Israel’s aspirations. George was honored and humbled that his activism also made him AIPAC’s “Man of the Year” in 2003.

I think that those awful, wretched camps also made George understand his adopted home better. George lived in Alabama during the years when the racial cauldron was boiling, and Alabama’s ill temper on race was one of the aspects of his new state that he most disdained. He was a quiet, but real, force for integration in Jasper. George also raised a daughter who raised a daughter who married a black man. His grandson-in-law James, an African American, was one of George’s pallbearers, and it is a measure of the Jasper that George help make that virtually no one stared at James’ role. George’s friends knew that tolerance was a Mitnick family value.

On August 6, 2005, J. George Mitnick died at the age of 87. I thank George for his faith and his life and for the promises he kept. I hope that my tenure in Congress will honor the world and the state he wanted to build. May the God of Abraham bless George Mitnick and his surviving wife Willene.
RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WALLACE BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JEFF MILLER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Wallace Baptist Church in my district. Through several locations and many pastors, the church has continuously provided a place of worship for the people of northwest Florida.

Originally founded as the New Smyrna Baptist Church, a small congregation first met in Bagdad, Florida, in 1905. For nearly 40 years, the church met in that location, constantly adding new members to their congregation and establishing a reputation as a house where all where welcomed.

The original 40 years added many people to the original congregation, and recognizing the need for more land, a group of 32 people in 1942 began meeting a short distance away in the Wallace Schoolhouse. The land had been donated to them by a local family interested in seeing the local community prosper. Less than a year later, the church had its own building constructed and continued to use the pulp from their first building. The pulpit still exists to this day, though it is no longer used. In addition, wood from the original building was used for construction of the new podium, instilling a physical sense of tradition that the church carries with it as it continues into the future.

About 20 years later, now under the name of Wallace Baptist Church, a larger auditorium was constructed to accommodate the increasing size of the church's membership. The previous building, adjacent to the auditorium, remained in use as a meeting place for Sunday School. A few years later, recognizing their long-term stability and consistent growth both in congregation size as well as services offered, the church voted to incorporate as Wallace Baptist Church.

The church continued to add facilities over the next several decades as it continued to flourish, so I much so that in 2003 the more than 300 members of the church saw the need for a larger main sanctuary and voted to have one built. The groundbreaking on the new site occurred earlier this year. Under the present leadership of Rev. Lee Botts and having already shown consistent growth, I am confident that the church and its mission will continue to be recognized by many as a great place to worship, continuing to serve the community well into the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Congress, I am proud of the success of Wallace Baptist Church over the last 100 years and look forward to its next century of service.

RECOGNIZING 94TH CELEBRATION OF NATIONAL DAY IN REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 94th celebration of National Day in the Republic of China (Taiwan).

Today, I join with the Taiwanese people as they celebrate their freedom. Taiwan has peacefully overcome authoritarian rule to attain democracy. It will hopefully constitute a model for the eventual establishment of a genuine democracy in China. The U.S. and Taiwan value human rights, civil liberties, a free press and the rule of law. Our shared values have produced a strong and dependable friendship for over 50 years. Today, the people of Taiwan determine their own destiny and government through free and fair elections.

Many of my colleagues will be surprised to learn that Taiwan is our 8th largest trading partner. A recent survey by the World Economic Forum ranked Taiwan fifth in the world and first in Asia for growth competitiveness. The Taiwanese have been increasing their demands for American goods becoming a more valuable trading partner. The Taiwanese people have also achieved economic prosperity with one of the highest standards of living in the world. It is impressive to find that less than 1 percent of the population lives below the poverty line. Now a strong member of the World Trade Organization, Taiwan's market-based economy is now the 12th largest in the world.

The government of Taiwan was one of the first to come to our aid after the events of September 11th and Hurricane Katrina. Taiwan continues to be our ally in the war on terrorism by cooperating with humanitarian assistance in Iraq and Afghanistan and providing intelligence. They have shown generosity and compassion by contributing to the Twin Towers Fund and the September 11th Memorial Fund, and now to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

I hope that its neighbors, especially those in China, will notice Taiwan's celebration of freedom, democracy, and a market economy. I hope Taiwan and China will work together and cultivate a future based on respect, democracy, and freedom. I am encouraged by reports that Taiwan's President, Chen Shui-bian is willing to hold a summit with President Hu Jintao and resume dialog on cross-strait issues.

It is with great pleasure I congratulate Taiwan, our friend and ally, on the celebration of their 94th National Day, October 10, 2005.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes in the House on Tuesday, September 27th, due to a previous and unavoidable commitment. Therefore, I was unable to vote on H.J. Res. 66, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of “Lights On After School!”; a national celebration of after-school programs (rollcall No. 494); and H. Con. Res. 209, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Domestic Violence Awareness Month (rollcall No. 496). Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on both these measures considered by the House.
Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an article by Azerbaijan Ambassador to the United States Hafiz Pashayev. This was published in The Washington Times on September 11, 2005 and is a great testament to the progress made in Azerbaijan toward holding peaceful and fair elections.

In a recent visit to Azerbaijan as National Democratic Institute chairman, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said, “Election day is important, but the months leading up to the elections are also crucial.” She referred to the parliamentary elections to be held Nov. 6, when the citizens of Azerbaijan go to the polls to elect their representatives to parliament, or Milli Mejlis. The Bush administration views these elections as a litmus test of the Azerbaijan government’s commitment to democracy. The U.S. Congress has weighed in by passing a resolution calling on Azerbaijan “to hold orderly, peaceful, and fair and free elections in November 2005 in order to ensure the long-term growth and stability of the country.”

We are the first to recognize that independence, stability and prosperity depend on successful democratic reform. President Ilham Aliyev wants an orderly transition, as our last few years of unprecedented economic progress would be jeopardized by political instability. Toward this end and to conduct elections according to international standards, the president issued an Executive Order outlining steps to be taken:

1. Allowing all political parties to organize rallies free from violence and intimidation.
2. Welcoming domestic and international election observers.
3. Providing access to media, thus ensuring fair coverage.
4. And ensuring central and regional authorities create the necessary conditions for exit polls.

Among many provisions of the Order already carried out are those that concern participation in the political arena by opposition parties. There has been dialogue between ruling and opposition parties, all opposition parties may freely conduct rallies and demonstrations and, thus far, all opposition activities are being conducted without interference of government officials who called for the overthrow of government in October 2005—have been allowed to become candidates if they wish. During his visit to Azerbaijan at the end of August, Sen. Richard Lugar, Indiana Republican, stated: “The opposition leaders underlined that the registration process of the MP candidates went well, which is a step forward compared to the previous elections.” President Bush went further by urging all regional election officials not to interfere in the old Soviet fashion, when ballot stuffing was common.

President Azerbaijan’s insistence on free and fair elections in November is based on the idea Azerbaijan’s secular government can coexist with its Muslim traditions. Our vision is premised on the belief that democratic pluralism will ensure a peaceful outlet for dissent, eliminating the need for violent alternatives. Citizens of all ethnicities and political persuasions are free to advocate their positions peacefully.

Today, Azerbaijan is a vibrant, independent state. We have faced many challenges in our young country’s life: preserving our independence in a tough neighborhood; making the transition from a shattered to a market economy; building government institutions and an independent judiciary; finding a peaceful solution to our conflict with Armenia; and developing our natural resources to world markets.

Throughout these difficult years, the United States has been a friend and ally of Azerbaijan. Our strategic partnership has blossomed since the attacks on America on September 11, 2001. Immediately after the late President Heydar Aliyev visited the U.S. Embassy in Baku not only to express his condolences but to offer his full support. Today, we stand side-by-side in the global war on terrorism. Our troops proudly serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Azerbaijan’s location between Russia, Iran and Turkey, coupled with our desire to integrate into the Euro-Atlantic community, requires that we conduct a balanced foreign policy focused on building democratic institutions and a strong economy. Azerbaijan has come this far without tangible foreign aid and expects to continue democratic and economic development, primarily through its own resources. According to a recent survey by the International Republican Institute sponsored by USAID, an overwhelming majority of Azerbaijanis want economic and social development to be their government’s priority concerns.

This November, the people of Azerbaijan will elect a Parliament I believe will accelerate our transition toward democratic pluralism to match the country’s unprecedented economic growth. Mr. Lugar told the press in Baku: “I sense in Azerbaijan a yearning for building strong democratic institutions.”

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am happy to congratulate Rebecca and Ben Mustian of Columbia, South Carolina, on the birth of their beautiful baby girl. Emily Quinn Mustian was born on September 29, 2005 at 12:01 PM, weighing 7 pounds, 4 ounces and measuring 19 inches long. Emily has been born into a loving home, where she will be raised by parents who are devoted to her well-being and bright future. Her birth is a blessing.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the South Lynches Fire Department and to recognize their 50 years of service to the South Carolina counties of Florence and Williamsburg. Chartered as the Lake City Rural Fire Department on January 27, 1955, they started with only one tanker. Today, they have 19 vehicles with which a full time staff and 125 volunteers provide fire and rescue services to the 250 square mile area that encompasses the South Lynches Fire District.

The original directors of the department in 1955 were S. Keels Brockington, Sr., H. Raymond Askins, Sr., Roy Rogers, J.P. Grimsley, L.W. McDaniel, Joe Tucker, and Walter Moody. Within 10 years, the department had completed a permanent home and secured a second tanker. The department changed its name in the middle 1970s to the Lower Flor- ence County Fire Department as it expanded its coverage beyond the Lake City area. In 1982, residents created the South Lynches Fire District establishing the area that the department currently services.

The South Lynches Fire Department today operates out of six locations within the district. The original station, in Lake City, is still operational. Station 2 “Camerontown” was built in 1971, Station 3 “Camp Branch” was built in 1979, Station 4 “Cades” in 1979, Station 5 “Leo-Camerontown” in 1979, and Station 6 “Scran- ton” in 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me today in honoring the South Lynches Fire Department as they celebrate their 50th anniversary. I thank each and every member of the Department for their service over the last 50 years and wish them great success and Godspeed in the future.
A VALUABLE SERVICE FROM BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to announce that BlueCross BlueShield of South Carolina, BCBSSC, ably led by President Ed Sellers, is now offering a valuable service in doctors’ offices throughout our State.

Recently, The Wall Street Journal reported that BlueCross BlueShield of South Carolina has begun to offer physician offices a swipe-card reader that will immediately inform members “how much the insurer will pay and what the patient owes.”

Physicians can lease the swipe-card readers from Companion Technologies, a subsidiary of BCBSSC; the health insurer plans to send members a card that they can swipe through the readers, which will connect to the BCBSSC system through a broadband Internet line. The swipe-card readers will have the ability to process debit and credit card payments and provide information about eligibility and claims information.

Companion officials said they hope other health insurers will integrate the swipecard readers into their systems. Companion President Harvey Galloway said, “Many doctors lose significant dollars because patients don’t treat their office payments like they do their Visa bills.” He added, “In a recent visit to the doctor’s office, while they have the patient in front of them, how much the patient liability is, and not having to go after them after they leave the office.”

I am hopeful that this new benefit will prove to be helpful to patients and physicians throughout South Carolina.

THE MAUDELL SHIREK POST OFFICE BUILDING

SPRECH OF
HON. BOB ETHERIDGE
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 2005

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments about H.R. 438.

In the House we routinely name Federal post offices after notable Americans. In fact, last year I requested a request from numerous constituents to name the post office in Dunn, NC after the late General William C. Lee.

The bill on the floor today, H.R. 438, would rename the post office at 2000 Allston Way in Berkeley, California after Ms. Maudelle Shirek. I am concerned about the lack of committee review over this bill, as H.R. 438 was not heard or marked up by the Government Reform Committee. It is the responsibility of the committee of jurisdiction to review the qualifications of the individual being honored and to determine if the candidate should be a candidate for Federal recognition.

Despite my reservations about the review process for H.R. 438, I will vote for this legislation as a matter of routine congressional courtesy and respect for the bill’s sponsor, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and her constituents.

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the bill that is before us, H.R. 3200, the “Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance Enhancement Act” of 2005, a bill that I have cosponsored.

This bill will increase federally subsidized life insurance for military personnel to $400,000, and that increase will be permanent.

If one of our Nation’s finest men and women is killed in the line of duty, it is our Nation’s obligation to provide an insurance policy that can assist the family in meeting expenses. These changes make the insurance more in line with today’s economy, and I support the passage of H.R. 3200.

There are a few other insurance changes, beyond H.R. 3200, that I believe are also the right steps to take. These changes would, first of all, affect the Service-Disabled Veterans Insurance, SDVI.

When this insurance began in 1951, the premiums were based on the 1940 mortality rate. Current standard life insurance policies have premiums based on the 2001 mortality rate—except for the SDVI, which still charges premiums based on a table that is 60 years out of date. This results in higher premiums, premiums that can be as much as 3 times what veterans should be paying.

The Independent Budget, prepared and endorsed by many Veterans’ Service Organizations, has recommended that the mortality table be updated. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2747, the “Disabled Veterans Life Insurance Enhancement Act”, that would make this important change and decrease this premium payment for disabled veterans.

A second part of H.R. 2747 affects the mortgage life insurance for severely service-disabled veterans (VMLI). Currently, this insurance covers only about 55 percent of the outstanding mortgage balance. We know how the cost of houses has skyrocketed in many areas of our country. In May, 2001, an evaluation by the Department of Veterans Affairs recommended increased coverage. H.R. 2747 implements those recommendations by increasing the maximum which would be expected to cover 94 percent of mortgage balances.

Let us begin to update and fix the insurance for our service members and our veterans by passing H.R. 3200. And I also encourage my colleagues to cosponsor my insurance bill, H.R. 2747, which expands what we are doing here today to additional insurance provisions and programs.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE EQUITY FOR GRAND CANYON SUBCONTRACTORS

HON. RICK RENZI
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, with Congressman PASTOR and Congressman HAYWORTH, to authorize the National Park Service to pay for services performed by subcontractors under a contract issued for work completed at the Grand Canyon National Park.

In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, the Grand Canyon National Park issued approximately 43 task orders to Pacific General, Inc. (PGI), under an Indefinite Deliver/Indefinite Quantity contract. The value of these task orders was more than $17 million for several construction projects throughout the Park.

According to invoices sent to the Park, PGI certified that payments were being sent to subcontractors and suppliers. However, in January 2004, complaints were received by numerous subcontractors that they had not received payment from PGI. The National Park Service paid more than $10 million to PGI. Of this amount, PGI did not pay $1.3 million to subcontractors who performed the work.

The Washington Contracting and Procurement Office of the National Park Service performed an acquisition management review. In this review, the National Park Service it was discovered that the Park had failed to ensure that PGI obtained the necessary payment and performance bonds required by the National Park Service and required under the Miller Act (40 D.S.C. 270a).

On February 6, 2004, the National Park Service suspended further payment to PGI and issued a suspension notice to cease activity by the contractor. PGI has ceased business and it is unlikely that the Federal Government will recover the $1.3 million issued to PGI.

The subcontractors who were not paid by PGI fall into two categories. The first category consists of those subcontractors that performed work on various projects where the National Park Service had already paid PGI for the work. The second category of subcontractor is composed of subcontractors who performed work on various projects where the National Park Service had not paid PGI for the work. The National Park Service has withheld $906,335 in payment for this work that will be paid to the second category of subcontractors that performed work.

The National Park Service has been unable to pay the first category of subcontractors who performed work in the Grand Canyon National Park because contract law prohibits payment due to the lack of direct, contractual relationship between the parties.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes the National Park Service to pay the $1.3 million to subcontractors who have performed work at Grand Canyon National Park and have not been paid by PGI. This legislation only addresses this situation in the Grand Canyon National Park and the $1.3 million that the Park paid to PGI for work performed by the subcontractors.

Many small businesses in Arizona, Utah and Washington, have been affected by this unfortunate contract mismanagement. This legislation will fix a grave inequity for many of our
Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the achievements of Santa Clara County Supervisor Blanca Alvarado. She continues to be a leader in local government and a national leader in the area of juvenile detention reform.

Blanca served 14 years as a San José City Councilmember representing San José’s East Side before being appointed to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. She challenged the notion that elected positions were the province of people from the East Side and became a leader in public life, whether it was helping her parents in union and political activities, hosting a women’s radio show called “Merienda Musical,” working for the Department of Social Services or acting as the local president of MAPA, the Mexican American Political Association.

I first met Blanca in the mid-1970’s when we served together on the Housing Service Center board of directors before either of us had stood for public office. I found her then to be a caring person committed to her community and especially to the needs of the poor. Those qualities have continued throughout her life—both in her public and private efforts.

As a City Councilmember and Vice-Mayor, Blanca actively worked to build neighborhood organizations and developed community plans and partnerships to renovate impoverished neighborhoods.

Blanca’s devotion to children is illustrated through projects such as the The East Initiative. The Initiative recognizes the importance of securing early access to parent support, health care, and social services for all children and their families. Blanca, as a member of the First Five Commission, lobbied for a school readiness program in the local school district. When the school district was not in a position to join with First Five in creating a school readiness program, the Commission partnered with the city to develop and focus on the neighborhoods surrounding Cesar Chavez, San Antonio, and Arbuckle elementary schools. First Five allocated $750,000 in the first year of the East Initiative alone.

Blanca also leads the county-wide effort to eliminate inappropriate and unnecessary incarceration of youth, especially youth of color who are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. Because of her efforts, the county has become a national model in juvenile detention reform. Since the movement began in July 2002, law enforcement, the Probation Department, the Juvenile Court, community partners, and many other participants have committed to shifting their efforts from incarceration to community-based approaches for treating troubled youth, to allow troubled young people to turn their lives around and to have productive, hopeful futures.

One of the projects Blanca is most remembered for is her leadership in the conception—and development of the Mexican Heritage Plaza, opened in 1995, right across downtown from the largest Latino cultural centers in the Nation. Twelve years in the making, and built over a site once picketed by San José native son Cesar Chavez, the Plaza is a 55,000 square-foot cultural center with state of the art theatrical venues, a Smithsonian-affiliate gallery space and lushious thematic gardens that serve as a regional resource for cultural progrmming and education.

In addition to her years of friendship, I wish to thank Blanca Alvarado for a lifetime of public service and her determined efforts to achieve social change. “I sí se puede!”

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose life in the Iraq War, Sgt. Karpowich’s awards included the Army Commendation Medal, the Expert Infantryman’s Badge, the Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Global War on Terror Medal.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose service and his determined efforts to achieve social change.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose courage and bravery transcended human frailty and shone like a beacon to inspire others.

Sgt. Karpowich well understood the importance of those objectives and willingly put his life in harm’s way to help others enjoy the same liberties we enjoy. He is a native son of Hazleton.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose service and his determined efforts to achieve social change.

Sgt. Karpowich joined the 82nd Airborne Division. He graduated from paratrooper school, after which he joined the 42nd Airborne Division and served with the 101st Airborne Division.

In December 2004, law enforcement, the Probation Department of Pennsylvania, which was killed in action in Iraq in December 2004.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose service and his determined efforts to achieve social change.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to the life of a true American patriot whose service and his determined efforts to achieve social change.

Sgt. Karpowich was 30 years old when he suffered the loss of his life while trying to liberate the Iraqi people and afford them the same opportunities we enjoy in a land ruled by democracy.

The victim of a suicide bomber whose family claimed the lives of 20 people, Sgt. Karpowich was one of 15 military personnel who were killed. The remaining five victims were civilian employees of Department of Defense contractors.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge those in Santa Clara County, California who have offered assistance to the victims of Hurricane Katrina. Their efforts stand as a testament to the American spirit of generosity.

The local governments of Santa Clara County have responded with munificent offerings to the victims of Hurricane Katrina. The San José City Council and Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors each authorized $500,000 for the Santa Clara Valley American Red Cross to provide services to hurricane victims who arrive in the area. The San José Fire Department deployed firefighters to assist in the region devastated by Hurricane Katrina and stand ready as needed.

Local universities opened their academies and housed those displaced by the hurricane. In fact, Santa Clara University admitted 75 students from New Orleans-based institutions Loyola University and Tulane University.
after the hurricane forced the campuses to close. The San José Recovery Center is pro-
viding interim shelter and services for evacu-
ees at a former student housing complex at
San José State University. So far, the Center
has served sixty-six people.

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Au-
thority responded as well by providing free bus
passes to individuals and families, assuring
mobility to access the medical services, edu-
cation, and jobs.

United by the Santa Clara County CADRE (Collaborating Agencies Disaster Relief Ef-
forts), many local community organizations
have provided ongoing evacuee support. The
Volunteer Center of Silicon Valley forwarded
900 housing offers while coordinating occupa-
tional opportunities for evacuees. Local busi-
nesses and individuals have also contributed
generous cash funds, food and supply donations to
the recovery effort.

I commend the many individuals, organiza-
tions and agencies of Santa Clara County
that contributed to the relief effort. I know that
these donations and others from across the coun-
ty have made a meaningful impact on the lives of the thousands of Gulf Coast resi-
dents still living in a state of uncertainty.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

HON. JAY INSLEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, the House has
cast to reauthorize the Violence Against
Women Act (VAWA), a historic measure first
passed in 1994. It marked when our country fi-
nally recognized that domestic violence is not
a private family matter, but a national problem
that requires a national response. Since
VAWA passed, victims of domestic violence
have more options to leave abusive relation-
ships, local communities have developed crit-
ical programs to assist victims, and our crimina-

del justice system has become better trained
in prosecute these unique crimes.

However, it is always the incident that hap-
pens in your backyard that will highlight the
scope of a problem, such as domestic vio-


tence. In 2003, the state of Washington State
became the focus of a national tragedy. Many
have read in the papers the heartbreaking
story of how, on April 26, 2003, Crystal Brame
was shot in a grocery store parking lot by her
husband, David Brame, chief of police for the
city of Tacoma. Crystal Brame died one week
later, and David Brame committed suicide at
the scene.

In response to this tragedy, people in the
state of Washington swiftly formed a statewide
task force of domestic violence, law enforce-
ment, and criminal justice system experts to
determine the best practices for law enforce-
ment agencies, focusing on prevention, train-
ing, enforcement, and response. Crystal’s
death and the state’s response, illustrated that
despite the progress since VAWA passed in
1994, tragedies of domestic violence live in our
communities today, and that we must con-
tinue to work toward solutions.

I think we can do a better job helping peo-
ple like Crystal, whose abuser happened to be
in a profession that responds to crimes of do-

mestic violence. I hope that my col-

leagues will help put a stop to such tragedies
and work with Mr. Norm Dicks, Mr. Adam
Smith, and Mr. Dave Reichert, and me to
commission a study by the Department of Jus-
tice to learn more about such incidences and
the best response to officer-involved domestic
violence. Ending domestic violence is an on-
going effort, and with the improvements to this end, I would like to see an even
stronger commitment so that other commu-

nities can prevent tragedies—like that of Crys-
tal Brame from happening in their backyard.

HONORING THE NATIONAL ENDOW-
MENT FOR THE HUMANITIES ON
ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES A. LEACH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recog-
nize the 40th anniversary of the National Endow-
ment for the Humanities and to offer my con-
gratulations to its chairman, Bruce Cole.

In 1965, Congress discovered that the most
successful denominator of the most in-
formed, the most curious, and the most cre-

ative citizens. When the 89th Congress cre-
ated the National Endowment for the Human-
ities, it declared that “Democracy demands
wisdom and vision in its citizens.

For 40 years, the NEH has promoted “wis-
dom and vision” by advancing the study and
understanding of history, literature, languages,
archaeology, philosophy, and other humanities
subjects, throughout the United States.

As Chairman Cole has so profoundly ob-
served, “The humanities are the study of what
makes us human: the legacy of our past, the
ideas and principles that motivate us, and the
eternal questions that we still ponder. The
classics and archeology show us whence our
civilization came. The study of literature and
art shape our sense of beauty. The knowledge
of philosophy and religion give meaning to our
concepts of justice and goodness.”

Today, the role humanities play in education
is increasingly important. Of all the learning
disciplines, they tap and expand the human
imagination at its most. In a world of exploding
options for individual and families, it is imper-

ative that history provide reference points, and
when there is no experience to serve as
guide, that the imagination be stimulated, and
perspectives applied and values brought to
bear. Without reference to the guide posts of the
humanities, society loses its soul. It be-
comes rudderless in the seas of societal
change.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Ten-
nesseans have a long tradition of vol-
unteerism. In times of need, the Nation is able
to count on our state.

In the aftermath of a truly devastating hurri-
cane season, we’ve seen our state and our
country come together to assist the gulf coast
region. Tennesseans are opening their hearts
and homes to evacuees and assisting with
what will be a very long recovery. Our own
Nashville Symphony will host a benefit concert
on October 4, 2005 for the Louisiana Phil-
harmonic Orchestra (LPO) as it struggles to
sustain its new home and the community have
together to reunite the
LPO in our city for a benefit concert.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking
Executive Director Alan Valentine, his team at
the Nashville Symphony, and the many local
businesses and supporters who

TENNESSEANS COME TOGETHER
TO AID THE LOUISIANA PHIL-
HARMONIC ORCHESTRA

HON. ED WHITFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to rec
ognize one of my constituents, Laxmaiah
Manchikanti, Ph.D of Paducah, Kentucky. Dr.
Manchikanti has been practicing medicine in my Congressional District for the last
24 years. I have known Dr. Manchikanti for sev-

eral years and have found him to be a man of
incredible integrity who is devoted to helping
others. He is an active member of the commu-
nunity as well as a forceful leader in the field
of pain management. Dr. Manchikanti has come
together from India who is a naturalized citizen
of the United States, exemplifies the fulfillment
of the American dream.

Dr. Manchikanti is a well known physician
with interests in many aspects of medicine,
both in patient care, as well as academics. He
specializes in anesthesiology with a sub-spe-
cialty in interventional pain management and
is well known in the circles of interventional
pain management. Apart from his interest in the
clinical practice of anesthesiology and

interventional pain management, he is also
proficient in administration, patient
advocacy, the economics of healthcare, med-

cal ethics, and various other aspects of the
profession.

Dr. Manchikanti is an avid clinical re-
searcher with numerous publications in peer-
reviewed journals with original contributions,
along with book publications. He is also an
internationally known teacher who has con-
ducted multiple seminars. As President and
founder of the American Society of Inter-
ventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP), Dr.
Manchikanti has participated in the develop-
ment of various guidelines, published on the
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
(AHRQ) web-site. Apart from this, he also
functions as a consultant to companies which
assess evidence including ECRI (formerly the
patient Safety Center, a nonprofit organization),
which is in charge of the AHRQ web-site and others.
He also serves as a member on the Carrier
Advisory Committee of Kentucky.

Because Dr. Manchikanti is a specialist in
pain management, many of the drugs he pre-
scribes have the potential to become addict-

ives. During a conversation I had with Dr.
Manchikanti a few years ago, we discussed
Kentucky’s efforts to combat prescription drug
abuse through the Kentucky All Schedules
Prescription Electronic Reporting System (KASPER) which monitors Schedule II through IV controlled substances to detect and deter abuse. Dr. Manchikanti touted the benefits of KASPER which allows him to receive a report on all of the controlled substances his patients have been prescribed.

The problem that Dr. Manchikanti identified was that while KASPER was effective in Kentucky, there was no mechanism to determine if his patients had been prescribed a controlled substance in another state. In Kentucky, which is bordered by seven states (four in my District alone), it is easy for an individual to engage in the practice of “Dr. Shopping.” In an effort to address the problem, Dr. Manchikanti and the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) proposed legislation creating a national monitoring system based on KASPER whereby physicians in all states would have access to the controlled substance prescription information of their patients, no matter where they filled the prescription. To that end, Dr. Manchikanti and ASIPP submitted draft legislation entitled the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act (NASPER).

After reviewing the language and examining the idea, I decided to introduce NASPER with my colleague FRANK PALLONE during the 107th Congress. After three years of hard work by Dr. Manchikanti, ASIPP, and our supporters in Congress, we passed NASPER in both Houses of Congress and President Bush signed it into law on August 11th. NASPER combats prescription drug abuse through the creation of a grant program housed at the Department of Health and Human Services to help states establish and maintain state-operated prescription drug monitoring programs (PMPs). California established the first PMP in 1940. Nineteen additional states currently operate a PMP and five more are in the process of establishing them.

NASPER addresses one of the main impediments to existing PMPs—that they currently operate only on an intrastate basis while the diversion of drugs is an interstate problem. We help foster interstate communication by establishing some uniform standards on information and privacy protections that will make it easier for states to share information. Columbia University noted in a report released over the summer that between 1992 and 2003 the number of people abusing prescription drugs increased 94 percent—twice the increase in the number of people using marijuana, five times the number of people using cocaine, and 60 times the number of people using heroin. Even more disturbing, the report found a 212 percent increase in the number of children between the ages of 12 and 17 abusing prescription drugs.

NASPER, which is now Public Law 109–60, would not have been possible without the leadership provided by Dr. Manchikanti and ASIPP. I’m confident that the enactment of NASPER will give physicians and law enforcement an additional tool to help reduce the number of Americans abusing prescription drugs.

IN RECOGNITION OF BETTY GORHAM AND FIFTY YEARS AS A CHURCH ORGANIST

HON. MIKE ROGERS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Betty Gorham, who will be celebrating 50 years as a church organist on Sunday, October 2, 2005.

Betty Gorham is an organist at First Baptist Church of Saks in Anniston, Alabama, and has been since October of 1975. Betty Gorham began taking organ lessons at age seven in Chattanooga, Tennessee, where her family moved after her father’s death in 1943. Her instruction continued until she was 16 years old, at which time she was performing at her home church, Eastdale Baptist Church. Her first full-time job as an organist was at Signal Mountain Baptist in Chattanooga in 1957, and was followed shortly by a move to Birmingham, Alabama, to play at Huffman Baptist Church. In fact, it was while playing the organ for a wedding rehearsal at this church that she met her future husband, Jim Gorham. They were married in 1958, and Betty followed her husband in several moves around the State of Alabama. They went first to Montgomery, where Betty played at Ridgecrest Baptist; then to Mobile in 1960, where she played at Westlawn Baptist; then back to Birmingham, Alabama, in 1963, where she played first at Fairfield Highlands Baptist Church and then at Center Point Baptist. Finally, in 1973, the Gorhams moved to Anniston, Alabama, where she played at Parker Memorial and Heflin Baptist Church before beginning her long career at First Baptist Church of Saks.

Betty and Jim Gorham have now been married 47 years and have four grandchildren. In addition to her devotion to her family and her church and church music, Betty has found time to do charitable work in the community. Let us all congratulate Betty Gorham on her 50 years of service as a church organist and thank her for her 30 years of service at First Baptist Church of Saks in Anniston, Alabama.

RECOGNIZING PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI-BIAN REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the citizens of Taiwan and to recognize their democratically elected President Chen Shui-bian who has made a stopover in the United States en route to Central America. I trust that President Chen has had a good visit in the U.S.

In the last five years, Taiwan has continued to impress the world as a prosperous island nation, free and democratic. Taiwan is truly committed to genuine democratization, as evidenced by the third direct presidential election of 2004.

By working together, Taiwan and China will have the potential to make significant contributions to peace, security and prosperity in the entire Pacific Rim. I sincerely hope that a framework will soon be established for peaceful interactions between the two sides. It is everyone’s dream that rapprochement between Taiwan and China be possible within the shortest period of time and to all parties’ satisfaction.

The people of the U.S. appreciate Taiwan’s cooperation with the U.S. government in combating global terrorism and Taiwan’s monetary contributions to the Twin Towers Fund and the Pentagon Memorial Fund. The relationship between Taiwan and the United States is strong and healthy. Ambassador David Tawei Lee is an effective bridge between the government of Taiwan and the government of the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, we must always remember Taiwan’s important role in maintaining peace and stability in the Pacific Rim. To have permanent peace in the region, the U.S. must do its part in urging Taiwan and China to continue peaceful dialogue and exchanges.

COMMEMORATING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES’ 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities—a small, independent Federal agency that each year puts millions of Americans in contact with the ideas, ideals, and institutions of our great Nation.

As co-chairman of the newly established Congressional Humanities Caucus, I would like to congratulate the Endowment’s Chairman, Dr. Bruce Cole, and his dedicated staff on the agency’s anniversary.

In establishing the NEH through the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, Congress declared that “encouraging and supporting national prosperity . . . in the humanities . . . is an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government.” Acknowledging the Federal Government’s interest in promoting progress and scholarship in the humanities, the 89th Congress expressed this interest in a single, powerful observation: “Democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens.” For 40 years, NEH has promoted “wisdom and vision” by advancing the study and understanding of history, literature, languages, archaeology, and philosophy throughout the United States. With the relatively small amount of funding provided by Congress to the agency each year, the Endowment has used impor-
tant seed money for projects and programs including scholarly editions of the papers of historical and cultural figures, preservation of historically important books and newspapers, seminars and institutes for K–12 teachers and college and university faculty, major television documentaries, and educational museum exhibitions.

Beginning in 2002, at the direction of President Bush and with the support of Congress, NEH began a historic initiative, We the People is a multi-faceted, agency-wide program focused on examining significant events and themes in our Nation’s history. The initiative is designed to expand
awareness and knowledge of the traditions and values that have formed our Nation, and to enhance appreciation of our civic institutions.

Because contact with the humanities encourages individuals and our Nation to seek knowledge and wisdom, to reflect deeply on issues of social, cultural, and political significance, and to understand how a diverse civilization can and does reach out to one another, I believe that because of the ills inflicted upon Cuba by the Castro regime, the transition from economic stagnation and political oppression to a democratic society built around the principles of respect for the rule of law and basic human rights—within the context of a free economy and democratic institutions—will be a challenging process, but it is an attainable goal. I have hope that there will be a day when the light of democracy shines in Cuba. Until that day, I say to Mr. Castro—we will never forget.

HONORING THE AUGUSTUS LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JIM GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Augustus Lutheran Church in Trappe, Pennsylvania on the occasion of their 275th anniversary.

The Augustus Lutheran Congregation was founded with its first baptism on May 8, 1730. From there, the first church was built. Originally described by an early Church press release as a “shrine of Lutheranism,” the Augustus Lutheran Church has diligently served its community since 1743. The first church building was constructed of stone by a German craftsman, Henry Melchor Muhlenberg. Its construction, according to church documents, marks the beginning of the Lutheran movement in America.
This unique church also stands as an extraordinary symbol that emphasizes the impressive 275 years that the Augustus' ministry has served its community in Pennsylvania. The Augustus Lutheran Church has always had a close and reciprocal relationship with its community. Prior to the construction of the Church, the Augustus congregation built the first schoolhouse in Providence Township, Pennsylvania, where Muhlenberg served as one of the teachers. Consequently, in 1743 when the congregation decided to build a church, men in the community donated their labor and materials by hauling stone and timber, while the women and children split and shingled the roof. The official dedication ceremony took place on October 6, 1745 when a dedicatory stone was placed in the wall over the main entrance. In 1751, the gallery was erected to house the newly purchased pipe organ that was brought from Europe. This pipe organ was unique in that it was one of first pipe organs in any country church in America.

As the congregation grew throughout the next 275 years, so did the need for a new church that could adequately accommodate its members. In 1852, a new cornerstone was laid and a new brick church was constructed. Throughout the following years, extensive reconstruction was done on the new church. Sunday school facilities were created, the pulpit was refurnished, and the pipe organ was electrified and enlarged by the addition of an echo organ chamber and chimes. In 1960, a new parish house was added and in 1987, new stained glass windows were added. Today, the Augustus Lutheran Congregation has grown substantially to include 480 families with 1,000 baptized members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Augustus Lutheran Church for its rich and honored history and its exemplary contributions to the religious and community life of the Trappe area for the past 275 years.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "LIGHTS ON AFTER-SCHOOL!"

SPEECH OF HON. RAHM EMANUEL OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 2005

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 66, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Lights On Afterschool," which is an educational program that provides after-school programs and the dedicated people who keep them going. After school programs play an important role in the lives of millions of school children throughout the United States. These programs provide educational and recreational activities that help develop the social, emotional, physical, cultural, and academic skills of children, while giving them a safe and enriching alternative to the streets.

Students in my home town of Chicago benefit from having a variety of exciting educational opportunities. Many of these activities are coordinated through After School Matters, a non-profit organization which partners with the City of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, the Chicago Park District, the Chicago Public Library, and the Chicago Department of Children and Youth Services to create a network of after school opportunities for teens in underserved communities.

Through After School Matters, Chicago teens take part in engaging activities that provide skills that translate to the workplace. After School Matters helps kids build positive relationships with adults and peers, providing them with access to educational and career opportunities in their neighborhoods and the city.

Programs such as After School Matters are making a difference in communities throughout the United States. These programs deserve our support, and I urge my colleagues to make after school programs a priority as we move through the budget process.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the work of these dedicated people who help provide quality after school opportunities for children. On October 20th, I urge my colleagues to participate in “Lights On Afterschool” and honor the after school programs which serve their communities.

CONGRATULATING SHERIFF MARK HACKEL

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Sheriff Mark Hackel, who is the recipient of the 2005 Alexander Macomb Man of the Year Award from the March of Dimes. Mark Hackel has dedicated his professional life to serving and protecting Macomb County. He began his career in 1981 as a dispatcher with the Macomb County Sheriff's Department and since then he has held every rank within the Department. Through hard work and determination, Mark was elected as Macomb County Sheriff in November of 2000.

Sheriff Hackel graduated from Sterling Heights High School in 1980. He received an Associate Degree from Macomb Community College in 1983, a Bachelor of Art Degree in Criminal Justice from Wayne State University in 1991, and a Master Degree in Public Administration from Central Michigan University in 1996.

To ensure excellence professionally, Sheriff Hackel has attended in 1994 the F.B.I. National Academy in Quantico, Virginia, and the United States Secret Service Dignitary Protection School in Washington D.C. He also has international training which includes Project Harmony Educational Exchange in Lviv, Ukraine and the Police Instructor Exchange Program in London, England.

In addition to being the Sheriff of the highest-county in Michigan, Sheriff Hackel serves the community in a number of other important capacities. He teaches young adults at Macomb Community College, is a Police Academy Instructor and an Advanced Police Training Instructor at the Macomb Criminal Justice Training Center.

Sheriff Hackel also participates in many community based organizations such as MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING, American Cancer Society, and Traffic Safety Association of Macomb. He has been a mentor through Winning Futures Mentoring Program and serves as a Fitness Council Advisory Board Member for Creating a Healthier Macomb.

Sheriff Hackel understands that many factors influence the law enforcement environment he is elected to lead and he seeks to bring about a better and safer community through all of his many endeavors. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to work with Sheriff Mark Hackel and to see first hand his many effective endeavors. I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing Sheriff Mark Hackel for his commitment to excellence, and his professional and personal devotion to his community.

HONORING AND RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATION OF THE MOHAMMAD ATAYA PARK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Ataya family for their collective vision, generosity and concern for the people of Twinsburg, especially the children, for donating their personal property and transforming it into a public park for residents of all ages to enjoy. Dr. Khalid Ataya, his wife, Dr. Alfida Ataya, and their three children, Dana, Samy and Ramsey, have dedicated the park in honor of Dr. Ataya's father, Mohammad Ataya.

Mohammad Ataya worked diligently to provide a safe and secure home for his family in America, and has also ensured that the cultural bridge connecting the Ataya family—from Cleveland to Lebanon—remains viable and strong. Mr. Ataya continues to be the center of his family, a living legacy defined by a steadfast dedication to his wife, nine children, and his many grandchildren.

In a clearing surrounded by trees, playground equipment, park benches and picnic tables spring from the green grass at Mohammad Ataya Park, located on Cambridge Street in Twinsburg. Plans are already in place to expand the playground and picnic area at the park—preserving a natural space where a sense of renewal is possible and where family unity abounds.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Dr. Khalid and Alfida Ataya, for their vision and generosity in entrusting their land to the Township of Twinsburg for use as a public park, in honor of Dr. Ataya's father, Mohammad Ataya. Mohammad Ataya Park will be a peaceful and joyous haven, accessible to all citizens, today and for generations to come. As founding members of the Arab American Community Center for Economic and Social Services (AACES), Dr. Khalid and Dr. Alfida Ataya continue to embody an energetic spirit and a dedication focused on service to others, and their efforts and volunteerism continue to enhance our entire community.
HONORING COMCAST CARES DAY

HON. JIM GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Comcast Cable Communications for their contributions to community service and volunteerism as demonstrated in their unique one-day Comcast Cares Day volunteer community project.

Comcast Cable Communications has an impressive history of investing in the people and the communities that they serve. From its founding more than 40 years ago, Comcast has diligently given back to its communities through various community outreach programs. In 1997, Comcast employees and their families participated in the Philadelphia Cares Day. The Philadelphia Cares Day began as a day of city-wide community service in the Comcast headquarters’ hometown. Over the next several years, Philadelphia Cares Day became what is now known as Comcast Cares Day. Today, Comcast Cares Day, the signature event of the company, is a national day of volunteer service for Comcast employees and their families in all the communities where Comcast operates.

The goal of Comcast Cable Corporation is to have 30,000 volunteers go into the communities the company serves and give back by improving the community aesthetically and by creating a stronger social presence for the company. At each event, Comcast goes out of their way to provide free manpower, supplies, and refreshment for each event. Most importantly, Comcast Cares Day unifies the company with the local community by working together towards a common goal.

In 2004, Comcast employees and their families volunteered to give back to their community during Comcast Cares Day. This inspiring group of individuals logged an estimated 180,000 hours worth of service in their respective communities. After such an impressive turnout in 2004, Comcast hopes to exceed their number of volunteers in 2005 by completing projects such as cleaning, painting, landscaping, preparing meals at food banks, and refurbishing community parks and recreation centers.

Specifically our area, the spirit of volunteerism and activities of Comcast employees' creates a positive impact on the Plymouth Township Community. One hundred and ninety volunteers will be recruited to work in Plymouth Township and they will address numerous community needs in a day of service to their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing Comcast Cable Corporation for their commitment to volunteerism and community service, not only in Pennsylvania, but throughout the country.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY COLLEGE

HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate San Joaquin Valley College for the celebration of their 20th Anniversary.

San Joaquin Valley College deserves to be commended for its dedication to maintaining a quality educational environment for all of the students on its various campuses. The college has made enormous progress within its twenty-year history. San Joaquin Valley College has advanced from a student body of less than 20 and a staff of only 11 to having over 660 students with a faculty of over 100 employees.

San Joaquin Valley College was founded in 1985. From their humble beginning, the college has always put their students first. They offer degree and certificate programs in business, medical, and technical fields. The college has ever increasing programs to fit the needs of their students. They are also committed to providing the best of both general and vocational education. From 1985 to present, San Joaquin Valley College has graduated over 8,400 students from their Fresno campus alone.

In 1995 San Joaquin Valley College became regionally accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The college makes sure to stay involved with the community. The Fresno Campus of San Joaquin Valley College is a strong partner in the local community, receiving numerous awards and recognition from some of the following organizations: The Mayor’s Office for the Fresno Dental Assistants, the California State Job Training Coordinating Council for Outstanding Service Provider, the Community Appreciation Award from the United Way of Fresno County, American Red Cross and so many other noteworthy organizations.

For the past 20 years San Joaquin Valley College has created superior learning standards that can only be described as life changing by all of their graduates. They offer small classes, a family-like atmosphere, flexible class schedules, hands-on training, financial aid availability, as well as job placement assistance. San Joaquin Valley College provides quality education in order to produce quality potential employees.

We stand to commend San Joaquin Valley College as an excellent educational provider and applaud their efforts to strengthen our community.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DE SOTO TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

HON. ALLEN BOYD
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate DeSoto Trail Elementary School in Tallahassee, Florida for receiving the Blue Ribbon School award under the No Child Left Behind program. As the home of the Trailblazers they have lived up to their mascot's name in earning this award. This is a testament to the quality of education this school provides and to the hard work the administrators, faculty and students have done to be one of only thirteen schools in the entire State to win this award.

Many identify No Child Left Behind with efforts to improve failing schools. However, schools like DeSoto Trail that go above and beyond what is required by the law should not be forgotten. I am extremely proud of not just the students who worked so hard, but also the faculty and administrators who spent so many hours helping the students become better citizens through education.

DeSoto Trail Elementary is a model of excellence that will serve as an example for every elementary school throughout the United States. This school has proven that through hard work and dedication, academic success is not out of reach for any student.

Therefore, I ask every member to please, join with me in congratulating the children and teachers who have worked so hard to achieve their goal. I would also like to congratulate Principal Janis Johnson and Assistant Principal Hank McGrath for providing this level of excellence.

The future of this country depends on the success of our education system. As the Representative of Tallahassee, Florida, I am honored and proud to be on the floor today speaking about such students and the parents who support them everyday.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DESOTO TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

HON. ALLEN BOYD
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate DeSoto Trail Elementary School in Tallahassee, Florida for receiving the Blue Ribbon School award under the No Child Left Behind program. As the home of the Trailblazers they have lived up to their mascot's name in earning this award. This is a testament to the quality of education this school provides and to the hard work the administrators, faculty and students have done to be one of only thirteen schools in the entire State to win this award.

Many identify No Child Left Behind with efforts to improve failing schools. However, schools like DeSoto Trail that go above and beyond what is required by the law should not be forgotten. I am extremely proud of not just the students who worked so hard, but also the faculty and administrators who spent so many hours helping the students become better citizens through education.

DeSoto Trail Elementary is a model of excellence that will serve as an example for every elementary school throughout the United States. This school has proven that through hard work and dedication, academic success is not out of reach for any student.

Therefore, I ask every member to please, join with me in congratulating the children and teachers who have worked so hard to achieve their goal. I would also like to congratulate Principal Janis Johnson and Assistant Principal Hank McGrath for providing this level of excellence.

The future of this country depends on the success of our education system. As the Representative of Tallahassee, Florida, I am honored and proud to be on the floor today speaking about such students and the parents who support them everyday.

CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY’S LIFE AND LEGACY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and legacy of Judge Constance Baker Motley who died September 21, 2005. Constance Baker Motley had a remarkable career as a public servant, achieving success both as an elected official and as a Federal judge. She made history and contributed greatly to the widening of opportunities for minorities and women. Judge Motley was the first woman and first African-American woman to be appointed to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the largest Federal trial bench in the country; the first African-American woman to be elected to the New York State Senate and the first woman to the Manhattan Borough Presidency.

Constance Baker Motley was born on September 14, 1921 in New Haven, CT, where her father worked as chef for a Yale University fraternity. Her parents were West Indian immigrants who encouraged her to excel in school and to become involved in community activities. Clarence Blakeslee, a wealthy white contractor and philanthropist was so impressed by her that he paid for her college education. She attended Fisk University and graduated from New York University in 1943. In 1946, she received her law degree from Columbia University and married rea...
interviewed her for the position and continued to mentor and support her in the years to come.

As one of the NAACP’s principal trial attorneys, Motley played a role in all of the major school segregation cases. She helped write the brief that the Board of Estimate successfully submitted to the Supreme Court, winning 5-4. She also represented such luminaries as Dr. Martin Luther King and the Reverend Ralph Abernathy.

In 1964 Motley became the first Black woman elected to the New York State Senate and in 1966 she became the first woman elected to be president of the Borough of Manhattan. In 1966 she was named U.S. District Judge, the first African-American woman to be appointed to the federal bench. Her nomination was approved only after months of fierce political opposition; President Lyndon Johnson had been forced to withdraw his earlier nomination of Motley to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Constance Baker Motley is the author of dozens of articles on legal and civil rights issues, including several personal tributes to Thurgood Marshall. She has received honorary doctorates from Spelman College, Howard, Princeton, and Brown Universities, and from many Connecticut institutions, including Yale, Trinity, Albertus Magnus, UCONN, and the University of Hartford. Among her many other awards are the NAACP Medal of Honor, the Outstanding American of African Descent Award, and honorary doctorates from Spelman College, Howard University, the University of Hartford, and the University of Mississippi. She is also the author of the biographical novel, "Thurgood: The Man and the Movement." She has been inducted into the Women’s Hall of Fame.

Judge Constance Baker Motley has truly been a trailblazer in the advancement of civil rights for all Americans, and a pioneer in breaking racial and gender barriers within the once homogeneous legal arena. She is truly not only an African-American “shero,” she is an American icon as well. Judge Motley leaves behind her husband of 59 years, Joel Wilson Motley, her son Joel Motley III; three sisters; a brother; and three grandchildren.

Constance Baker Motley, a civil rights lawyer who fought for every important civil rights case for two decades and then became the first black woman to serve as a federal judge, died yesterday at NYU Downtown Hospital in Manhattan. She was 84.

The cause was congestive heart failure, said Joel Motley, her daughter-in-law.

Judge Motley was the first black woman to serve in the New York State Senate, as well as the first woman to be Manhattan borough president, a position that guaranteed her a voice in running the entire city under an earlier system of local government called the Board of Estimate.

She first emerged at the center of the firestorm that raged through the South in the two decades after World War II, as blacks and their white allies pressed to end the segregation that had gripped the region since Reconstruction. She visited the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in jail, sang freedom songs in churches that had been bombed, and spent a night under armed guard with Medgar Evers, the civil rights leader who was later murdered.

In 1943, she married Joel Wilson Motley III, who became president of the local N.A.A.C.P. Chapter. Her family included three daughters and a son, Joel III, who lives in Scarborough, N.Y.; three grandchildren; her brother Edmund Baker of Florida; and her sisters Edna Carnegie, Enice Royster and Marian Green, all of New Haven.

Mr. Marshall had no qualms about sending her into the tensest racial terrain, precisely because she was a woman. She said she believed that was why she was assigned to the Meredith case in 1961.

“Thurgood says that the only people who are safe in the South are the women—white and Negro,” she said in an interview with Pictorial Living, the magazine of The New York Journal-American, in 1965, “I don’t know how he’s got that figured. But, so far, I haven’t been able to.”

Mr. Meredith’s admission to the University of Mississippi in September 1962 was a major victory for the civil rights movement. Mrs. Motley worked on the case for 18 months before Mr. Meredith’s name was even seen in the papers.

She made 22 trips to Mississippi as the case developed. Judge Motley once called the day Mr. Meredith received his diploma in 1963 the most thrilling in her life.

Her greatest professional satisfaction came with the reinstatement of 1,100 black children in Birmingham who had been expelled for taking part in street demonstrations in the spring of 1963.

In 1964, Mrs. Motley’s high-level civil rights profile drew her into politics. A Democratic State Senate candidate from the Upper West Side was ruled off the ballot because of an election-law technicality. She accepted the nomination on the condition that it would not interfere with her legal work and that she would be a Republican to become the first black woman elected to the State Senate. She was re-elected that November.

She remained in the job until February 1965, when she was chosen by unanimous vote of the City Council to fill a one-year vacancy...
as Manhattan borough president. In citywide elections nine months later, she was re-elected to a full four-year term with the endorsement of the Democratic, Republican and Liberal Parties.

As borough president, she drew up a seven-point program for the revitalization of Harlem and East Harlem, securing $700,000 to plan for the homes and other underprivileged areas of the city.

After becoming a federal judge in 1966, Judge Motley ruled in many cases, her decisions often reflected her past. She decided on behalf of welfare recipients, low-income Medicare patients and a prisoner who claimed he was unconstitutionally punished by 372 days of solitary confinement, whom she awarded damages.

She continued to try cases after she took senior status. Her hope as a judge was that she would change the world for the better, she said.

"The work I’m doing now will affect people’s lives intimately," she said in an interview with The New York Times in 1977, "it may even change them."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 2005]

CIVIL RIGHTS LAWYER BAKER MOTLEY DIES
(By LARRY NEUMEISTER)

NEW YORK—When she was 15, Constance Baker Motley was turned away from a public beach because she was black. It was only then—even though her mother was active in the NAACP—that the teenager really became interested in civil rights.

She left school and found herself fighting racism in landmark segregation cases including Brown v. Board of Education, the Central High School case in Arkansas and the case that let James Meredith enroll at the University of Mississippi.

Motley also broke barriers herself. She was the first woman appointed to the federal bench, as well as the first one elected to the New York state Senate.

Motley, who would have celebrated her 40th anniversary on the bench next year, died Monday April 1 at the age of 87.

She is a person of a kind and stature the likes of which they’re not making anymore," said Chief Judge Michael Mukasey in U.S. District Court in Manhattan, where Motley served.

From 1961 to 1964, Motley won nine of 10 civil rights cases she argued before the Supreme Court.

"Judge Motley had the strength of a self-made star," federal Judge Kimba Wood said.

"As she grew, she was unfailingly optimistic and positive—she never let herself be diverted from her goal of achieving civil rights, even though, as she developed as a lawyer, she faced almost constant condescension from our profession due to her being an African-American woman."

Motley, who spent two decades with the NAACP’s Legal Defense and Educational Fund, started in 1947 as a law clerk to Thurgood Marshall, then its chief counsel and later a Supreme Court justice. In 1950, she prepared the draft complaint for what would be the Board of Education.

In her autobiography, “Equal Justice Under Law,” Motley said defeat never entered her mind. “We all believed that our time would come. We just had to go on fighting.”

The Supreme Court ruled in her and her colleagues’ favor in a decision unchallenged with toppling public school segregation in America while touching off resistance across the country and leading to some of the races of the 1960s.

In the early 1960s, she personally argued the Meredith case as well as the suit that resulted in the enrollment of two black students at the University of Georgia.

“Mrs. Motley’s style could be deceptive, often allowing a witness to get away with谎言 by letting them challenge him,” one of the students, journalist Charlayne Hunter-Gault, wrote in her 1992 book. “In My Place.” But she would suddenly throw a curve ball with so much skill and power that she would knock them off their chair.

Motley also argued the 1957 case in Little Rock, Arka., that led President Eisenhower to call in federal troops to protect nine black students at Central High School.

Also in the early 1960s, she successfully argued for 1,000 school children to be re-instated in Birmingham, Ala., after the local school board had them demonstrating. She represented “Freedom Riders” who rode buses to test the Supreme Court’s 1950 ruling prohibiting segregation in interstate transportation. During this time, she represented the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. as well, defending his right to march in Birmingham and Albany, Ga.

Motley and the Legal Defense and Education Fund, committed to a careful strategy of dismantling segregation through the courts, were among the first to advocate more militant tactics such as lunch-counter sit-ins, but she came to believe that litigation was not the path to equality.

Recalling a 1963 visit to King in jail, she remarked, “It was then I realized that we did indeed have a new civil rights leader—a man willing to die for our freedom.”

Motley was born in New Haven, Conn., the ninth of 12 children. Her mother, Rachel Baker, was a founder of the New Haven chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Her father, Willoughby Alva Baker, worked as a chef for student organizations at Yale University.

It was the beach incident that solidified the course her life would take.

Though her parents could not afford to send her to college, a local philanthropist, Clarence W. Blakeslee, offered to pay for her education after hearing her speak at a community meeting.

Motley earned a degree in economics in 1943 from New York University, and three years later, got her law degree from Columbia Law School.

In the late 1950s, Motley took an interest in politics and by 1964 had left the NAACP to become the first black woman to serve in the New York Senate.

In 1965, she became the first woman president of the borough of Manhattan, where she worked to promote integration in public schools.

The following year, President Johnson nominated her to the federal bench in Manhattan. She was confirmed nine months later, though her appointment was opposed by conservative federal judges and Southern politicians.

Over the next four decades, Motley handled a number of civil rights cases, including her decision in 1978 allowing a female reporter to be admitted to the New York Yankees’ locker room.

Motley is survived by her husband and son, three sisters and a brother.
CONGRATULATING THE AGGELER FAMILY

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Aggeler Family, the proud recipients of the 2005 Donna Greco Issa Family of the Year Award from the March of Dimes.

Following in the tradition of those families who are past recipients of this distinguished award, the Aggeler Family has a strong and passionate enthusiasm for family and devotion to community.

Mr. and Mrs. Aggeler moved from Missouri to Michigan in 1944. Soon after, they founded a lumber company, John’s Lumber, in Mount Clemens. The business has been in the family for over 58 years.

John Aggeler believed if you treat people well, they will continue to come back. This ideology is the foundation for the company’s commitment to its community, family, and employees. Currently, the family’s third generation is working for the company and continues to reside in Macomb County.

The Aggeler children have continued his legacy of commitment and outstanding service. The thread of service to others runs through their family.

Michael Aggeler is one of many Aggeler children who continues to work for the family business and is extremely active in the community. For 31 years, Michael has been a member of St Mary’s S.M.A.S.H. outing. He also served for 6 years as a board member of the Michigan Lumber and Building Materials Association and is a member of the Mount Clemens Lions Club.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing the Aggeler Family for their commitment to their family and employees, along with the extraordinary legacy of the service to their community. They are well deserving of the Donna Greco Issa Family of the Year Award.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT WASH

HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Robert M. Wash of Fresno, California. He is survived by his two sons John and Thomas, and daughter Lynn.

Robert Wash was a respected member of our community and his memory will be forever cherished. He was born to Henry and Effie Wash on May 27, 1908 and grew up in Fresno County. His family instilled in him the values of character with which he touched so many lives.

Robert Wash was his Family’s hero and will continue to be appreciated by his community.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DEERLAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

HON. ALLEN BOYD
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Deerlake Middle School, home of the Bucks, in Tallahassee, Florida for receiving the Blue Ribbon School award under the No Child Left Behind Program. This award is certainly a testament to the quality of education this school provides and to the hard work the administrators, faculty and students have done to be one of only thirteen schools in the entire state to win this award.

Many identify No Child Left Behind with efforts to improve failing schools. However, schools like Deerlake that go above and beyond what is required by the law should not be forgotten. I am extremely proud of not just the students who worked so hard, but also the faculty and administrators whom spent so many hours helping the students become better citizens through education.

Deerlake Middle School is a model of excellence that will serve as an example to every Middle School throughout the United States. This school has proven that through hard work and dedication, academic success is not out of reach for any student.

Therefore, I ask every member to please, join with me in congratulating the children and teachers of Deerlake Middle School who have worked so hard to achieve their goal. I would also like to congratulate Principal Jackie Pons and Assistant Principals Gwendolyn Lynn Williams and Shane Syfrett for providing this level of excellence.

The future of this country depends on the success of our education system. In the Representative of Tallahassee, Florida, I am honored and proud to be on the floor today speaking about such students and the parents who support them everyday.
Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the eloquent remarks made by the Honorable P.J. Patterson, Prime Minister of Jamaica as he accepted the Charles Diggs Award for International Service from the Congressional Black Caucus as part of our Annual Legislative Conference Awards Dinner on Saturday September 24, 2005. His acceptance speech reached beyond words of gratitude, to encompass a stirring statement of the basis for the commonality of people throughout the African Diaspora. Prime Minister Patterson inspired us with his words to provide encouragement, unity and brotherhood.

In his address he reminded us of the shared histories and experiences of Blacks in the Americas and across the globe. He showed how those who survived the Middle Passage were reunited by a larger family of shared experience. Prime Minister Patterson illustrated the common experiences of poverty, neglect and misrepresentation that affected the social status of Africa and its descendants of the Diaspora alike. His message showed that the need for action is federal, state, and local governments following Hurricane Katrina were a microcosm of the global experience of blacks everywhere in the world. He gave us hope that through this shared history, we have a common foundation from which we as one people regardless of nation, color and location can stand on to fight injustice around the world, especially since those of African descent suffer most from the injustices.

Mr. Patterson also reminded and encouraged us as public officials and as citizens of the world to continue the fight for what we vowed to do, fight for justice on the local, national and international levels. He reminded us in the African American community that we are not alone in our struggle for justice and equality. We are part of a larger global struggle to bring empower those who are poor and oppressed around the world and that we must take courage from our faith that what is right will prevail. We all have to engage all our energies and intellects in the struggle to build the national and global framework where marginalized groups, industrialized countries, and developing nations alike have an equal voice in the determination of how best we protect and share the resources of not only our country and others alike, but our planet as well.

Prime Minister P.J. Patterson and his words of hope and optimism were a breath of fresh air to his audience during such despondent and confusing times. He gives direction where there is seemingly none, and he makes sense far too long. He stands in the unbroken line of Patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live, and he serves with me in the Caribbean and, as incumbent Chairman of the Group of 77 and China, a Group which embraces every sovereign nation on the Mother Continent of Africa.

Many decades ago, Marcus Mosiah Garvey implored us to redress the inequities of our history and change irreversibly the cruel imbalance that our people have suffered in the economic and social development, at both the global and domestic levels. We are yet to complete that mandate. The uphill climb, likening us once to children of Sisyphus, most certainly does not deter us. To quote Maya Angelou: “History, despite its wrenching pain, cannot be un-lived, it is faced with courage, need not be lived again.”

**BUILDING A JUST WORLD**

It has been my passionate resolve throughout my public life to engage all my energies and my intellect in the struggle to build the global framework where industrialized countries and developing nations alike have an equal voice in the determination of how best we protect and share the resources of the only planet where human life exists; that we recognize there can be no lasting peace so long as a few seek to perpetuate political and social dominance to the detriment of those who have been marginalized far too long.

Injustice anywhere threatens justice everywhere.

Why should we continue to spend trillions of dollars and devote so much of our professional and technical skills to making armament and weapons of mass destruction when people are dying of hunger, when lives are cut short by malaria, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and infectious diseases?

Wherever we operate, in the political sphere, no matter what continent or island, let us recognize that the prevention of genocide, the successful fight against terrorism, the preservation of our global environment are imperatives.

**ONE HUMAN RACE**
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We see our brothers and sisters in the CBC as stalwart partners in the struggle to promote economic self-reliance, democracy, governance and social upliftment to fulfill the needs of our citizens.

Together we must continue to strive for unity of purpose and action among us. We seek together to fashion a single World which we can inhabit and where, irrespective of gender, age, religious creed, or colour, we can all live in harmony, because we all belong to the human race.

I congratulate you for all you are doing to nurture our confidence in ourselves. I congratulate the Foundation for this evening’s splendid and unforgettable ceremony.

In closing, let me quote from Genesis: “Behold they are one people, and they all have the same language. And this is what they began to do, and now nothing which they purpose to do will be impossible for them. (Genesis 11:6):”

May the Almighty continue to guide and bless us all.

**SUPPORTING GOLD STAR MOTHERS DAY**

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 61, Supporting the Goals and Ideals of Gold Star Mothers Day. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important resolution, which honors the mothers of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation.

We often invoke the sacrifices of our nation’s fallen in general. Seldom do we take the time to thank them and their families individually. It is June and July of this year, I joined 21 other members from both sides of the aisle to read the names of each of our fallen on the house floor. I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize an thank the mothers of these individual heroes.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt once wrote to the mother of a fallen serviceman, “He stands in the unbroken line of Patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live, and grow and increase its blessings. Freedom lives, and through it he lives, in a way that he could never have undertaken.

Organizations such as American Gold Star Mothers keep the memory of these heroes alive, as they help fellow mothers and family members of the fallen work through the grief of losing a loved one. They are also actively involved in their communities, visiting VA hospitals, helping veterans with claims to the Veterans Administration and volunteering at patriotic and memorial services throughout the year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the words of President Abraham Lincoln, who wrote to the mother of a fallen soldier during the Civil War: “I pray that our heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the
Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Commissioner Nancy White, who is the recipient of the 2005 Alexander Macomb Woman of the Year Award from the March of Dimes.

Nancy White has dedicated her life to educating and improving her community. After Mrs. White received her Bachelor's degree from Michigan State University and her Master's degree from Wayne State University, she began her 22-year career in the Fraser Public School District. She served as a teacher, counselor, and coach.

In 1992, Mrs. White was elected by the people of Fraser and southern Clinton Township as their representative on the Macomb County Board of Commissioners. Since then, she has dedicated the last seven years to the County Board. Her strong leadership was recognized by her fellow board members and she was elected in January 2005 to serve a two-year term as chair of the Macomb County Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. White is committed to efficient and responsive County government. She lives out this commitment by creating a Strategic Visioning Task Force, a forum for Mayors throughout the county, and by striving to work on a bipartisan basis. She was the Chair of a County-wide effort to defend the County’s military installations in the recent BRAC process. She has traveled to the Middle East on a trade mission with other government and business leaders from Southeastern Michigan.

Mrs. White’s excellent leadership skills are not only utilized on the Macomb County Board of Commissioners. She served as chair of the Macomb County Community Mental Health Board and co-chair of the Clinton Township American Red Cross Blood Drive.

In 2002, the community acknowledged Mrs. White’s leadership and commitment. She was awarded The Woman of Distinction Award from the Girl Scouts of America for her many outstanding contributions as a mentor and community leader.

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored to work in collaboration with Mrs. White over a number of years and to see first hand her commitment and devotion to improving communities throughout Macomb County. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Commissioner Nancy M. White as she receives this distinguished award.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 45th Anniversary of the Republic of Cyprus. It was on October 1, 1960, that Cyprus became a republic after decades of British colonial rule.

I am very fortunate and privileged to represent Astoria, Queens—one of the largest and most vibrant communities of Greek and Cypriot Americans in this country. Among my greatest pleasures as a Member of Congress are participating in the life of this community and the wonderful and vital Cypriot friends that I have come to know.

As a full-fledged member of the European Union, Cyprus is playing a vital role in European affairs while also strengthening relations with the United States. On July 25, the United States and the Republic of Cyprus signed a reciprocal Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) Ship Boarding Agreement, which is aimed at preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Cyprus was the first EU member to sign this agreement. Earlier this month Cyprus became a signatory to the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. Finally, in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, Cyprus offered both its condolences and assistance to the victims of this horrible disaster.

I am saddened that the commemoration of Cyprus’ Independence Day this year, as in the past, is clouded by the fact that Cyprus continues to be illegally occupied by the Turkish military forces, in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions. On July 20, 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus, and to this day continues to maintain an estimated 35,000 heavily armed troops. However, I remain hopeful that an end to this division will be achieved.

Cyprus and the United States have a great deal in common. We share a deep and abiding commitment to democracy, human rights, free markets, and the ideal and practice of equal justice under the law. Despite the hardships and trauma caused by the ongoing Turkish occupation, Cyprus has registered remarkable economic growth, and the people living in the government-controlled areas enjoy one of the world’s highest standards of living. Sadly, the people living in the occupied area continue to be mired in poverty.

I am encouraged that since the Turkish occupation, the Government-controlled areas have lifted restrictions on freedom of movement across the artificial line of division created by Turkey’s military occupation, hundreds of thousands of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots have crossed the U.N. ceasefire line to visit their homes and properties or areas of their own country that were inaccessible to them for nearly 30 years. The peaceful and cooperative spirit in the person-to-person, family-to-family interactions between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots bodes well for the successful reunification of Cyprus.

In the times we are facing, it is clear that divisions among people create harmful, destructive environments. We must find a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem. The relation-ship between Cyprus and the United States is strong and enduring, and we stand together celebrating democracy and freedom.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY COLA PROTECTION ACT

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, before I was elected to the House of Representatives, I made a promise to thousands of seniors in South Dakota that, if they would send me to Washington, I would fight for them, stand by them, and make their voice heard. To help keep that promise by protecting the retirement income of nearly 100,000 South Dakotans from rising health care costs, the “Social Security COLA Protection Act” was the first piece of legislation I introduced upon my arrival.

Today, I am reintroducing the “Social Security COLA Protection Act” because the situation facing seniors in South Dakota and around the country is just as dire today as it was a year ago.

For retirees who depend on Social Security benefits to live, the only defense against increasing prices for food, clothing and energy is an annual cost-of-living adjustment, or COLA. However, rising Medicare premiums are diminishing the purchasing power of this yearly increase in benefits.

Over the last 5 years, monthly Medicare Part B premiums have nearly doubled. On September 16th, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services announced that Medicare beneficiaries will pay an additional 13 percent out of their Social Security checks in 2006. This marks the third consecutive rise of more than 10 percent and exceeds the 12 percent increase Medicare’s trustees predicted in March. Every dollar that goes toward rising Medicare premiums is one less South Dakota’s seniors can use to pay for groceries or utility bills.

We are not wealthy in South Dakota. Retirees in South Dakota clip coupons. They put off buying the things they need. They live modestly because that is what they must do to get by. It is no exaggeration to say that retirees in South Dakota need every penny of their COLA. Not just so they can maintain a basic standard of living—but so they can live with dignity.

My legislation protects retirees by ensuring that no more than 25 percent of their COLA can be absorbed by the increase in Medicare premiums. Next year, it would protect 100,000 South Dakotans who otherwise would see their scarce dollars taken from food, clothing and other essential purchases. For those who depend on Social Security to pay their bills, this legislation will help them save enough to buy that extra medicine or just a plane ticket to visit the grandchildren.

Last Congress, my legislation had the support of 116 members of the House and of prominent advocacy groups for seniors such as the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the Alliance for Retired Americans and Families USA. I hope that Congress will take up and pass this legislation quickly, because the need for it is real and immediate.
This fall, just as Medicare premiums go up, temperatures in South Dakota will be going down. Seniors will sit at their kitchen tables, reading through the bills, and they may wonder yet again how they are going to make it through the month. We owe it to them to do better. I will work to see that we will.

FREEDOM FOR VIRGILIO MARANTA GUELMES

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Virgilio Maranta Guelmes, a political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Maranta Guelmes is a pro-democracy activist and a delegate of the 24th of February Movement. The movement is named for both the cornerstone of the glorious Cuban War of Independence in 1895, and the day in 1996 when two civilian aircraft carrying four members of the Brothers to the Rescue movement were shot down over international waters by the Cuban dictatorship’s fighter jets. The 24th of February Movement desires and struggles for freedom in Cuba.

Because of his belief in freedom and democracy, Mr. Maranta Guelmes has been a constant target of the tyrant’s machinery of repression. According to Amnesty International, he was arrested and imprisoned in the totalitarian gulag on December 6, 2002. On May 19, 2002, he was again detained and interrogated by the dictatorship. In that interrogation, he was told to abandon his activities with the 24th of February Movement.

Mr. Maranta Guelmes, knowing full well the heinous repression that awaited him if he continued to advocate for freedom for the people of Cuba, never wavered in his convictions. Unfortunately, on May 18, 2004, in a sham trial, Mr. Maranta Guelmes was sentenced to 3 years in the totalitarian gulag.

Let me be very clear: Mr. Maranta Guelmes is locked in a dungeon because he desires freedom for Cuba. The U.S. State Department describes the conditions in the gulag as, “harsh and life threatening.” The State Department also reports that police and prison officials beat, neglect, isolate, and deny medical treatment to detainees and prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that anyone, anywhere, is imprisoned in sub-human gulags simply for their belief in truth, freedom and democracy. At the dawn of the 21st century, mankind must no longer tolerate prisoners of conscience in any form, in any place, in any country. My colleagues, we must cry out for the immediate and unconditional release of Virgilio Maranta Guelmes and all prisoners of conscience in the totalitarian Cuba.

TRIBUTE TO DR. PAUL PEPE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about a remarkable, courageous man who has dedicated himself to improving the lives of those around him. Dr. Paul Pepe is a fine member of my home community of Dallas, Texas, and I am proud to announce that he has been recognized for his contribution in emergency medical services from the American College of Emergency Physicians. The award, presented by U.S. Surgeon General Richard Carmona in Washington, D.C. on Monday, September 26, 2005, recognized Dr. Pepe for his achievements during a 30 year career that included education and service to numerous city, state and federal agencies.

Dr. Pepe, a protégé of Drs. Leonard Cobb and Michael Copass from the University of Washington in Seattle, may be best known as one of the leaders of the initial 1991 American Heart Association publications.

Dr. Pepe co-authored a comprehensive Early Childhood Center curriculum for K through 12 school children, and he championed statewide training of middle school students using high school seniors as instructors in both CPR and automated external defibrillator use. In addition, he helped to forge the exact language and subsequent passage of one of the most liberal Good Samaritan Laws ever enacted in any state regarding AED use by bystanders. Translating all of these ambitious CPR initiatives into major media events—and ultimately thousands of lives saved—Dr. Pepe has been labeled in some educational circles as a “Contributor to Millions.”

Dr. Pepe has been a longstanding member of the National Advanced Cardiac Life Support and Basic Life Support committees of the American Heart Association. He has also served on national ad hoc committees for various AHA activities including National Mass CPR Training Day initiative.

In addition to his AHA duties, Dr. Pepe also serves as the Emergency Medicine and Trauma Consultant to diverse entities as the White House Medical Unit, ABC News, and the National Basketball Association Trainers. Most recently, he trained the U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. David Satcher, and several dozen of his highest ranking senior staff members in CPR and AED use.

A ubiquitous and popular world-wide lecturer and author of hundreds of published scientific papers and abstracts, Dr. Pepe has been featured routinely in many network and prime-time broadcasts. He has won multiple health policy, community service, academic and professional society awards, both here and abroad, and he has provided consultation for multiple foreign governments regarding the coordination of emergency health services.

Dr. Pepe is a dedicated community servant, activist, and leader. He is a tremendous asset to Dallas, and through his tireless work, my home town has become a better place to live and a safer place to grow up. I am proud to join his family, his colleagues and the North Texas community in congratulating Dr. Pepe on a job well done.

LANCE CORPORAL JOSHUA BUTLER

HON. BILL SHUSTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and distinguish one of America’s finest—United States Marine Lance Corporal Joshua Butler of Altoona, PA. Butler, who dreamed of being a U.S. Marine since he was four years old, protected hundreds of his fellow comrades from suicide bombers mounting an attack with trucks, explosives and no regard for human life.

Butler was stationed in Iraq along the Syrian border, and while guarding the base’s perimeter from a lookout tower his post was attacked. Butler sprayed the first suicide bomber with 20 or 30 rounds causing him to veer off at the last moment to miss his target. The truck, filled with explosives and manned by a suicide-mission insurgent, crashed through the improvised barrier the Marines had built up along the edge of the base. After being knocked down by the blast, Lance Corporal Butler remained focused, alert and ready. Through the smoke of the blast, he saw a red, suicide-driven fire engine coming toward the base. Butler fired 100 rounds onto the vehicle. After the truck was hit by a grenade, launched by Pfc. Charles Young, its explosives were detonated outside of the base but within 50 yards of Butler. Debris sprayed the length of 4 football fields and knocked down soldiers as far as 200 yards away. But no Marines were seriously hurt, including Butler.

Lance Corporal Butler’s actions saved the lives of hundreds of his fellow Marines and marked a significant victory against the insurgents in Iraq. The suicide bombers mission was thwarted by Butler’s courageous and timely reaction. An estimated 21 insurgents were killed that day while 15 were reported wounded.

Lance Corporal Butler—You are a U.S. Marine and a hero, and across the country Americans are proud of your leadership. Thank you for serving when your nation called.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF APRIL RENETTA LOVE

HON. MIKE ROSS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of April Renetta Love of Hope, Arkansas. April was born on May 1, 1985 in Texarkana and passed away this month in Fayetteville, Arkansas. I wish to recognize her life and achievements.

A 2003 honors graduate of Hope High School, April was a junior at the University of Arkansas and was majoring in Political Science, Communications, and African-American Studies.

April was extremely active in a wide array of campus organizations at the University of Arkansas. She was a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, the Order of the Eastern Star Youth Fraternity and Young Democrats. Her interest in politics extended beyond campus and she spent the summer of 2005 interning for the Congressional Black Caucus in the nation’s capital, when I had the privilege of meeting this bright and talented young woman. April was also an accomplished musician and served as the church pianist for seven years.

April will forever be remembered for her contagious smile, her leadership and for her commitment to furthering her education. My
Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Congress will stand by and allow the Ryan White CARE Act to expire. While this does not signify the end to the program, it does underscore our responsibility to conduct hearings and vote on its soon overdue reauthorization. We must act swiftly to ensure that this landmark program, which provides lifesaving treatment to more than half a million persons living with HIV/AIDS each year, be strengthened to meet the changing needs of their care.

New York City has always had a special respect for the opportunities the Ryan White CARE Act affords the city in serving the needs of our HIV/AIDS population. New York City comptably meets 16 percent of the nation’s population, but more than 16 percent of the nation’s AIDS cases. As of December 31, 2003, there were 142,085 cumulative AIDS cases in NYC, and 88,479 City residents diagnosed as Persons Living With HIV/AIDS. Although Ryan White CARE Act is widely considered the payer of last resort for people with HIV/AIDS, it fills much of the void in providing treatment and support services for those who either are uninsured or underinsured, without the necessary resources to access desperately needed care.

We must do better by CARE Act funding. This program has been virtually flat funded for years, and its AIDS Drug Assistance Programs (ADAP) only received a 10 million dollar increase in this year’s House Labor-HHS bill. Many very low-income people continue to be shut-out from ADAP programs due to states’ varying income eligibility levels, which can range from 125 percent to 500 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. Without early, aggressive treatment people living with HIV/AIDS can experience rapid and often irreversible disease progression. Additionally, if care is interrupted drug resistance can develop, which compromises their ability to properly control their health. Now, more than ever, the President should release emergency ADAP funding to help host states care for the estimated 8,000 victims of Hurricane Katrina, who have been displaced from their homes and networks of care.

The President’s Principles for Ryan White CARE Act Authorization include some troubling provisions which could have devastating results for communities’ ability to provide consistent, appropriate care for persons living with HIV/AIDS. The proposed Severity of Need for Core Services Index will change funding formulas to take into account the availability of other resources, like state and local funding streams. This is bad public policy as it diminishes the federal government’s ability to provide consistent, appropriate care for local HIV care and creates a powerful disincentive for states to prioritize funding for HIV funding in future years, if they think the federal government will just cover the gap. No state spends more than New York does to care for its residents with HIV and AIDS—over $3 billion last year. New York has always viewed this funding as a partnership between the state, cities and federal government and should not lose out on future federal funding for being at the forefront of providing progressive services and treatment.

Secondly the President’s proposal for a minimum of 75 percent of Ryan White CARE Act funding to be spent on core medical services should be seriously revisited. While there is no question that appropriate funding should be directed towards medical care, localities that benefit from comprehensive state funding for medical care, might better serve patients with the funding for transportation to medical visits, emergency housing assistance for homeless patients, and other key services. This hard number fails to reflect the different resources that cities like New York utilize to care for their patients, and the changing needs of the HIV/AIDS patient population.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I look forward to holding hearings on the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act. We must work together with the Senate to strengthen and preserve the foundation of the Ryan White CARE Act program with the compassion and thoughtful consideration it deserves.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to celebrate a true milestone in our Nation’s history, the 85th anniversary of our Constitution’s 19th amendment, guaranteeing that “the rights of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

The efforts of pioneers in the fight for women’s suffrage such as Susan B. Anthony, Alice Paul, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, served not only to advance women’s rights, but also promoted equality for all Americans.

I would also like to acknowledge the contributions made by Business and Professional Women/USA during the suffrage movement, most notably the organization’s oldest Michigan chapter, located in Saginaw. These women were dedicated to protecting and defending human dignity. Those beliefs remain today with the current members of this BW, with continue to strive for the betterment of women in society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the 109th Congress to please join me in recognizing the 85th anniversary of the 19th amendment to the Constitution. It has helped make our country a better place in which to live.

INTRODUCING THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL EQUITY ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my good friend, Representative HILDA SOLIS, and Senators KERRY and DURBIN to introduce the Public Health and Environmental Equity Act.

It has been 5 weeks since Hurricane Katrina devastated the lives and landscapes of the gulf coast region. The floodwaters that ravaged Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi in the last month have finally begun to recede and America and the world have become all too aware of the losses suffered by the citizens of these areas. They have lost family and loved ones. Most have lost homes, jobs, and businesses. And in their greatest hour of need, they were left alone.

Our own President was forced to admit the shortcomings of the so-called “relief” effort.

While nothing can ever make up for the misery endured in the first days of the storm, there is plenty we must do to alleviate additional hardships. As rebuilding commences, residents are anxious to get back to their homes and to their lives. Anxious contractors with a different agenda have vowed that such a mission can be fulfilled sooner rather than later. They want us to believe that homes, buildings, and schools fully submerged from weeks of raw sewage, accidents, decaying corpses, and teaming with mold will magically become clean and safe to move into.

How will they accomplish such a feat? Their plan: Have the EPA completely waive every environmental mandate that has protected us for 35 years. Simply put, this means that anyone involved in Katrina rebuilding will be allowed to dump where they want, pollute where and when they want, and contaminates for as long as they want. It’s a quick but dirty solution for cleanup and reconstruction with no regard for maintaining clean air, water, or soil.

Once in place, environmental loopholes attributed to Katrina recovery in the gulf region will also be the excuse for any company to create toxic breeding grounds anywhere in the country. Your backyard could be next.

Mr. Speaker, waiving these long-standing environmental regulations is an irresponsible and unconscionable way to jump-start the rebuilding process. What we’ll end up with are toxic residues that will sicken these communities for years to come. Residents who return to their homes under such EPA waivers will face a lifetime of illness and uncertainty about the water they drink, the air they breathe, and the soil they walk on every day. Failure to fully implement current environmental health and safety regulations jeopardizes every human and ethical standard we claim to hold dear.

Loosening these environmental safeguards will further victimize those still struggling to regain their lives.

We know what Katrina’s victims look like; we know their income level; and we know why they’ve been ignored. To roll back highly regarded environmental protections will add insult to an already festering injury of racial and social injustices. The citizens of the gulf coast...
want the same things the rest of America strives for—a safe place to live, work, and raise their families. They expect their elected officials to uphold laws that secure these basic necessities. They deserve our assurances and our actions that the value of their lives are no longer a back burner issue.

Katrina’s victims already survived the worst natural disaster in modern American history. They’ve already survived a relief effort that can only be described as shameful. Why on earth would we create a man-made catastrophe and tell them it’s in their best interest? The resolution which we are introducing today makes Congress’s commitment clear and obvious that we do not believe that Katrina—or any other natural disaster—should be used to justify rolling back and completely waiving environmental regulations. I ask for our colleagues’ support and urge the House to move this resolution swiftly.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2123, SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 2005

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2123, as this bill is a remarkable improvement on last Congress’s version and includes important provisions which will benefit all Head Start participants. I will, however, vote against this legislation if Leadership succeeds in inserting a “poison pill” that, if adopted, would mark the first time Congress would permit organizations that run Head Start programs to discriminate against job applicants solely on the basis of their religion.

While by no means a perfect bill, this legislation stands as a testament to the progress that can be made through bipartisan cooperation. This bill contains none of the controversial provisions from last Congress, such as block granting or universal competitions. Instead, H.R. 2123 contains several provisions which will benefit all Head Start participants, and I am proud of this fact and have worked hard with my Colleagues towards achieving these goals.

In particular, H.R. 2123 provides additional resources for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start (MSHS) program expansion, which will allow for thousands of farm-worker children to exit the fields and enter the classroom. This expansion includes a 5% funding floor for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start. In step with this funding floor, the Secretary is required to compose a report determining how well we are serving children eligible for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start. The bill also requires a study on the inclusion of Limited-English-proficient children and their families in Head Start and Early Head Start programs. These provisions and many others included in the bill before us today will benefit all Head Start students and families and set kids on the right foot for competing with their peers throughout their school years.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the provisions in this year’s bill will help millions of Head Start students and their families’ educational, personal, and economic well-being. I ask, why, then, are we considering inserting a poison pill into this remarkable piece of legislation? The amendment offered by Mr. BOUSTANY would severely block the program’s participants, children and parents, from climbing out of poverty and towards self-sufficiency. This is simply unacceptable in light of what Katrina has unearthed as a systemic problem in our country: widespread and unresolved poverty.

This amendment would prevent volunteer Head Start parents from moving off the welfare rolls into self-sufficiency as Head Start certifies teachers, they are the wrong religion. This outcome is not needed, not wanted, and definitely not helpful to the millions living in poverty today.

Additionally, this amendment also sets a dangerous precedent: such a change would allow faith-based organizations to discriminate not just on the basis of a person’s religious affiliation, but also on how closely they follow the tenets of that religion. This could include religious beliefs on medical treatments, marriage, pregnancy, gender, and even race. What’s more, the amendment would lead the Department of Health and Human Services to dismiss qualified teachers and engaged parents from Head Start programs run by faith-based organizations. I urge my colleagues to vote no on final passage if this dangerous amendment passes.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 2005

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support all the women and children who have survived domestic violence, and for all the women whose lives have been claimed by domestic abuse. It is abhorrent that violence within our homes continues to be prevalent today—many American women report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or boyfriend at some point in their lives. Violence against women is a profound and extremely pervasive problem, striking across borders, across economic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and across all age groups. It is an epidemic that affects not only women, but their children and families as well.

As we recognize National Domestic Violence Awareness Month this October, it is time that we actively work to end violence against women. I would like to draw special attention to immigrant women who continue to lack access to many resources that would enable them to escape domestic abuse. While we were able to include many critical provisions of relief to battered immigrant women when we reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act in 2000, there are still battered immigrants, like asylees and the elderly, who are forced to remain in abusive relationships, unable to appeal for protection from law enforcement and the courts for fear of deportation. I have introduced H.R. 3188, the Immigrant Victims of Violence Protection Act, which will allow them to safely escape their abusers without fear of deportation or other negative immigration consequences. This legislation would also provide a safety net for battered legal immigrants and their children by allowing them access to work permits, health insurance, food, and other benefits required to escape their abuser and gain economic independence.

It is time that we change attitudes in this country so that violence against women is no longer tolerated. We are devoting extensive resources to ending terror around the world, while at the same time one in four women continue to be terrorized by domestic violence and sexual assault in their lifetime. It is time that we devote the same amount of resources to ending a form of violence that terrorizes over half the population of this globe. We must teach our sons that violence of any kind is unacceptable; we must give our daughters encouragement and support so they have the self-esteem to leave abusive relationships; and we must start to envision a world free of violence against women. I believe that if we all work together, we can turn this vision into reality. But it is going to take resources, hard work, and, most of all, incredible resolve. I challenge my colleagues to make the fight against domestic violence a top priority, and together we can make this country a safer place for our mothers, daughters, sisters, and friends.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FRANK C. LEAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL UPON BEING NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

Ms. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 22nd, the Frank C. Leal Elementary School of Cerritos was awarded the distinct honor of being named a National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. Frank C. Leal Elementary joins 33 other public schools and seven additional private schools in the State of California who have also been named National Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence.

I commend the efforts of each and every one of these outstanding California schools. The Blue Ribbon Schools is a national recognition program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. The 22-year-old program encourages states to nominate public and private kindergarten through grade twelve schools that are either academically superior or demonstrate dramatic gains in student achievement. The Blue Ribbon distinction duly recognizes the level of excellence that is achieved every day at Frank C. Leal Elementary School of Cerritos. This school is setting a national example of what it takes to be a superior learning environment. It is absolutely essential that our schools continue to strive for excellence, if we want our students to realize their academic potential.

Frank C. Leal Elementary School is a visual and performing arts magnet school, and is a testament to the impact that an arts education can have on a student’s academic achievement. I commend the hard working teachers and school administrators of Frank C. Leal Elementary School of Cerritos for their contributions and commitment to our young people. I
also would like to recognize the parents and our community for supporting the Frank C. Leal Elementary School’s efforts to help every child reach their full potential.

Education has always been tied to the promise of equality and opportunity for all and the ABC Unified School District and the community of Cerritos have worked hard to give every student an equal chance to succeed. Congratulations to the Frank C. Leal Elementary School of Cerritos and the ABC Unified School District for this incredible achievement!

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING THE CAPITAL PURSUIT DRIVE

HON. HOWARD P. “BUCK” McKEON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker:

Whereas, the American League of Lobbyists and Men’s Wearhouse, have created the annual Capitol Pursuit Drive and through their efforts to help citizens in Washington D.C. and nationwide to obtain employment; and

Whereas, The 2nd Annual Capitol Pursuit Drive event will be held on October 5 from 10:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. in the Rayburn Foyer; and

Whereas, the American League of Lobbyists and Men’s Wearhouse, should be commended for their excellence in service to the local community for their unwavering dedication to helping individuals acquire the necessary skills and attitude to pursue a career; and

Whereas the First Annual Capitol Pursuit Drive successfully collected over 7,000 suits as tax deductible donations in under four hours on Capitol Hill and the recent events in the affected Gulf Coast region have created an additional need by displaced residents.

Therefore, I join with Members of Congress and their staff in honoring and congratulating the Capitol Pursuit Drive for its outstanding mission and efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TED POE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, due to preparations for Hurricane Rita in my district, I unfortunately missed the following votes on the House floor on Friday, September 22, 2005.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been able to vote that day, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 488 (Sauder Amendment to H.R. 2123), 489 (Steamer Amendment to H.R. 2123), 491 (Musgrave Amendment to H.R. 2123), 492 (Boehner Amendment to H.R. 2123), and rollcall vote No. 493 (Final Passage of H.R. 2123, School Readiness Act). I strongly support these amendments and the bill because they take important steps to prepare children for success in school.

I also ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been able to vote that day, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 490 (Davis (D–IL) Amendment to H.R. 2123).

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JUDGE CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the invaluable contributions of Judge Constance Baker Motley. She died of congestive heart failure at NYU Downtown Hospital in New York City yesterday at the age of 84. Judge Motley was a woman of many firsts and true pioneer in the civil rights struggle.

Judge Motley was a woman with numerous accomplishments. She helped write briefs in the groundbreaking Brown vs. Board of Education case in 1954 and she headed a legal campaign that opened admission at the University of Mississippi to James Meredith in 1962. Meredith was the first African American student to attend that school. By the time he graduated in 1963, Constance Motley had made 22 trips to Mississippi on behalf of the case. Later that year, she helped 1,100 black children be reinstated in Birmingham after they were expelled for taking part in a demonstration. Judge Motley also served as the first black woman in the New York State Senate in 1964 and the first woman borough president for Manhattan.

In 1966, Judge Motley was sworn in by President Lyndon Johnson as the first African American woman to serve as a federal judge. She ruled on a number of cases that dealt with everything from discrimination in housing to denial of benefits to Medicaid recipients to prisoners who had been unconstitutionally confined to solitary confinement for more than a year.

Her aspiration for what she termed as “dignity for all people” emerged early. Constance Motley was the ninth of twelve children born to parents from the small Caribbean island of Nevis. At the age of 15, she was not allowed onto a public beach because she was black. It was then that she began reading all she could about black history. She later became president of her N.A.A.C.P. youth council.

Three years later, Clarence W. Blakeslee, a white philanthropist, heard Constance Motley giving a speech at an African-American social center. He was so moved by her stately oration that he offered to finance her aspirations for a law degree.

Judge Motley attended Fisk University in Nashville, my alma mater, then transferred to New York University. In 1946, she graduated from Columbia School of Law and became a volunteer at the N.A.A.C.P.’s Legal Defense and Education Fund, which had been founded by Thurgood Marshall.

Known for her dignified manner and quiet approach, Judge Motley was highly regarded as an extraordinary legal tactician. It was also one of the reasons Thurgood Marshall felt that she could be so effective during the Meredith case in 1961. Of the ten cases she argued before the Supreme Court, Judge Motley won nine. She continued to work tirelessly on a variety of civil rights cases. One of the most recent cases included her decision in 1978 allowing a female reporter to be admitted to the New York Yankees’ locker room.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Constance Baker Motley was a brilliant advocate for the legal rights of all people. In her autobiography Equal Justice Under Law, Motley said defeat never entered her mind. “We all believed that our time had come and that we had to go forward.” It is with this faith that she lived, and in this spirit that she will forever be remembered.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr., to be Chief Justice of the United States.

House Committees ordered reported 13 sundry measures.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S10631–S10771

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1789–1803, S. Res. 260–261, and S. Con. Res. 55. Pages S10723–24

Measures Reported:


S. 1803, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (S. Rept. No. 109–142)

S. 1725, to strengthen Federal leadership, provide grants, enhance outreach and guidance, and provide other support to State and local officials to enhance emergency communications capabilities, to achieve communications interoperability, to foster improved regional collaboration and coordination, to promote more efficient utilization of funding devoted to public safety communications, to promote research and development by both the public and private sectors for first responder communications, with amendments. Pages S10722

Measures Passed:

*Medicare Cost Sharing and Welfare Extension Act:* Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. 1778, to extend medicare cost-sharing for qualifying individuals through September 2006, to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, transitional medical assistance under the Medicaid Program, and related programs through March 31, 2006, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Grassley/Baucus Amendment No. 1894, to eliminate coverage under the Medicare and Medicaid programs for drugs when used for treatment of erectile dysfunction. Page S10696

Department of Defense Appropriations: Senate began consideration of H.R. 2863, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, which will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S10656–88, S10699–S10705

Adopted:

Harkin Amendment No. 1886, to make available emergency funds for pandemic flu preparedness. Pages S10685–88, S10701

Leahy/Bond Modified Amendment No. 1901, to appropriate $1,300,000,000 for Additional War-Related Appropriations for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for homeland security and homeland security response equipment. Pages S10700–02

Durbin Amendment No. 1908, to ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard shall continue to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than basic pay such individual would then be receiving if no interruption in employment had occurred. Pages S10702–05

Senate expects to continue consideration of the bill on Friday, September 30, 2005.
Nomination—Joint Referral: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the nomination of Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, be referred jointly to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification regarding the proposed use of public safety funds provided to the District of Columbia pursuant to title I of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2005, Public Law 108–335; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. (PM–24)

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 78 yeas 22 nays (Vote No. EX. 245), John G. Roberts, Jr., of Maryland, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Gigi Hyland, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2011.

J. Thomas Rosch, of California, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2005.

Margaret Spellings, of Texas, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Thirty-third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

James Hardy Payne, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—245)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:26 p.m., until 9:30 on Friday, September 30, 2005. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S10771.)
damage wrought by Hurricane Katrina to the communications industry and the Federal Communications Commission’s efforts to assist consumers, the industries the agency regulates, and other Federal Agencies during this difficult crisis, including efforts to address public safety interoperability issues, receiving testimony from Kenneth P. Moran, Director, Office of Homeland Security, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; David G. Boyd, Director, Office for Interoperability and Compatibility, Systems Engineering and Development, Directorate of Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security; Dereck Orr, Program Manager, Public Safety Communications Systems, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Technology Administration, Department of Commerce; and Willis Carter, Shreveport Fire Department, Shreveport, Louisiana, on behalf of the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International.

Hearings recessed subject to the call.

TREATIES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Protocol of 1997 Amending MARPOL Convention (Treaty Doc. 108–7), Agreement with Canada on Pacific Hake/Whiting (Treaty Doc. 108–24), Convention Concerning Migratory Fish Stock in the Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. 109–1), Convention Strengthening Inter-American Tuna Commission (Treaty Doc. 109–2), and the Convention on Supplementary Compensation on Nuclear Damage (Treaty Doc. 107–21), after receiving testimony from David A. Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental Policy, Environmental Protection Agency; and James Bennett McRae, Assistant General Counsel for Civilian Nuclear Programs, Department of Energy.

U.S.-JAPAN RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs concluded a hearing to examine United States-Japan relations and future policies, after receiving testimony from Christopher R. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs; Richard P. Lawless, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Affairs; Amelia Porgies, Sidley, Austin Brown & Wood LLP, Washington, D.C.; Stephen P. MacMillan, Stryker Corporation, Kalamazoo, Michigan, on behalf of the Advanced Medical Technology Association; and Gerald Curtis, Columbia University Department of Political Science, New York, New York.

DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine the effectiveness and cost of the Defense Travel System (DTS) of the Department of Defense, focusing on whether DTS can deliver on the increased efficiency and cost savings that were anticipated when the program was established, after receiving testimony from Senator Grassley; Thomas F. Gimble, Acting Inspector General, Scott A. Comes, Director, Strategic and Information Programs Division, Program Analysis and Evaluation, and Zack E. Gaddy, Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, all of the Department of Defense; McCoy Williams, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, Government Accountability Office; Thomas A. Schatz, Citizens Against Government Waste, Washington, D.C.; and Robert Langsfeld, The Corporate Solutions Group, Menlo Park, California.

PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security concluded an oversight hearing to examine certain activities of the General Services Administration, focusing on the procurement process, which includes acquisition of workspace, equipment, technology, furniture, supplies, vehicles, and professional services, after receiving testimony from Stephen A. Perry, Administrator, General Services Administration.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Veterans Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of William F. Tuerk, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, who was introduced by Senator Specter, Robert Joseph Henke, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Management, John M. Molino, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning, Lisette M. Mondello, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, who was introduced by Senator Hutchison, and George J. Opfer, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, all of Department of Veterans Affairs, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DRUG ADVERTISING

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the impact of direct-to-consumer drug advertising on seniors’ health and health care
costs, after receiving testimony from Rachel E. Behrman, Deputy Director, Office of Medical Policy, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Public Health Service, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Paul Antony, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Donna Sweet, American College of Physicians, and Peter Lurie, Public Citizen, all of Washington, D.C.; and Richard L. Kravitz, University of California Center for Health Services Research in Primary Care Davis Medical Center, Sacramento, California.

---

House of Representatives

**Chamber Action**


Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
- Conference Report on H.R. 2360, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (Rept. 109–241);
- H. Res. 474, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (Rept. 109–242); and

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Rev. Kevin Gormley, Pastor, St. Peter Church, Marshall, Missouri.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Wednesday, September 28:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the July, 2005, measures of extreme repression on the part of the Cuban Government: H. Res. 388, to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the July, 2005, measures of extreme repression on the part of the Cuban Government against members of Cuba’s pro-democracy movement, calling for the immediate release of all political prisoners, the legalization of political parties and free elections in Cuba, urging the European Union to reexamine its policy toward Cuba, and calling on the representative of the United States to the 62d session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to ensure a resolution calling upon the Cuban regime to end its human rights violations, by a yea-and-nay vote of 393 yeas to 31 nays, Roll No. 503;

Expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Supreme Court should speedily find the use of the Pledge of Allegiance in schools to be consistent with the Constitution of the United States: H. Con. Res. 245, to express the sense of Congress that the United States Supreme Court should speedily find the use of the Pledge of Allegiance in schools to be consistent with the Constitution of the United States, by a yea-and-nay vote of 383 yeas to 31 nays with 8 voting “present”, Roll No. 504; and

Recognizing the need to pursue research into the causes, a treatment, and an eventual cure for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, supporting the goals and ideals of National Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Week: H. Con. Res. 178, as amended, to recognize the need to pursue research into the causes, a treatment, and an eventual cure for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, supporting the goals and ideals of National Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Week, by a yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 508.


Point of Order sustained against:
- Obey motion that sought to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House forthwith with amendments.
- H. Res. 469, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution, was agreed to by voice vote.

Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act of 2005: The House passed H.R. 3824, to amend and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act...
of 1973 to provide greater results conserving and recovering listed species by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 506.

Pursuant to the rule that in lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Resources Committee Print dated September 26, 2005 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read.

Agreed to:

Pombo Manager's amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 109–240) that makes a number of technical changes to clarify certain provisions and address issues concerning science, definition of "jeopardy", consolidation of ESA related programs, and review of protective regulations. Allows actions authorized under an approved Section 10 permit to be carried out without duplicative consultation. The amendment prevents water stakeholders from being held accountable for impacts due to State actions. The amendment requires the four Power Marketing Administrations to include ESA costs in their monthly billings. The amendment directs the Secretary of Interior to survey certain Federal lands to assess their value for report to Congress. The amendment clarifies conflicting statutes to make ESA the governing statutory authority when receiving a dock building permit.

Rejected:

George Miller of California amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–240) that sought to improve the use of science, providing certainty to landowners, providing flexibility on deadlines for listing species, creating a voluntary conservation program to promote species conservation on private lands, creating a technical assistance program to help small landowners, increasing the role of State and localities, ensuring accountability of the Department of Interior, ensuring that permit and license applicants fully participate in the consultations process, and requiring a balancing of risks in planning for species recovery (by a recorded vote of 206 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 505).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was adopted.

H. Res. 470, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 252 yeas to 171 nays, Roll No. 502, after agreeing to order the previous question without objection.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Thornberry to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through October 6, 2005.
OPERATIONS IN IRAQ

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on operations in Iraq. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary; GEN Richard B. Myers, USAF, Chairman; Joint Chiefs of Staff; GEN John Abizaid, USA, Commander, U.S. Central Command; and GEN George W. Casey, Jr., USA, Commanding General, Multi-National Force—Iraq.

UNDERSTANDING THE IRAN THREAT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on understanding the Iran threat. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CLOSING THE GAP IN AMERICA’S SCHOOLS: THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing entitled “Closing the Achievement Gap in America’s Schools: The No Child Left Behind Act.” Testimony was heard from Margaret Spellings, Secretary of Education; Deborah Jewell-Sherman, Superintendent, Richmond Public Schools, Richmond, Virginia; and a public witness.

HURRICANE KATRINA—ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled “Hurricane Katrina: Assessing the Present Environmental Status.” Testimony was heard from Marcus C. Peacock, Deputy Administrator, EPA; LTG Carl A. Strock, USA, Chief of Engineers, and Commander, U.S. Corps of Engineers; Henry Falk, M.D., Director, National Center for Environmental Health and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; Karen Gautreaux, Deputy Secretary, Department of Environmental Quality, State of Louisiana; and public witnesses.

DISASTER PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Public Safety Communications from 9/11 to Katrina: Critical Public Policy Lessons.” Testimony was heard from Kevin J. Martin, Chairman, FCC; David G. Boyd, Director, SAFECOM Program Office, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Vance Hitch, Chief Information Officer, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

MORTGAGE INDUSTRY LICENSING/REGISTRATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled “Licensing and Registration in the Mortgage Industry.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Government Reform: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 1317, amended, Federal Employee Protection of Disclosures Act; H.R. 3699, amended, Federal and District of Columbia Government Real Property Act of 2005; H. Res. 15, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Campus Safety Awareness Month; H. Res. 276, Supporting the goals and ideals of Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month; H.R. 3549, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 210 West 3rd Avenue in Warren, Pennsylvania, as the “William F. Clinger, Jr. Post Office Building;” H.R. 3830, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Marion Avenue in Punta Gorda, Florida, as the “U.S. Cleveland Post Office Building;” H.R. 3853, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 208 South Main Street in Parkdale, Arkansas, as the “Willie Vaughn Post Office;” H.R. 923, amended, Mailing Support to Troops Act of 2005; and H. Res. 389, Supporting the goals of The Year of the Museum.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY/HEALTH CARE

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled “The Last Frontier: Bringing the IT revolution in Healthcare.” Testimony was heard from David J. Brailer, M.D., National Coordinator, Health Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services; Robert M. Kolodner, M.D., Chief Health Informatics Officer, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

DISASTER PREPAREDNESS/COORDINATION

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology held a hearing entitled “Incident Command, Control, and Communications during Catastrophic Events.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EVOLVING COUNTERTERRORISM STRATEGY

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation held a hearing on Evolving Counterterrorism Strategy. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.
MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 3648, amended, To impose additional fees with respect to immigration services for intracompany transferees; H.R. 1065, as amended, without recommendation, United States Boxing Commission Act; H.R. 3647, amended, To render nationals of Denmark eligible to enter the United States as nonimmigrant traders and investors; and H.R. 1400, amended, Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2005.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE/U.S. CONSTITUTION
Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution approved for full Committee action H. Res. 97, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that judicial determinations regarding the meaning of the Constitution of the United States should not be based on judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions unless such foreign judgments, laws or pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

DUAL/BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP
Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims held an oversight hearing entitled “Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MARINE DEBRIS RESEARCH, PREVENTION, AND REDUCTION ACT
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans and the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a joint hearing on S. 362, Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act. Testimony was heard from Timothy R. E. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Oceans and Atmosphere, NOAA, Department of Commerce; RADM Tom Gilmour, USCG, Assistant Commandant, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 326, To amend the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 2000 to adjust the boundary of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area and to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance under that Act; H.R. 1436, To remove certain use restrictions on property located in Navajo County, Arizona; and H.R. 1972, Franklin National Battlefield Study Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Blackburn; Sue Masica, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

CONFERENCE REPORT—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS
Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 2360, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

ENTREPRENEUR SOLDIERS EMPOWERMENT ACT
Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight held a hearing to discuss the Entrepreneur Soldiers Empowerment Act (ESEA). Testimony was heard from Bill Elmore, Office of Veterans Affairs, SBA; John Winkler, Manpower and Personnel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director, CBO.

PEST MANAGEMENT AND FIRE SUPPRESSION FLEXIBILITY ACT
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on H.R. 1749, Pest Management and Fire Suppression Flexibility Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Otter and Cardoza; Benjamin H. Grumbles, Assistant Administrator, Water, EPA; and public witnesses.

U.S.-BAHRAIN FREE TRADE
Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on the Implementation of the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement. Testimony was heard from Shaun Donnelly, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative, Europe and the Mediterranean; and public witnesses.

MEDICARE VALUE-BASED PURCHASING FOR PHYSICIANS’ SERVICES ACT
Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 3617, Medicare Value-Based Purchasing for Physicians’ Services Act of 2005. Testimony was heard from Mark McClellan, M.D., Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.
Joint Meetings

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT


COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Hillen, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Barry F. Lowenkron, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, both of the Department of State, and Kent R. Hill, of Virginia, and Jacqueline Ellen Schafer, of the District of Columbia, both to be Assistant Administrator, United States Agency for International Development, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.
Program for Friday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. Senate expects to vote on final passage of a continuing resolution; following which, Senate expects to continue consideration of H.R. 2863, Defense Appropriations.

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 4 p.m.