



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 2006

No. 38

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Beauty and Everlasting Lord of all, cherry blossoms in Washington are a true sign of the new life of spring. They bring tourists from across the Nation and from around the world to marvel at fragile beauty and seek lasting promise here in the Nation's capital of these United States.

Lord, bless the work of Congress during these days of grace. May the freshness of new ideas and bold undertakings bolster the vigor of the Nation while the hard work of all Americans, the steadfast perseverance of military forces and the stability of family life sustain a climate of creativity and prosperity for all Your people.

While the hidden roots of faith penetrate the landscape upon which we walk and the far reaching branches of charity draw strength from the sky above, it is You who produce blossoms of hope in human hearts, living in an anxious yet cold world, and you do this here, now, and forever.

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 gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BERKLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

### LONE STAR VOICE: GARY SPURGER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Gary Spurger of Humble, Texas has written me about unlawful entry into the United States. He says:

"I am writing you as I sit here and listen to the news and watch on TV the protests against immigration policy reform. I am tired of seeing those protesters walking the streets that we taxpayers pay for, using our school buses and resources and then waving Mexican flags and chanting 'Mexico, Mexico.'"

"Please do not be blinded by the protests supporting illegal immigrants. If we don't take care of us then we will not have the ability to help others less fortunate. Allowing illegal immigrants to siphon off resources that they provide no compensation to will in the end be the fall of our society.

"We need to take heed of the lessons of history such as Rome. It fell from the inside by allowing fractured and discordant groups to maintain their own unique identity to the extent that it caused Rome to no longer be Rome but nothing more than a bunch of little other countries. Recent history is teaching us just by looking at France, it is no longer French but so inclusive to the point that France is nothing more than a hodgepodge of other cultures, not French."

Mr. Speaker, people that come to the United States must do so legally and they must expect to assimilate into this country and become Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

### YUCCA MOUNTAIN AND NUCLEAR WASTE

(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, just when I think the Department of Energy couldn't become more incompetent or dangerous, they do something that proves me wrong.

You will find this cartoon character on a taxpayer-funded Web site run by the Department of Energy. His job, Yucca Mountain Johnny, is to convince kids in Nevada that nuclear waste is okay and that the State of Nevada is a safe place to store nuclear waste.

What really bothers me is the message that Yucca Mountain Johnny is giving to our school children. This is akin to Joe Camel telling our school kids that smoking is healthy.

The Department of Energy ought to dump Yucca Johnny and his slanted, one-sided view of how our Nation should address the issue of nuclear waste disposal. We should stop using taxpayers' money to spread this message. It is despicable.

The Las Vegas Sun wrote in an editorial on March 25, "Children don't need a cartoon character to tell them what is easily understood by most people: nuclear waste is dangerous. Don't let anyone bury it in your backyard."

Save the people of the State of Nevada, the school children, and get rid of Yucca Mountain Johnny. It is disgusting.

### IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Representatives, we are aware of the awesome power that we have to make laws under which

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1323

we all are governed, but we are also uniquely acquainted with our own limitations. Polls may indeed show that a majority of our constituents today would simply like to see our current immigration laws enforced, but we are in a position to know that such is unreasonable.

Deciding whether our role is to lead or to follow is not a new conundrum. During the Constitutional Convention in 1787, George Washington counseled: "If to please the people we do what we ourselves disprove, how can we afterwards defend our work?" It might be comfortable in an election year to warm ourselves by the populist fire that we ourselves have stoked, but it is not leadership.

Leaders appeal to the better angels of our nature rather than bow to the manifestations of our baser instincts. The standard bearer of the modern conservative movement, Ronald Reagan, understood this very well when he talked about the shining city on the hill. In his farewell address he described this, "a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity, and if there had to be city walls," he said, "the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will to enter."

I hope that that is how we see it today.

#### DEMOCRATS UNVEIL PLAN FOR REAL SECURITY

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democrats in the House, the Senate and our Governors unveiled the Democratic plan for real security. This plan reveals the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans and the Bush administration in protecting our country.

Among the differences, the greatest danger we face is that al Qaeda gets nuclear weapons. The problem with getting nuclear weapons is how to find fissionable material. There is enough fissionable material lying around not properly guarded in the former Soviet Union for thousands of bombs. The Bush administration wants to get it out of there—in 30 years. Democrats say, Get it now, all of it, by 2010 before it is smuggled to al Qaeda to make nuclear weapons to use against American citizens.

We are rightly concerned about the Dubai Ports deal, who controls our ports, but more important is what comes into our ports. Eleven million shipping containers a year, 40-foot boxes, come into American ports. The Republicans, the Bush administration, inspects 5 percent of them. Democrats say, no shipping container, not one, should be put on a ship bound to an American port till it is electronically scanned and inspected by the United States in the foreign port so that no

atomic bomb gets put in there and we know about it before it gets on the ship, not after.

If we want to make our country safe, we better elect some Democrats.

#### CONGRATULATING OHIO GIRLS' STATE HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL CHAMPION MOUNT NOTRE DAME COUGARS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, while I was at home last week in Ohio's First Congressional District, I had the honor of attending a pep rally at Mount Notre Dame High School. The school spirit in that gym was really something to behold. Of course there was cause for celebration, since the Cougars captured their second Ohio girls' State basketball championship in the last 3 years with an overall record of 25-3. The Cougars faced a difficult road to the championship, including a regional final victory over a tough Oak Hills Lady Scots team, which also happens to be in my congressional district.

Mount Notre Dame basketball has become synonymous with success throughout the State of Ohio. Not only have they appeared in the State finals 3 years in a row, but this victory made the Cougars the first Cincinnati girls' basketball program to capture two State titles. It is also important to note that Mount Notre Dame excels in academics.

It is a great honor for me to recognize the success and achievements of these outstanding young women, their head coach Scott Rogers, his staff and the entire student body. Their hard work and dedication makes all Cincinnatians proud.

Go Cougars.

#### LOBBYING REFORM

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, it is time for a spring clean at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. In the wake of the Jack Abramoff scandal, public approval for this Congress is at an all-time low and voters are demanding new priorities for America. But rather than working to restore the public's trust, some are more interested in protecting the culture of business as usual. They are perfectly happy with their cozy relationships where highly paid lobbyists serve as their "back office," writing legislation, providing jobs to Members and relatives, and lavishing them with expensive dinners and trips.

Yesterday, for instance, the Senate missed an opportunity for real reform when it rejected new restrictions on lobbyist-sponsored travel, presidential libraries, and, most importantly, an independent office of public integrity.

Think about it. You can't take a ham sandwich from a lobbyist but you can

get on their private plane with a ham sandwich. That is what they are allowed to do. You could drive a truck through those types of reforms. The House Ethics Committee hasn't even met in more than a year when one Member here has pled guilty and three others are under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people won't accept the continuation of business as usual under the guise of real reform. When that gavel comes down, it is intended to open the people's House, not the auction house.

It is time for new priorities in America.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give the American people some straight talk on higher education. The Higher Education Act before Congress today will strengthen the Pell Grant program, expand Perkins student loans, and increase access to college for millions of worthy American students.

The Democrat substitute is called, quote, reverse the raid on student aid. Don't believe the hype. Not one student in America will receive less financial aid under our bill. Not one.

The heart of our bill is the Pell Grant program. Let's look at this chart to show the history of Pell Grant funding over 20 years. The yellow represents when the Democrats were in control of Congress. The red represents when Republicans were in control of Congress. Does that look like we have raided student aid to you? The last 3 years Democrats were in control of Congress, they had a Democrat House and a Democrat President and they cut Pell Grants every single year in a row.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of partisan slogans and election-year double talk. This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 609.

#### DEMOCRATIC REAL SECURITY PLAN: REAL SECURITY STARTS AT HOME

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday congressional Democrats unveiled our detailed agenda to fully secure our Nation. Since 9/11, we have worked to make America safer, and we have attempted to work in a nonpartisan way, the record will show. Immediately after 9/11, myself and some Democrats were given the assignment to structure ways of improving our intelligence, aiding our first responders, and securing our infrastructure.

And really it is unconscionable that some Republicans, some, have said that this party had to wait till yesterday to

provide an agenda. I don't know where they have been for the last 4 years. This is absolutely unacceptable. We pushed for a Homeland Security Department. We wanted a secretary to sit at the table and be part of the Cabinet. The independent 9/11 Commission gave President Bush failing grades on America's preparedness. Dirty bombs and other deadly materials are still able to enter the United States through unsecured ports and airports. The administration has failed to meet the basic needs.

Democrats have a plan. We will implement all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We will improve border security; invest in mass transit security; fully man, train and equip first responders; and we will screen 100 percent of the containers before they come into this country.

Mr. Speaker, we will make America safer.

□ 1015

#### WAR PLANS LEAKED TO SADDAM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week a disturbing report was released showing evidence of a security breach at U.S. Central Command in Doha, Qatar.

According to the report, Iraqi documents now in our possession show that Russian officials provided Saddam Hussein with intelligence on U.S. strategic planning during the lead-up to the war in Iraq. The documents say Russians provided the intelligence through "their sources inside the American Central Command in Doha," specific details 2 weeks before our troops entered Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small matter. U.S. CENTCOM in Qatar is the nerve center of our operations in Iraq. That's why it is absolutely vital that we have full confidence in the security of our operations there. With troops on the ground and in harm's way, it is essential that we seek to find out how this information was leaked and whether or not such leaks could still be happening.

While military officials have been slow to investigate, Congress should not be. Getting to the bottom of this should be a top priority of the House and Senate Intelligence and Armed Services Committees. Nothing less than the security of our troops is at stake.

#### ATTACK ON STUDENT AID

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, student aid is under serious attack. As I look at the 100 amendments that were blocked from being considered later on

today, we saw amendments that would have extended the Pell Grant to qualifying prisoners. That is an attack on student aid; an amendment that would have provided forgiveness for teachers who go into rural communities, that is an attack on student aid; amendments that would have restored \$12 billion to the student aid pool.

If those are not attacks on student aid, then I need to be educated.

#### CONGRATULATING KRISTINA SLATER

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to bring to the attention of the U.S. House a wonderful recognition of one of my constituents, Kristina Slater, and what she has just received. Just yesterday she was honored at the Pentagon with the Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service Award at the Secretary of the Army's annual awards ceremony.

This award stands for more than a certificate or a pin. It stands for superior commitment to excellence. It stands for dedication. It stands for remarkable pride in doing one's job day in and day out.

Kristina Slater's work exemplifies this. She was instrumental in helping transition various information, technology functions, finances, and manpower to meet current and future needs of the Army. The results of this are being met with strong operational success, vital to everyone involved.

We are all extremely proud of Kristina Slater and congratulate her on this wonderful honor. As the highest honorary award bestowed upon a civilian employee by the Army, this worthy achievement is a testament to Ms. Slater's diligent and loyal service to our Nation.

I know the House joins me in thanking Kristina Slater on this award and her selfless service and dedication to our Nation.

#### DEMOCRATIC PLANS FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democrats rolled out a plan for emergency and energy independence by 2020.

Mr. Speaker, as the spring arrives, gas prices are once again on the rise. America's dependence on foreign oil is up to 60 percent. Dependence on foreign sources of energy compromises our national security and makes families and businesses less secure because of high energy costs.

To free America from dependence on foreign oil, Democrats pledge to achieve energy independence for America by 2020 by eliminating reliance on oil from the Middle East and other un-

stable regions of the world. We will increase production of alternative fuels from America's heartland, including bio-fuels, clean oil, geothermal and fuel cells. We will also promote hybrid technology and enhance efficiency and conservation incentives.

During consideration of an energy bill last year, the Republican majority rejected many of these proposals when they were offered by Democrats. Under a Democratic majority, energy independence would finally become a reality. That is what people want.

#### TIP FOR DEMOCRATS ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, after many months, the Democrats have managed to release their so-called national security agenda; and one of the things their agenda calls for is improving border security.

Last year, House Republicans passed the Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act as well as the REAL ID Act. How do these bills protect our borders?

First, the Border Security Act increases penalties for illegal immigration and holds violators accountable to restore the integrity of our Nation's borders, reestablishes respect for our laws, and helps ensure that terrorists cannot enter the United States.

Second, the REAL ID Act federally standardizes the requirements for applying and issuing State identification cards because the 19 hijackers responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks carried between them 13 valid driver's licenses and 21 State-issued ID cards.

How did the Democrats vote on these issues? 164 of them opposed the Border Security Act and 152 opposed the REAL ID Act. So Democrats now want to improve border security? Here is a tip for them: start voting for legislation that does exactly that.

#### SEAL OUR BORDERS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the issue is not hard to understand. The American people understand this issue and we are getting lots of calls into our offices.

We have the immigration debate. As we talk about illegal immigration, as we discuss the problem of illegal entry into this country, we all know that you have to begin with the very first step. It has to be a priority and that priority is seal our borders.

We all learned in kindergarten that the beginning is a very good place to start. As we have this debate on illegal immigration and illegal entry into this country, let's begin at the very beginning by sealing the borders to this great Nation.

### DEMOCRATS WILL NOT PROTECT AMERICA

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday congressional Democrats outlined their agenda to better secure America. I must say I was a bit surprised by what they had to say. Even though America has not been attacked on our soil since September 11, 2001, even though the vast majority of the leadership of the al Qaeda has been killed or captured, even though we have toppled two dictatorships and brought freedom to 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan, even though funding has been dramatically increased to aid first responders, the Democrats are trying to peddle the idea that President Bush has failed to secure our Nation.

Even though it was the Democrats who gloated that they “killed the PATRIOT Act.” Even though it was the Democrats under the Clinton administration who gutted our intelligence operations. Even though it was leading Democrats who voted against giving our troops the funding and support they need to win the war on terror. Even though it was the Democrats who advocated a defeat and retreat strategy for Iraq.

I hope the American people will take a good look at the Democrats’ plan and who is offering it, because they will see once again that it is the Republican Party that is the one that will fight to the ends of the Earth to protect America.

### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE REMINDER

(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 greatly appreciate pharmacists, social workers and other caregivers who are working to help American seniors realize they have only 6 weeks to take advantage of an opportunity to save hundreds of dollars in the coming year.

Although over 27 million Americans have registered for the Medicare prescription drug program, additional seniors throughout our Nation are still eligible to sign up for this positive plan. I am glad that independent reports indicate that those who have registered say the total cost of all of their drugs is often less than the amount they were paying for just one prescription benefit in the past. Additionally, seniors who have consulted Medicare experts and insurance counselors are usually quite happy with their coverage.

As the May 15 registration deadlines draws near, I encourage American seniors to take advantage of this opportunity to significantly decrease their

drug expenses. Simply call 1-800-MEDICARE.

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

### PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 609, COLLEGE ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 742

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 609) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965. No further general debate shall be in order. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment 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 in 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 report the bill 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 to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 742 provides for a structured rule and continued debate on several additional amendments to H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005.

This second rule for H.R. 609 allows for the consideration of the Democratic substitute bill offered by the ranking Democratic member of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MILLER of California, and allows for 30 minutes of debate on that measure alone so the House will be able to debate and discuss the substitute’s vision of whether

it is appropriate to support the creation of at least eight new Federal education spending programs which are contained in that language.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like only yesterday we were discussing this bill. And with apologies for using baseball analogies; but it is spring training season and for a Cubs fan, hope looms always eternal. But to quote the great philosopher and relief pitcher for the Kansas City Royals, Dan Quisenberry: “I have seen the future. It is just like today, only longer.”

When we are talking today about how we help kids to fulfill their dreams of a college education, I think he is going to prove not only visionary but prophetic. What we talk about today I think will be the future, just longer.

This rule today allows eight important additional amendments to be brought forth, and they will be debated on the floor.

I think it is significant of the 117 amendments that were filed on this bill for the Rules Committee, 15 were made in order yesterday, another eight today. Half of yesterday’s and half of today’s will be either Democrat or bipartisan amendments.

□ 1030

This does not even begin to count the number of issues which were already worked out between the minority and the Education and Workforce staff and chairman in the base text of the bill over the past several months, or those items for Democratic Members which were included in the manager’s amendment which was passed by a voice vote yesterday.

I also want to statistically note that 44 of the amendments that were filed were in violation of our germaneness rule, including mandatory spending on new programs or invoking jurisdiction of other committees, including Judiciary and Ways and Means.

Twenty-five of the amendments were filed past the Rules Committee deadline.

Members are always advised to be sure of the procedure and the time deadlines for submitting amendments, and once again, we said yesterday, having the additional time before part two would give Members a chance to work out with the Parliamentarian’s Office the details of their particular amendments.

Eight amendments were withdrawn. Three were duplicative. Four were taken care of in the manager’s amendment from yesterday.

The underlying bill, H.R. 609, still strikes a very good balance between reauthorizing important and existing higher education assistance programs, while steering clear of social engineering mandates and massive new spending programs. At the same time, it returns the emphasis to the original intent of the 1965 Higher Education Assistance Act, to give students a hand up in helping them to earn their own higher education.

Once again, the goal of this bill is still simply to help more kids achieve their dream of a college education and not to try and funnel the money that can be used for them into other kinds of projects and programs. This is still a good bill and, more importantly, a fair rule, and it allows the minority to offer its comprehensive vision of the future with regard to these issues in the Miller substitute.

In conclusion, I ask that all Members support and to vote in favor of this rule so that we can complete our work on this important legislation and move closer to ensuring that more individuals and students than ever wanting a college education can indeed receive the help they need to do that.

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

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

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time as we continue into part two.

Today, we are considering a second rule to make in order amendments to the Republican majority's version of the higher education reauthorization. I had hoped we would have had the opportunity to continue a meaningful debate about how to best assist families and students across this Nation trying to pursue the college dream because a college education plays such a critical part in our lives.

As children, we all play at grown-up roles, dreaming of what we may be when we grow up, a teacher, an astronaut, a doctor, a scientist, an underwater adventurer or perhaps even a Member of Congress. Well, an education is what turns those dreams into reality, and with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we could have had an opportunity to play a role in encouraging these children's futures.

But to do that, we need to be looking at a reauthorization that reinforces our Nation's longstanding commitment to providing educational opportunities for all Americans, but alas, at the start of this year, my colleagues across the aisle pushed through the budget reconciliation package that cuts student loan programs by \$12 billion, the single largest cut to the Nation's Federal student aid programs ever.

Middle-income families are hard-pressed to keep up with rising tuition costs. Due to record high financial barriers, high school graduates who are fully prepared to attend a 4-year college are unable to do so.

While college tuition has continued to rise far faster than the cost of living, the maximum Pell Grant level has remained virtually constant, thus forcing many qualified students to postpone or cancel their dreams of a college degree or to incur significant debt in the form of loans.

Clearly, this bill has room for improvement. We could be debating a

number of thoughtful amendments that would help substantially increase our investment in student loan programs, recruit teachers and develop a high-skilled workforce. However, fewer than one in five amendments was made in order.

Take, for example, the amendment offered by Representative INSLEE to recruit Head Start teachers. I remember visiting the Nedra Court and Whispering Pines Head Start program in my district. The 60 students at each site definitely kept those teachers busy. This is a challenging job for which the \$20,000 salary really is not much of an incentive.

Yet, last year, the House passed H.R. 2123, the School Readiness Act, to reauthorize the Head Start program. Contained in that legislation was an unfunded mandate requiring Head Start teachers to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Representative INSLEE offered a straightforward amendment to increase student loan forgiveness programs to \$17,500, which is the same level allowed for other targeted forgiveness programs for high-need professions. However, we will not be allowed to debate this amendment because the Republican majority are limiting the democratic process.

And those \$12 billion in cuts from the Deficit Reduction Act, Representative EMANUEL had an amendment that would restore the \$12 billion to student aid programs cut in the Deficit Reduction Act. I think I hear about the negative impacts of these student aid cuts at least every other day, whether I am home in Sacramento or here in Washington, D.C. I find it hard to believe every other Member is not hearing this as well. But that amendment was not made in order.

Nor was the bipartisan Student Aid Reward amendment. At no additional cost to taxpayers, the STAR amendment would generate more than \$12 billion in additional college scholarship aid.

Representatives HOLT and KIND also crafted an exceptional amendment to promote students to study and enter into careers focused on math, science, engineering and technology. At a time of increasing concern about America's competitiveness in the world, these are fields we must promote to develop an engaged workforce.

I recently toured the UC Davis Center for Biophotonics in my district. This center explores how light and lasers can be applied to medical procedures, making for less invasive treatments and better diagnoses of cancer. The center has dozens of math and science graduate students assisting with research alongside the Nation's leading biophotonics experts.

Unfortunately, today we are sending a mixed message to students: We need you to pursue math and sciences, but we will not ensure that you can afford the education to enter these fields.

Today, the economic, social and civic importance of a college education has

never been more important. Yet, college enrollment rates in the United States are stagnant. As more and more baby boomers begin to retire, we will be facing a crisis in the employment market if we cannot develop a highly skilled and trained workforce. This must be a national priority, but apparently not for this Congress.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the time.

I had concerns about this bill as well. As Republicans, we are not in favor of increasing government but decreasing the amount of restrictions that additional bureaucracy creates, and I saw part of this that created additional bureaucracy by allowing States to start accrediting.

But before I say anything else, there has been a great deal of misinformation about what the Deficit Reduction Act did. Having two children in college right now myself and another about to start next year, I have been particularly sensitive about this issue. I have had bankers and other educators saying, we understood you cut \$12 billion in the Deficit Reduction Act for money that was available for students, and that is not right.

What occurred was there was a reduction by about \$12 billion of subsidies that were going to banks for making the student loans, but the fact is there was around \$9.5 billion increased in the amount available for student loans and grants and funding. So we increased, not decreased, by about \$9.5 billion the amount available for students.

So it was a good thing, and we recognize the importance of education, and we are trying to help them. So that addresses that comment from my colleague.

But with regard to the bill, I have grave concerns about it, especially to allow the States to start accrediting. Governments have done enough damage to education in K-12 over the last 30 years. I was very concerned about that, but I appreciate Chairman MCKEON working with me, and I appreciate his staff working with us.

They have agreed to support an amendment which strikes out the provision that allows States to apply to the Federal Government which creates more Federal Government, to allow them to start accrediting, and that provision, under my amendment, will be struck. There will be no additional State agencies accrediting universities and colleges, and I am hopeful that that will be passed with the chairman's support of that.

Also, we share a very strong concern about the increases in college tuition and fees. They have dramatically gone up over the last 30 years. In fact, I was asking, when I went to law school, if it was still \$500 a semester for tuition, and they said, yeah, that much an hour

now, but anyway, over a 30-year time, things have just gone up dramatically.

In balancing the difficulty of not increasing government, which naturally requires an increasing cost to universities but at the same time requiring some accountability, I think the chairman's bill, if my two provisions are passed, that this is a good bill because it balances those things.

The task force that is created in the top five most abusive colleges in raising tuition over a 3-year period and costs of the college, they will have to set up their own task force to figure out why their institution has gotten so abusive in its costs. So it will be its own people looking at its own institution. It will not set up more bureaucracy. It will not set up more government, and this will push and provide pressure on institutions and have some accountability, even though it is by people in their own community, as the bill sets out, as amended, if my amendment is allowed to pass.

So I applaud the bill if my amendment, those two provisions, pass. I think it will be helpful in controlling costs without increasing bureaucracies in government, and I appreciate very much Mr. BISHOP and the chairman and his staff in working with us on this.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and in strong opposition to H.R. 609, the underlying bill.

As a matter of fact, I had hoped when we started the process that we were going to see a bipartisan effort because all of us talk about how great and how important education is, and I do not think that there is a single person in this House who would not agree with that. But oftentimes I am afraid that our conversations are different than our actions.

When I look at this restrictive rule, it prevents us from discussing and debating at least 100 amendments, 100 ideas, perhaps even 100 programs at different ways to look at and try to improve access to college education for thousands and thousands of individuals in our country who will be left out and left behind, with no, or virtually no, hope of ever reaching mainstream society because they would not have had the chance.

Yet, philosophically, when we think of education, I was thinking of something that Abraham Lincoln was supposed to have said at one time, and that is, that education makes a man easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave.

So we should have been trying to provide the highest level of opportunity for every individual in our country to grasp for that great opportunity.

□ 1045

I had two amendments that I consider to be very minor, meager amend-

ments that I had hoped to have made in order. One of them would have restored Pell Grants to thousands of individuals who are currently incarcerated with little skill, little training, and little possibility without the additional education. And yet that amendment, and we are the most incarcerated Nation on the face of the Earth, with more than 2 million people languishing in jails and prisons, knowing full well that most of them will return within a short period of time if they do not acquire some of this great opportunity that we call education, that amendment, unfortunately, was shot down.

The second one would have provided a modest sum of money, only \$25 million, for predominantly black student-serving institutions that are serving a low-income population, most of them being the first in their family to have a chance to go to college. The schools they attend do not qualify as part of the historically black college and university network, and yet they will not be allowed to get the little additional resources.

I do want to thank Mr. PICKERING for his sponsorship of this amendment. Hopefully, if it didn't make it this round, of course we will be back and hopefully, eventually, it will happen.

I did have one amendment, and I am grateful to the majority for including that idea in the manager's amendment, to have the Secretary of Education take a hard look at why there is such a heavy disparity between African American males, for example, who are attending colleges and universities and other parts of the American population.

When we look at the bill in every way that we can, and I know that I have heard my colleagues come to the floor and say that this is not a raid on student aid; that this is expanding opportunity; that this is making education more affordable, I know that they believe what they are saying. I just can't figure out which playbook they are reading from when you take a government that takes away money and gives back tax dollars to the wealthy.

Education is so vitally important that we do ourselves and we do this Nation a disservice when we prevent any individual from having an opportunity to acquire it.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is with great disappointment today that I rise to voice my opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Higher education has become more important than ever in ensuring America's economic prosperity, national security, and health. A quality college degree is the cornerstone of the American Dream, opening the doors of opportunity and professional fulfillment.

For decades, the Federal Government has been a partner with States and col-

leges in creating opportunity and access to college, especially for middle- and lower-income students. But today, just 2 months after the Republicans voted to raid Federal student aid by \$12 billion, a vote which passed by only two votes, Republicans once again are pushing through a higher education bill that does not help American families pay for college. Why? Well, it is because the Republican Party is apparently more interested in tax cuts for corporations and for oil companies.

Traditionally, the Higher Education Act has enjoyed widespread bipartisan support. But today, instead of meaningful debate about the future of our students and our country, a debate that would provide accountability and access and opportunity, we find that debate has been blocked by the Republican majority.

The Higher Education Act should be about creating access to vocational training and college for millions of America's students and adults who find themselves having to get reeducated in this tough economy. The reauthorization law should serve as an opportunity to improve the current law and make college more accessible.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill does nothing to make college more affordable, and in fact it raids student aid. And it does this at a time when tuition is rising faster than the rate of inflation; at a time when financial aid for America's families is not keeping up with the rising cost of a college education; and at a time when this Congress will be voting for tax giveaways for the Nation's wealthiest. In other words, as a former teacher, I give this higher education bill a failing grade. And it gets a failing grade because it misses the opportunity to promote students' abilities to afford college and to make America more economically secure.

This dramatic rise in tuition that I spoke about earlier over the past decade can only be explained by our lack of participating and making college more affordable at a Federal level, but also many of our States also get a failing grade for their participation in making higher education affordable for all students. When we put the dream of a college education out of reach for Americans, America suffers. When we put the dream of being able to afford a college education out of reach for Americans, our students suffer.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment, along with Mr. TIERNEY, that would have presented a real solution to the college affordability issue, offering an achievable goal for the Federal Government to work in partnership with States to have accountability, to provide the opportunity for the American Dream for millions more families. Unfortunately, this opportunity was missed when our amendment was ruled out of order. We would have ensured that students and colleges in my district and districts all over this country would have invested

in a competitive fashion in order to make our students and our country more able to compete in the future.

Why has Congress backed away from their future? Well, the answer is simple. Congress backed away because they wanted to take \$12 billion that could have been put back into the higher education bill. They raided that \$12 billion and gave it to corporations.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, later today this House will have an opportunity to reverse one of the more egregious things that we have done, or those who voted for it have done, against the interest of America's economy, of America's institutions of higher education, for the students who are attending them, and the families that are supporting them. And that was when earlier this year in the budget reconciliation bill, this Congress, under Republican leadership, cut \$12 billion out of the student aid accounts and foisted a higher cost onto students and their families at the exact time when the increased cost of college education is outstripping the ability of those families to afford that education.

We are starting to see an increasing number of young people who are fully qualified, who would fully benefit from a college education who are now deciding maybe they can't do it because they can't afford it. The exact purpose of the Federal Government's involvement in helping to finance higher education for America's students is to make sure that no qualified student is turned away from that opportunity because of cost.

So today, in our substitute, we will have the opportunity to make a down payment on reversing those costs for those families and those students most in need. And what we will do is we will cut the new interest rate that is going to go into place in July at 6.8 percent on these loans. We would reduce that to 3.4 percent, and this would be a down payment for 1 year. We obviously hope that the Congress would follow on and continue that effort so that these students can afford that education.

It is just incredible what was done in that budget reconciliation. Over 70 percent of the net savings that comes from excessive fees that we identify, and excessive interest rates that are charged to families and to students, rather than return what are identified as excessive rates to those families so they can help pay for their college education, we took those, the Congress took those, the Republicans took those and gave them in tax cuts to the wealthiest people in the country.

So these people will continue to pay excessive interest rates, but they will not get it returned to them. It will go

to pay for the tax cuts. They want to say it is for deficit reduction. It wasn't for deficit reduction. It was to pay for the tax cuts, either the tax cuts for the oil companies or the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country.

So it is very important that all Members give very serious consideration to this substitute. It will be offered by myself and Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, DANNY DAVIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA as a way of doing this. It also provides for establishing a new predominantly black-serving institutions program to boost college preparation rates among low-income black students, and it also provides for increasing the tribal college minimum grants. It stabilizes tribal college construction to ensure that the funds for construction under the Higher Education Act are guaranteed.

It takes a number of the provisions that are in the underlying bill that help Hispanic teaching institutions and gets rid of the single-lender rule so that people can have an option about where they go to refinance and renegotiate their college loans.

But it is a very important substitute. It is, in fact, a down payment on behalf of American students, on behalf of America's families, and on behalf of America's economy. It is about economic and national security because it ensures that young Americans with a lot of talent will not be shut out of college because of the increased cost imposed upon them by the Republicans' actions earlier this year in the Budget Reconciliation Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Higher Education Act that will be reauthorized today by this House is a good bill because it strengthens the Pell Grant program, it expands Perkins loans, and it increases access to college for millions of people.

Now, we have just heard from the other side that they have a substitute that is better, called Reverse the Raid on Financial Aid. Now, let's just take a look at whether this is an actual true statement, whether the Republican Party has been raiding financial aid.

I have here a chart that shows the history of Pell Grants for the past 20 years. And of course Pell Grants are the heart of this higher education reauthorization bill. Shown here in yellow are the Pell Grant funding levels when the Democrats were in control of the Congress. Shown here in red are when Republicans have been in control in Congress.

Looking at this over the past 20 years, does it really look like Republicans have raided financial aid? Are you kidding me? You can easily see from these figures that under a Republican Congress financial aid has increased dramatically.

□ 1100

In fact, if you look at the last 3 years when Democrats were the majority in Congress, you see something pretty interesting. You see, in 1992, they had funded Pell Grants at \$2,400, and then they got a Democrat President in the White House, Bill Clinton. And with a Democrat President and a Democrat House of Representatives, what happened next? They cut Pell Grants 3 years in a row.

And then they come before us today with this partisan slogan and election-year double talk saying we have raided financial aid. Don't believe the hype. Not one student in America will receive less financial aid under this bill, not one.

They say, well, tell you what, instead of the 6.8 percent that all of the Democrats agreed to back in 2002 as part of a bipartisan compromise that fixes the interest rate, let's now for the first time in the interest of election year politics say we will give students a 3.4 percent interest rate which will cost \$2.7 billion for 1 year. How do they pay for it? They don't tell us. They don't have any way to pay for it. Why not just say zero percent? That sounds even better, but it is irresponsible, and it breaks an agreement they made that was bipartisan and was in compliance with what student groups said.

Now, let me show how we have fared with the Pell Grant program since President Bush has been in office. Actually, I need another chart, if I can have it. While they are pulling that chart, I will just tell Members what it is.

In the year 2000, when I was elected and President Bush was elected, we funded Pell Grants at \$7.6 billion. This past year, we funded Pell Grants at \$13 billion, a 71 percent increase in Pell Grant funding. Yet what slogan do we hear from the other side? Reverse the raid on financial aid. It is crazy.

The next figure, I will show, if my chart were here, that, in 2000, the maximum award was worth \$3,300 per student. This year, it is \$4,050, and under this bill, we provide an additional \$1,000 taking up to \$5,050 for those high achieving, low-income students.

Finally, since 2000, we have seen a 36 percent increase in the number of students able to get Pell Grants. In 2000, we had 3.9 million students. This year, we have 5.3 million students. So not only have we dramatically increased the funding for Pell Grants, we have been able to do it despite the dramatic increase in the number of students.

For Members to appreciate how big a jump this is to go from \$3,300 to \$4,050, let me explain it. Every \$100 that we increase the maximum Pell Grant award costs us \$420 million. We have made the most historic and largest increases in the history of the Pell Grant program; and the other side has nothing to say except "reverse the raid on financial aid."

Mr. Speaker, this is a darn good bill. It increases funding for Pell Grants. It

expands the Perkins Student Loan Program, and it is going to help millions of students go to college who otherwise would not have the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this fair rule and vote "yes" on this excellent bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning to continue debate on a bill that forms the backbone of the opportunities our Nation's students may have at our Nation's colleges and universities. We must get it right which is precisely why this House must reject the rule before us.

As I reminded my colleagues yesterday, the House reauthorized the Higher Education Act in 1992 and in 1998 in a very different way than we have seen in the 109th Congress. Historically, any amendment to the Higher Education Act that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ahead of time could be offered on the floor.

The broad consideration those rules provided yielded reauthorization measures with broad support in the House. Each of those years, the rules, the bills and the conference reports passed either by voice vote or by overwhelming margins.

So my colleagues will forgive me when I place the historical record on reauthorization next to this year's bill and ask: What happened?

Instead of a bipartisan bill, we see the Higher Education Act torn in two by the majority, solely so some of its provisions could be used to cut more than \$12 billion from student aid partially to finance the majority's tax cuts. Instead of careful floor consideration of several different policy approaches, we saw 118 amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules but only 23 amendments were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of all of the amendments to H.R. 609 submitted to the Committee on Rules but not made in order under either of the two rules.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 97—(Late) Requires institutes of higher education to request emergency contact information on enrollment forms.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 98—(Late) Allows students, whose parents refuse to provide financial information on FAFSA forms, to receive unsubsidized loans.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 99—(Late) Provides right of action for students to sue IREs for violations of privacy rights.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 100—(Late) Provides that federal aid be given without regard to university aid, which could then be given on top.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 101—(Late) Requires personal computers that are disposed of by IHEs be fully scrubbed of all personal information.

Andrews (NJ)/Price (GA)—No. 105—(Late) Requires IHEs to distribute materials on meningitis to new students along with the other general disclosures they are required to provide.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 106—(Late) Protects the award levels of institutions that report at least at 75% of their students come from

families with incomes that are within 150% of the poverty line.

Andrews (NJ)/Price (GA)—No. 117—(Late) Requires IHEs to distribute materials on meningitis to new students along with the other general disclosures they are required to provide.

Berman (CA)/Bono (CA)/Goodlatte (VA)/Hoyer (MD)—No. 61—Requires colleges and universities to report whether they are taking steps to prevent illegal downloading of copyrighted material on their campus information technology systems.

Bishop (UT)—No. 32—(Withdrawn) Ensures that state and local education officials, as well as private schools and parents of home schooled students, retain control over secondary school curriculum for purposes of eligibility under the new Academic Competitiveness Pell Grants program. Potential control over this curriculum was improperly given in-part to the Secretary of Education by the portion of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 which created this program.

Bishop (NY)—No. 34—Increases oversight on the administration of the ability to benefit test.

Bishop (NY)—No. 36—Blocks any Department of Education funds from being used to recall Perkins loan funds.

Bishop (NY)—No. 37—Extends the Tuition Deduction for Higher Education through 12/31/2011.

Cole (OK)/Payne (NJ)—No. 2—(Withdrawn) Strikes Section 402(c) from the bill to eliminate the 10 percent set aside for novice TRIO applicants.

Davis (IL)/Owens (NY)/Pickering (MS)—No. 80—Includes predominantly black institutions into existing higher education efforts to strengthen the ability of minority-serving institutions to attract, retain, and graduate low-income students.

Davis (IL)—No. 81—Re-extends Pell eligibility to individuals in prison in an effort to increase successful transitions into the community and reduce recidivism.

Davis (IL)—No. 82—(Withdrawn) Revises the study on minority graduation rates that was included in H.R. 609 as reported by Committee to be consistent with recommendations made by the Department of Education and the National Center for Education Statistics.

Davis (CA)—No. 14—Prevents contributions made by military service members to the Montgomery GI Bill (MGJB) program from causing any reductions to a veteran student's eligibility for federal student financial aid.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 16—Provides grants to states and local education agencies seeking to create teacher preparation activities. In order to qualify, agencies must have a written agreement with a local college or university where the teaching residents will enroll and complete a Masters Degree in teaching; teaching residents will spend no less than 10 months in a classroom with an experienced mentor teacher; and teaching residents must sign a written agreement with the local education agency agreeing to teach in that district for a minimum of five years.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 17—Instructs the Secretary of Education to reduce the number of questions on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form by 50 percent within 5 years.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 18—Simplifies the application process for the neediest students with automatic qualification for the maximum aid awards through federal means tested programs (such as Free and Reduced Price School lunches). Raises the automatic zero income threshold to \$25,000 (from \$20,000) and adjusts the threshold annually according to the Consumer Price Index. Also eliminates certain nontaxable income data elements from the FAFSA form.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 19—Restores the \$12 billion to student aid programs that the Deficit Reduction Act cut.

Engell (NY)—No. 88—(Late) Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that, in an effort to raise awareness about sexual assault, all colleges and universities should provide a training course to incoming students to educate them on sexual assault.

Etheridge (NC)—No. 47—Adds Fayetteville State University to the list of schools eligible for funding under Title III B of HEA.

Fattah (PA)—No. 107—(Late) Establishes a new and distinct Dual Enrollment Section as an addendum to the current GEAR UP program. This section is essentially an additional programmatic element that would specifically target resources and services towards the promotion of dual enrollment among low income students participating in GEAR UP programs throughout the country. The language was drafted in a manner that adds a new section to GEAR UP, and attaches a separate appropriation for this section, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the succeeding five years. In short, dual/concurrent enrollment is defined as the practice by which high school students may enroll in college courses while still enrolled in high school. Students receive college credits but are not required to apply for admission to the college in order to participate.

Fattah (PA)—No. 108—(Late) Adjusts the minimum scholarship amount in which grantees are required by law to distribute in accordance with the requirements of the program from the maximum Federal Pell Grant to the minimum Federal Pell grant awarded.

Fattah (PA)—No. 109—(Late) Creates legislative action to take precedence over current agency regulations which prevent new funds appropriated under new authorizing legislation to be used to provide services under old authorizing legislation. With this amendment, funds will be permitted for use with current GEAR UP students who have not yet graduated from high school.

Gingrey (GA)—No. 104—(Withdrawn) Ensures economically eligible students enrolled in a full-time, university level, academically gifted program, but are of traditional high school age, qualify for Pell Grants. Students affected by the amendment are full time university students who reside on campus as a requirement of the gifted program. The students do not attend high school courses, nor will they return to a high school classroom as a student.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 58—Offers loan forgiveness for teachers who work in schools located on Native American reservations or in Indian Country who complete five years of service.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 59—Offers loan forgiveness for educators working at high poverty (Title I eligible) and large free-and-reduced lunch population Border Schools within the 100 mile region of the US-Mexico border who complete 5 years of service. Seeks to reduce the burden of student debt for Americans who dedicate their careers to service in areas of national need along the border.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 60—Offers loan forgiveness for teachers who work in rural schools located in low-income communities who complete five years of service.

Holt (NJ)/Bishop (NY)—No. 33—Rebates students who lost Pell Grant eligibility due to changes in the state tax tables, and replaces the tax tables with the highest income protection allowance.

Holt (NJ)—No. 50—Authorizes \$15 million in grants to institutions of higher education to establish programs that encourage students to develop foreign language proficiency as well as science and technological knowledge. Eligible institutions will develop



programs in which students take courses in science, math and technology taught in a foreign language. Funds will also support immersion programs for students to take science and math courses in a non-English speaking country.

Holt (NJ)—No. 51—Creates the opportunity for school systems to complete a Needs Assessment in science, mathematics, and foreign languages to guide teacher professional development and classroom improvement. The Needs Assessment will include as many education stakeholders as possible, including teachers, administrators, parents, school boards, businesses, institutions of higher education, professional associations, and others as determined by the community. The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to properly direct funds and energy to necessary and ambitious teacher professional development and classroom improvement.

Holt (NJ)—No. 52—Creates year-round professional development for mathematics, science, vocational education, and technical course teachers inspired by reports like the NAS' "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" and the Glenn Commission's "Before Its Too Late". The process begins with a two week summer institute at an institution of higher education targeted to improve content knowledge of, grade level teaching of, and the use of technology in the disciplines in which they teach. The professional development continues with meetings to discuss new scientific, industrial, and academic research and how to incorporate it into classroom practice. Additionally, an online community is created to further foster a collaborative learning community amongst teachers that exceeds the limits of a once a month gathering.

Hooley (OR)—No. 46—Creates a Technology Education State Stimulus Scholarship Program, that will allow the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to provide supplementary scholarships to students for study at the postsecondary level in science, math, engineering, or a related field.

Inslie (WA)—No. 25—Seeks to retain Head Start and Early Head Start teachers by increasing the level of discretionary loan forgiveness from \$5,000 to \$17,500 (the level for math and science teachers). Seeks to address the unfunded mandate passed in School Readiness Act (H.R. 2123) requiring 50 percent of Head Start and Early Head Start teachers to obtain a bachelor's degree in early education by 2011.

Inslie (WA)/Wu (OR)—No. 26—Instructs the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (ACSFA) to assess the increasing cost of college textbooks and the effect on access to higher education, and to recommend strategies for reducing the costs. Currently, ACSFA operates within the Department of Education to advise and counsel Congress and the secretary of education on student financial policy, focusing only on financial aid. Allows the ACSFA to consider total costs, including textbooks, that may affect overall costs and access to postsecondary education.

Israel (NY)—No. 66—Requires the Department of Education to study and report on methods of encouraging centers of higher education, and their students, to study topics and regions important to our nation's national security, such as Islamic studies and China studies.

Israel (NY)—No. 67—Directs the Secretary of Education to match, on a 1:1 basis, any funding set aside by National Security Education Trust Fund (NSETF) for the National Security Education Program, thereby doubling the funding of this program.

Israel (NY)—No. 68—Directs the Secretary of Education to make grants to eligible members of the Armed Services to pay tuition

and other authorized fees to an educational institution in which the service member is enrolled. The funds made available for these grants shall match, on a 1:1 basis, funding set aside by the Secretaries of the military departments.

Israel (NY)—No. 20—(Withdrawn) Requires the Department of Education to study and report on methods of encouraging centers of higher education, and their students, to study topics and regions important to our nation's national security, such as Islamic studies and China studies.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 73—Expresses the Sense of Congress encouraging publishers, professors, and universities to ensure accessibility of braille textbooks for blind or vision-impaired students.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 74—Commends a study of students in higher education with learning disabilities.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 55—Increases the maximum Pell grant from \$6,000 to \$7,350.

Jefferson (LA)—No. 38—Seeks to provide an additional semester of Pell Grant eligibility to college students who (1) attended school in an "area affected by the Gulf hurricane disaster"; (2) were dependents whose parents lived and were employed in the area; or (3) whose education was interrupted by the disaster. Also directs the Secretary of Education to increase the annual loan limits by \$3,500 for affected students; eligible students may elect to apply the loan increase to either the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school years.

Jefferson (LA)—No. 110—(Late) Establishes a low-cost relief loan program to make available low-cost, long-term, guaranteed loans to eligible institutions of higher education for expenses relating to the losses incurred during and after the gulf coast hurricane disasters including: construction and rehabilitation, faculty salaries and benefits and to supplement the institution's operations. The loan should be repayable over 50 years and the Secretary will determine the loan amount.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 64—Expands anti-discrimination measures to preclude institutions of higher education from using Federal financial assistance to perform any study or fulfill any contract that prohibits persons of a particular color, ethnicity, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation or national origin from performing that study or executing that contract. Institutions are not prevented from conducting objective studies pertaining to discrimination or including the subject of discrimination in its curriculum.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 65—Expands Pell grant eligibility to children who lost a parent or guardian as a result of the conflicts in Iraq or Afghanistan. These children will be eligible for the maximum amount of Pell grant assistance.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 62—Changes eligibility standards for Academic Competitiveness Grants by requiring recipients to also be Pell recipients, as opposed to the current requirement of Pell eligible. Academic Competitiveness Grants are not to exceed that of a student's Pell grant, with first year awards adjusted from \$750 to \$1,000, and second year awards adjusted from \$1,300 to \$1,050. Academic Competitiveness Grant recipients will be given top priority for SMART Grants.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 63—Expands Pell grant eligibility to children who lost a parent or guardian as a result of Hurricanes Katrina or Rita. These children would be eligible for the maximum amount of Pell grant assistance.

Kind (WI)/Van Hollen (MD)—No. 30—Reinstates the eligibility of undergraduates in Section 602(b), Foreign Language Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships, for advanced level

training in foreign language, world area, and other international studies. It also clarifies that undergraduates may use the fellowships while studying abroad.

Kind (WI)/Holt (NJ)—No. 31—Provides institutions of higher education with grants to institute creative and innovative ways of encouraging students to study and enter into careers focused on math, science, engineering, and technology.

Lantos (CA)—No. 24—Makes a technical correction to the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) program to clarify Congressional intent that a Masters Degree level institution or program is eligible to be the lead recipient of a grant under the GAANN program.

Lee (CA)—No. 15—Makes school counselors, school social workers and school psychologists eligible for student loan forgiveness program and identifies them as an "in need" profession in our elementary and secondary schools.

Lewis (KY)—No. 49—(Withdrawn) Strikes a provision from the legislation to allow states to become accreditors of independent colleges and universities. Regional accrediting entities now assure that colleges and universities are meeting standards. Prohibits state intervention into private and independent colleges and universities.

McCarthy (NY)—No. 21—Requires teacher preparation programs to publicly report on the number and type of teachers they are preparing.

McCarthy (NY)/Andrews (NJ)—No. 22—Includes nursing schools in Section 102, "Institutions Outside the United States".

McCarthy (NY)—No. 23—Creates a pilot program to increase the number of graduate educated nurse faculty to meet the future need for qualified nurses.

McCollum (MN)—No. 75—Requires colleges that participate in Federal financial aid programs to disclose information to students and the Department of Education about the college's compliance with U.S. regulations that prohibit bonuses to admissions counselors for their recruitment efforts.

McCollum (MN)—No. 96—(Late) Strikes Section 204 and related sections. This amendment strikes the Teacher Incentive Fund provisions and requires the Secretary of Education to direct any funds appropriated for the Teacher Incentive Fund to financial assistance to higher education institutions located in areas affected by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 4—Makes mentoring a component of the community services programs under work-study. The program can be coordinated between the eligible institution and the public and private organizations and entities that will participate in providing mentoring for children in foster care (such as faith-based organizations, foster care/adoption agencies, children's groups, State Departments of Social Services, public school systems).

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 3—Directs the Secretary of Education to advocate for and support the addition of foster-care mentoring programs as part of the independent study requirements if such independent study requirements are required for graduation in the following areas of Education, Sociology, and Psychology at 4-year or 2-year institutions. The duration of the program would be as outlined by academic requirements for graduation.

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 6—Clarifies the due process owed to educational institutions throughout the accreditation process. The amendment would: (1) provide express Congressional definition of minimum due process for educational institutions; and (2) require key accreditation decision making to be made in public and after an opportunity for public comment.

Miller (NC)/Bishop (NY)—No. 89—(Late) Establishes a pre-competitive innovation investment grant program that will assist colleges and universities in establishing precompetitive technology transfer centers.

Miller (CA)/McCarthy (NY)—No. 91—(Late) Offers up-front tuition assistance to undergraduates committed to a teaching career, and seeks to establish teachers infields like math and science. Establishes grants with which local districts can provide competitive salaries to their best teachers in the most high-need areas.

Norton (DC)—No. 93—(Late) Amends title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include the University of the District of Columbia as an eligible institution in Section 326 to receive funding for its qualified graduate programs.

Norton (DC)—No. 95—(Late) Amends Section 496 to clarify the current statutory due process requirements, require cited institutions to receive notice of the deficiencies and be provided the opportunity to respond, grant cited institutions the right to assistance of counsel, and change the final appeals procedure to provide an alternative dispute resolution component.

Petri (WI)/Miller (CA)—No. 27—Inserts at the end of part G of title IV of the bill, the provisions of HR 1425, the Student Aid Reward Program.

Ryan (OH)—No. 8—Requires the Education Secretary to award grants of not more than \$25,000 each on a competitive basis to not more than 20 institutions of higher education to enable those schools to determine the feasibility of operating a course material rental program on their campuses. The feasibility studies would determine the effectiveness and cost of a program which expands the services of bookstores to provide the option for students to rent course materials in order to achieve savings for students.

Ryan (OH)—No. 7—Requires institutions of higher education to waive academic progress requirements for interruptions of study caused by active military service.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 111—(Late) Adds language so that paragraph 4 of section 513 enables students receiving financial assistance to receive some sufficient to cover elevated costs of living that exist in some regions.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 112—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(b)(1) will require the website to provide, along with other data elements of importance, information which will be useful to minority student populations. For example, by including Hispanic Serving Institutions as a search criterion in the website's college search, students will be able to target the universities which may provide scholarships or areas of study of their preference.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 113—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(b)(3)(B) reads as follows: "includes clear and uniform information determined to be relevant to prospective students, enrolled students, and families; in both English and Spanish". This amendment will require all the information in the website to be presented in both English and Spanish.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 114—(Late) Adds a new paragraph so that the new SECTION 131(c)(2) requires the schools in the website to present a list of scholarships they offer. This will help students who are eligible for specific scholarships to identify institutions who offer that specific type of scholarship.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 115—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(d) will require the information under this section to be in both English and Spanish.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 116—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 401A(a)(1)

will oblige recipients of federal student aid to receive some instruction in financial literacy and responsibility to better manage their financial aid.

Scott (GA)/Drake (VA)/Weiner (NY)—No. 69—Establishes a student loan repayment program within the Department of Education for borrowers who agree to remain employed, for at least three years, as public attorneys who are: (1) State or local criminal prosecutors; or (2) State, Local, or Federal public defenders in criminal cases. The repayment under this program will be limited to \$6000 per calendar year and \$40,000 total.

Scott (VA)—No. 83—Requires degree granting institutions to collect hate crimes data using the same crime categories that the FBI is required to use under the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1991.

Strickland (OH)—No. 70—Requires that the maximum authorized Pell grant award increases every year by a percentage equal to the percent increase in the cost of higher education, according to the Price Indexes for Personal Consumption Expenditures by Type of Product of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce.

Strickland (OH)—No. 71—Defines and sets minimum standards for "educational organizations" eligible for teacher education partnership grants under Title II of the bill.

Strickland (OH)—No. 53—Expands the loan forgiveness program for FFEL and DL borrowers to all teachers working in low-income schools who became first-time borrowers on or after October 1, 1990.

Stupak (MI)—No. 78—Provides Federal student loan relief to borrowers who go into school administration in low-income school districts. Applies to any borrower who has been employed as a full-time school superintendent, principal, or other administrator for five consecutive complete school years in a school district in a low-income area.

Tierney (MA)/Kind (WI)—No. 76—Prohibits the campus-based aid funding formula changes from taking place until the Secretary of Education certifies that sufficient funding has been appropriated so that no school loses money.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 40—Provides incentives to make tuition affordable. Provides that any institution of higher education that keeps its net tuition price increase below the Higher Education Price Index receives a 25 percent increase to the Pell Grant award of its Pell Grant recipients and any institution that guarantees net tuition price increases below the Higher Education Price Index for five years receives a 10 percent increase to the Pell Grant award of its Pell Grant recipients. Institutions that raise net tuition price by more than the Higher Education Price Index shall submit a report explaining the causes of such an increase and detailing a plan for preventing such increases in the future.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 41—Commissions the National Research Council to conduct a national study to determine the viability of developing and implementing standards in environmental, health, and safety areas to provide for differential regulation of industrial laboratories and facilities, on the one hand, and research and teaching laboratories on the other. The National Research Council shall make specific recommendations for statutory and regulatory changes that are needed to develop such a differential approach.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 42—Creates an articulation agreement demonstration program, monitored by the Department of Education, to encourage institutions of higher education to enter into articulation agreements or consortia groups, as a means to lower tuition prices to students.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 43—Renews states' commitment to affordable college education by ensuring that they maintain their own level of college financing. Gives students and families access to accurate information about the cost of college and steps individual schools are taking to offer affordable rates of tuition.

Tierney (MA)—No. 44—Commissions a study by the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance to examine the adequacy of current financial aid programs and the extent to which every qualified eligible student receives a sufficient comprehensive financial aid package from all sources, including aid from Federal financial aid programs under this title, state financial aid programs, institutional financial aid programs, and privately-funded grant aid programs.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 45—Commissions a GAO Study on college costs and the relationship between state, Federal and institutional support for higher education and college costs.

Waters (CA)—No. 118—(LATE) Seeks to condition the eligibility of private, post-secondary institutions as "institutions of higher education" for purpose of funding under the Act on the obtaining of at least 10 percent of its total funding from sources other than Title IV.

Waters (CA)—No. 56—Extends eligibility for Centers of Excellence program funds to states in which a major disaster has occurred under Section 402 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act for a period of two years following the date of Presidential declaration.

Wu (OR)/Simmons (CT)—No. 9—Allows student loan borrowers to refinance their student loans. Upon reconsolidation, the borrower would get a variable rate with a cap of 6.8 percent.

Wu (OR)/McGovern (MA)—No. 10—Increases the Pell Grant award to \$8,000 through the use of mandatory funds over a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, why doesn't Mr. INSLEE deserve a floor vote on his proposal on Head Start teacher loan forgiveness? Why prevent public discussion of Mr. MCGOVERN's and Mr. WU's proposal that we increase Pell Grant awards? Or the amendment from Mr. MILLER and Mr. PETRI that would provide \$12 billion in student aid without costing the taxpayers a dime?

Clearly, their ideas would have at least made it to the floor for the debate in 1992 and 1998. So have these Members simply shown up to the wrong section of Congress, or does the majority feel that these amendments might be sound policy and pass?

Members on both sides of the aisle decry the lack of bipartisanship in the House every day, but what are we doing to really embrace bipartisanship? We should be able to agree that every Member of this body deserves time to offer his or her suggestions on something as fundamental as our Nation's education policy. Sadly, that is not the case this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the second rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

As we have seen today, Dan Quisenberry was right: The future is much like the past, only longer.

Yesterday the debate on the underlying bill provided ample discussion, and we realize that the underlying bill is one that has the one goal, the most important goal, to expand the number of kids who have the opportunity of fulfilling their college dream, with a special emphasis on new students coming into the system and those who accelerate their study programs in some particular way.

If I can speak for the chairman of the committee, I believe at that point that part of the discussion was done in a very bipartisan manner in the committee.

Mr. MILLER, the ranking member, will give a comprehensive alternative program and have 30 minutes of debate, and he can include anything he wishes to include in that. We are offering plenty of debate on this particular bill.

I would like to say something simply about the rule itself and the process of the rule. If we extend the logic of some who are saying everything should be an open rule, realizing we have four times the number that are in the Senate, we move ourselves into a structural system where we start to emulate the Senate process which should strike fear in the hearts of Members just on that concent.

Prior to the War of 1812, we had always had committee work done in the House. It was Speaker Clay who instituted standing committees and formulated a structural policy that the House has used since that time to try to use committees in a different way than our sister body on the other side of this Capitol to try to put a greater emphasis on committees so that Members would become specialists in areas. They would have expertise. In committee, you can have expert testimony in the hearing to assist, and in the committee with expertise in that area, Members could sit down and work through bills before they actually came to the House.

There was for this particular bill 79 amendments discussed in the committee, half as many of those amendments in the subcommittee on this particular bill with endless discussion. It was a thoroughly vetted and discussed bill. I would add, of the 117 amendments that then came to the Committee on Rules for further discussion here on the floor, 68 of those were from members of the committee who already supposedly discussed that. Multiple amendments were either withdrawn, were duplicative, or had jurisdictional problems. And more important, many of those amendments presented in the Rules Committee had been discussed and defeated in the committee of jurisdiction.

As I look at some of the amendments that were proposed: No. 97 was defeated on a rollcall vote; No. 98 was withdrawn in committee; No. 100 defeated on a voice vote; No. 101 was defeated in

a rollcall vote; No. 80 was defeated on rollcall vote; No. 27 defeated on a rollcall vote; No. 83 defeated on a voice vote; No. 43 defeated on a rollcall vote; and No. 45 was actually incorporated into the bill. Amendment No. 9 was defeated twice, once in the subcommittee and once in the committee and then, once again, presented on the floor.

What the Rules Committee is trying to do is cull through the process in the committees where this discussion should take place with people who have expertise and people who have developed competence in that particular area, not replicating the entire thing on the floor, which is why if you look at the rules for both yesterday and today, they are both rules which reward bipartisanship for indeed half of the amendments made in order were either Democrat or bipartisan amendments at that particular time.

One of the greatest managers of all time, Casey Stengel, once talking about who I still think is the best second baseman in the history of the Yankees' organization, Bobby Richardson, said he was amazed because the guy doesn't drink, he doesn't smoke, he doesn't stay out late, and he still can't hit .250. That is a wonderful non sequitur. Not staying out late, not drinking, not smoking makes you healthy and perhaps play longer but it has nothing to do with the ability of hitting a curve ball.

Oftentimes when we come here with amendments on the floor, we bypass the concept of the bill with some amendments or processes that I think are non sequitur.

Talking about the various kinds of teachers in various disciplines that we can enhance is good, is worthwhile and wonderful, but this bill is about how kids can have better access to a college education.

Talking about increasing the potential of lender profits is great for the lenders, but this bill is about how you expand the number of kids who can get a college education.

Having an amendment that deals with National Resource Council to have an environmental health and safety study is a wonderful concept and a worthwhile goal, but it is not the purpose and the function of this bill.

I hope as we go through this process we recognize what the Rules Committee tried to do is focus in on what the purpose of this bill is. The purpose of this bill is to try to help more kids get a college education. In that regard, I think this rule moves us in that direction and the underlying bill supports that.

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. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gibbons	Nunes
Akin	Gillmor	Nussle
Alexander	Gingrey	Osborne
Bachus	Gohmert	Otter
Baker	Goode	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Green (WI)	Petri
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pickering
Biggart	Hall	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harris	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Poe
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Blunt	Hayes	Porter
Boehlert	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bonilla	Hensarling	Putnam
Bonner	Herger	Radanovich
Bono	Hobson	Ramstad
Boozman	Hoekstra	Regula
Boustany	Hostettler	Rehberg
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Istook	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	Kelly	Schmidt
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Castle	King (NY)	Sessions
Chabot	Kingston	Shadegg
Chocola	Kirk	Shaw
Coble	Klaine	Shays
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Sherwood
Conaway	Kolbe	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Cubin	LaHood	Simmons
Culberson	Latham	Simpson
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Souder
DeLay	Linder	Stearns
Dent	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	E.	Terry
Drake	Mack	Thomas
Dreier	Manzullo	Thornberry
Duncan	Marchant	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Tiberti
Emerson	McCotter	Turner
English (PA)	McCrery	Upton
Everett	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McHugh	Walsh
Ferguson	McKeon	Wamp
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Miller (MI)	Weller
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Fossella	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Fox	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Ney	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	
Gerlach	Norwood	

NAYS—188

Abercrombie	Allen	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird

Baldwin	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Barrow	Harman	Obey
Bean	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Becerra	Herseth	Ortiz
Berkley	Higgins	Pallone
Berman	Hinchey	Pascarell
Berry	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Boren	Hookey	Pomeroy
Boswell	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boucher	Inslee	Rahall
Boyd	Israel	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Royal-Allard
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Rush
Capps	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Salazar
Carnahan	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)	T.
Case	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kucinich	Sanders
Cleaver	Langevin	Schiff
Clyburn	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Crowley	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowey	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Solis
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Markey	Stark
Davis (TN)	Matheson	Strickland
DeFazio	Matsui	Stupak
DeGette	McCarthy	Tanner
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
DeLauro	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McNulty	Tierney
Doyle	Meehan	Towns
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Engel	Michaud	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Millender-	Velázquez
Etheridge	McDonald	Visclosky
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Fattah	Miller, George	Schultz
Filner	Mollohan	Watt
Ford	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gordon	Murtha	Woolsey
Green, Al	Nadler	Wu
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wynn
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—20

Cardoza	Marshall	Schakowsky
Clay	McKinney	Sweeney
Davis (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Evans	Miller (FL)	Watson
Gilchrest	Owens	Whitfield
Issa	Oxley	
Jackson-Lee	Rangel	
(TX)	Ruppersberger	

□ 1144

Messrs. STUPAK, BUTTERFIELD, DOGGETT, and CUELLAR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1145

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION REQUIRING ETHICS INVESTIGATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BRIBED BY REPUBLICAN LOBBYIST JACK ABRAMOFF

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise in regard to a question

of the privileges of the House, and I offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, it has been two years since credible reports of misconduct by Mr. Jack Abramoff and Members of Congress began appearing regularly in the public record, including reports closely linking Republican Members of Congress with the documented misconduct of Mr. Abramoff;

Whereas, in the first session of the 109th Congress, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, the rules of procedure of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct were changed on a partisan basis, the Chairman of the Committee and two of his Republican Colleagues were dismissed from the Committee, the newly appointed Chairman of the Committee improperly and unilaterally fired non-partisan staff, and the Chairman attempted to appoint supervisory staff without a vote of the Committee in direct contravention of the intent of the bi-partisan procedures adopted in 1997;

Whereas, because of these actions, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducted no investigative activities in the first session of the 109th Congress and has not yet conducted such activities;

Whereas, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and the Senate Committee on Finance have both undertaken investigations of Mr. Jack Abramoff's activities, yet no House Committee has begun any such investigation;

Whereas, on March 29th, 2006, Mr. Jack Abramoff was sentenced to 5 years and 10 months in prison after pleading guilty to conspiracy and wire fraud;

Whereas, a Justice Department press release reported that Mr. Jack Abramoff “corruptly provid[ ed] things of value to public officials . . . including, but not limited to, a lavish trip to Scotland to play golf on worldfamous courses, tickets to sporting events and other entertainment, regular meals at Abramoff s upscale restaurant, and campaign contributions for [a] Representative, his political action committee, his campaign committee, and other political committees on behalf of [that] Representative.” (Department of Justice press release, January 3, 2006);

Whereas, Mr. Jack Abramoffs plea agreement states that he and his colleagues “provided things of value to public officials in exchange for a series of official acts and influence . . . including agreements to support and pass legislation (and) agreements to place statements in the Congressional Record.” (Abramoff Plea Agreement);

Whereas, on November 5, 2005, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a former Congressional staff member and business partner of Mr. Jack Abramoff pled guilty to conspiracy to violate Federal laws and admitted that, beginning in January, 2000, he offered and provided things of value to public officials, including Members of Congress and staff, in exchange for a series of official acts;

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately initiate an investigation of the misconduct by Members of Congress and their staff implicated in the scandals associated with Mr. Jack Abramoff's criminal activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 193, answered “present” 7, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Norwood
Akin	Gibbons	Nunes
Alexander	Gillmor	Nussle
Bachus	Gingrey	Osborne
Baker	Gohmert	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Pence
Barton (TX)	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Graves	Petri
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pickering
Biggart	Hall	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harris	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pombo
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Blunt	Hayes	Price (GA)
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hefley	Putnam
Bonilla	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Herger	Ramstad
Bono	Hobson	Regula
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boustany	Hostettler	Reichert
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hyde	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	Kelly	Schmidt
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Carter	King (IA)	Schenzenbrenner
Castle	King (NY)	Sessions
Chabot	Kingston	Shadegg
Choccola	Kirk	Shaw
Coble	Kline	Sherwood
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Conaway	Kolbe	Shuster
Crenshaw	Kuhl (NY)	Simmons
Cubin	LaHood	Simpson
Culberson	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Linder	Stearns
DeLay	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Dent	Lucas	Tancredto
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Terry
Doolittle	Mack	Thomas
Drake	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dreier	Marchant	Tiahrt
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McCrery	Upton
English (PA)	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Everett	McHugh	Walsh
Feeney	McKeon	Wamp
Ferguson	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Weller
Foley	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Murphy	Wicker
Fossella	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Foxx	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Young (AK)
Gallely	Northup	Young (FL)

NOES—193

Abercrombie	Baca	Bean
Ackerman	Baird	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Berkley
Andrews	Barrow	Berman

Berry	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Pastor
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Payne
Blumenauer	Honda	Pelosi
Boren	Hoolley	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	Hoyer	Platts
Boucher	Inslee	Pomeroy
Boyd	Israel	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Reyes
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Rothman
Capps	Kaptur	Rush
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	Ryan (OH)
Cardin	Kildee	Sabo
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar
Carson	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Case	Kucinich	T.
Chandler	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Lantos	Sanders
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cooper	Leach	Schwartz (PA)
Costa	Lee	Scott (GA)
Costello	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Shays
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Cummings	Lowey	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Markey	Snyder
Davis (TN)	Marshall	Solis
DeFazio	Matheson	Souder
DeGette	Matsui	Spratt
Delahunt	McCarthy	Stark
DeLauro	McCollum (MN)	Strickland
Dicks	McDermott	Stupak
Dingell	McGovern	Tanner
Doggett	McIntyre	Tauscher
Edwards	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Emanuel	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Etheridge	Melancon	Towns
Farr	Michaud	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Millender-	Udall (NM)
Filner	McDonald	Van Hollen
Ford	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Visclosky
Gerlach	Moore (KS)	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Waters
Green (WI)	Murtha	Watt
Green, Al	Nadler	Waxman
Grijalva	Napolitano	Weiner
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Wexler
Harman	Oberstar	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Wu
Herseth	Ortiz	Wynn
Higgins	Owens	
Hinchev	Pallone	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Doyle	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Green, Gene	Mollohan	
Jones (NC)	Paul	

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (TX)	Issa	Oxley
Cardoza	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Clay	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Davis (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Sweeney
Evans	Miller (FL)	Watson
Gilchrest	Obey	

□ 1208

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I mistakenly cast my vote against tabling the privileged motion offered by Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI. In fact, I intended to vote in favor of tabling the motion and would like my intentions to be reflected in the RECORD.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 609.

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

There was no objection.

COLLEGE ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 742 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. 609.

□ 1209

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. 609) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, with Mr. CHOCOLA (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 29, 2006, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-399 by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) had been disposed of and proceedings pursuant to House Resolution 741 had been completed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 742, no further general debate shall be in order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 742, no further amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 109-401. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mrs. BIGGERT: Page 230, after line 10, insert the following new subsection:

(d) HOMELESS YOUTH.—Section 480(d) is further amended—

- (1) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and
- (2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) has been verified as both a homeless child or youth and an unaccompanied youth, as such terms are defined in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a), during the school year

in which the application for financial assistance is submitted, by—

“(A) a local educational agency liaison for homeless children and youths, as designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11432(g)(1)(J)(ii));

“(B) a director of a homeless shelter, transitional shelter, or independent living program; or

“(C) a financial aid administrator;”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce an amendment that would make the dream of a college education more accessible to youth who are homeless and on their own.

While many young people experience homelessness as part of a family, so many youth in homeless situations are on their own. These children are unaccompanied for reasons that are extremely diverse and usually heartbreaking. In many cases they have run away to escape physical or sexual abuse. Others have been abandoned by their parents.

Due to their severe poverty, these homeless students are extremely unlikely to be able to access post-secondary education without Federal student aid. But in order to determine student eligibility for aid, the FAFSA requires them to provide financial information and a signature from their parent or guardian.

While these requirements are logical for most applicants, they create insurmountable barriers for unaccompanied homeless youth. So the very children who are most in need of financial assistance are the least likely to receive it.

My amendment removes these barriers by allowing unaccompanied homeless youth to be considered independent students. To ensure that there is no fraud or abuse, the living situation of the student must be verified by one of the following individuals: a McKinney-Vento Act school district liaison, a shelter director, or a financial aid administrator.

This independent student status will ensure that unaccompanied homeless youth are not required to provide their parental income information and parental signature, information they simply do not have and cannot get. The amendment thus opens the doors of higher education to some of our Nation's most vulnerable youth.

I should add, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment was scored by the CBO as having no budgetary impact.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman, a good member of her committee, for her work. I think this makes the bill better, and I hope all of our Members can support this amendment.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I would ask everybody to support it. I thank her for all the work she does on behalf of homeless youth. We appreciate it, and I am sure they do too.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is certainly thoughtful, realistic and sensitive, and I urge everyone to support it.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Thank you all. I would like to thank in particular Chairman MCKEON and the ranking member, Mr. MILLER of California, for their support for homeless education. Whether we are talking about the No Child Left Behind Act or this legislation today, the Education and Workforce Committee members and staff have worked in a bipartisan way to address problems related to the education of homeless children, and I believe that we have made significant progress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. GOHMERT:

Page 31, beginning on line 20, strike subsection (f) and insert the following:

(f) OUTCOMES AND ACTIONS.—

(1) RESPONSE FROM INSTITUTION.—Effective on June 30, 2010, an institution that has a college affordability index that exceeds 2.0 for any 3-year interval ending on or after that date shall provide a report to the Secretary, in such a form, at such time, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Such report shall include—

(A) a description of the factors contributing to the increase in the institution's costs and in the tuition and fees charged to students; and

(B) if determinations of tuition and fee increases are not within the exclusive control of the institution, a description of the agency or instrumentality of State government or other entity that participates in such determinations and the authority exercised by such agency, instrumentality, or entity.

(2) QUALITY-EFFICIENCY TASK FORCES.—

(A) REQUIRED.—Each institution subject to paragraph (1) that has a college affordability index that is in the highest 5 percent of such indexes of all institutions subject to paragraph (1) shall establish a quality-efficiency task force to review the operations of such institution.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—Such task force shall include administrators and business and civic leaders and may include faculty, students, trustees, parents of students, and alumni of such institution.

(C) FUNCTIONS.—Such task force shall analyze institutional operating costs in comparison with such costs at other institutions within the class of institutions. Such analysis should identify areas where, in comparison with other institutions in such class, the institution operates more expensively to produce a similar result. Any identified areas should then be targeted for in-depth analysis for cost reduction opportunities.

(D) REPORT.—The results of the analysis by a quality-efficiency task force under this paragraph shall be included in the report to the Secretary under paragraph (1).

(3) CONSEQUENCES FOR 2-YEAR CONTINUATION OF FAILURE.—If the Secretary determines that the institution has failed to reduce the college affordability index below 2.0 for such 2 academic years, the Secretary shall place the institution on an affordability alert status and shall make the information regarding the institution's failure available in accordance with subsection (d).

(4) INFORMATION TO STATE AGENCIES.—Any institution that reports under paragraph (1)(A) that an agency or instrumentality of State government or other entity participates in the determinations of tuition and fee increases shall, prior to submitting any information to the Secretary under this subsection, submit such information to, and request the comments and input of, such agency, instrumentality, or entity. With respect to any such institution, the Secretary shall provide a copy of any communication by the Secretary with that institution to such agency, instrumentality, or entity.

(5) EXEMPTIONS.—

(A) RELATIVE PRICE EXEMPTION.—The Secretary shall, for any 3-year interval for which college affordability indexes are computed under paragraph (1), determine and publish the dollar amount that, for each class of institution described in paragraph (6) represents the maximum tuition and fees charged for a full-time undergraduate student in the least costly quartile of institutions within each such class during the last year of such 3-year interval. An institution that has a college affordability index computed under paragraph (1) that exceeds 2.0 for any such 3-year interval, but that, on average during such 3-year interval, charges less than such maximum tuition and fees shall not be subject to the actions required by paragraph (3), unless such institution, for a subsequent 3-year interval, charges more than such maximum tuition and fees.

(B) DOLLAR INCREASE EXEMPTION.—An institution that has a college affordability index computed under paragraph (1) that exceeds 2.0 for any 3-year interval, but that exceeds such 2.0 by a dollar amount that is less than \$500, shall not be subject to the actions required by paragraph (3), unless such institution has a college affordability index for a subsequent 3-year interval that exceeds 2.0 by more than such dollar amount.

(6) CLASSES OF INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the classes of institutions shall be those sectors used by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, based on whether the institution is public, nonprofit private, or for-profit private, and

whether the institution has a 4-year, 2-year, or less than 2-year program of instruction.

(7) DATA REJECTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as allowing the Secretary to reject the data submitted by an individual institution of higher education.

Page 37, after line 2, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the succeeding subsections accordingly):

“(g) INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC.—Upon receipt of an institution's report required under subsection (f), the Secretary shall make the information in the report available to the public in accordance with subsection (d) on the COOL website under subsection (b).

Page 262, beginning on line 19, strike paragraph (1) and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1215

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

This amendment seeks to cut down on Federal meddling with our colleges and universities. As Republicans, we have made a promise to the American people that we stand for less government, not more. Our preeminent system of higher education is the last thing that needs extensive Federal oversight. We have seen what happened to K-12 as the Federal Government started meddling too much 30 years ago in it, and we are only now starting to recover from Federal meddling 30 years ago.

I do support the overall bill, and I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for working with me on the amendment. He and his staff have been wonderful to work with, and I thank them for being so gracious.

But this amendment would strike certain reporting requirements for colleges and universities within section 131(f). Cutting down on some red tape will allow these schools to focus on educating their students first.

This amendment also strikes section 495(a)(1) that would allow States to apply to the Secretary of Education to become recognized accreditors. It just looked like that created more Federal bureaucracy, more State bureaucracy, and we have the best university system in the world. It is too expensive. It has gotten expensive so fast, and with two kids in college, I certainly am very sensitive to that.

So I applaud the chairman's efforts in his bill to assist in bringing those down, but I have concerns about some of these other provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), my friend.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I, too, applaud Representative GOHMERT for this amendment. This amendment does recognize that the American system of higher education is truly the envy of

the world, and just as importantly, it recognizes the role our independent colleges and universities play in that overall system.

Specifically, this amendment addresses the primary concerns of so many of the private and independent colleges about what they have seen as a genuine threat to their independence and their ability to fulfill their diverse missions.

I, like many others in this chamber, have spoken with a number of the presidents in my district and understand how deeply they feel about undertaking their responsibilities to their students without excessive and inappropriate Federal or State interference.

And for this reason, I offer my support for the Gohmert amendment which removes Federal intervention mechanisms while pushing schools to voluntarily rein in costs, and that is all included in this legislation. It also further eliminates the authority for States to become accreditors.

The other good thing about this amendment is disclosures are still in the bill, but the price controls essentially are out.

In terms of States as accreditors, the concern would be that any State higher education bureaucracy that wants to control the State's private and independent colleges can simply require State accreditation, giving the State control over its curriculum and mission. Although the intent of the provision is to offer more options to the institutions, the opposite may well occur. There is no way to anticipate all the ways in which a State might seek to control private institutions using its accreditation powers as leverage.

For all those reasons, I strongly support Mr. GOHMERT's amendment and thank Chairman MCKEON for his willingness to work with us on this matter.

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

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for those kind comments. At this time, I would like to thank the chairman for reaching out to me, and I also want to thank all of the institutions of higher learning in the districts. We have heard from so many of them. They have been so helpful, and I just appreciate that that is what makes for better government.

I do applaud the chairman's efforts to stem the tide of vast increases over the last 30 years in the cost of education, and this amendment and the provisions that it deals with, I think it does create a bill that will be a significant help to America in higher education.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) my chairman.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Mr. GOHMERT from Texas for the great work that he has done on improving this bill.

It is very important that this amendment passes and Mr. SOUDER's amend-

ment later today. I have a letter here from NAICU, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, who have been vigorously opposing the bill, and because of your amendment and Mr. SOUDER's amendment, they have written us today that they are withdrawing their opposition to the bill on the House floor and I appreciate that, and I appreciate all the work that Mr. GOHMERT has done on this bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment. It is a step in the right direction on some of the provisions that I expressed concern over yesterday, and I have no objection to its adoption, urge its adoption.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

Page 189, line 13, redesignate subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (J), and before such subparagraph insert the following new subparagraph:

“(I) CHILD OR ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—An individual who is employed as child or adolescent mental health professional and is currently providing a majority of their clinical services to children or adolescents.

Page 194, after line 14, insert the following new paragraphs:

“(8) CHILD OR ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL.—The term ‘child or adolescent mental health professional’ means an individual who is employed as a psychiatrist, psychologist, school psychologist, psychiatric nurse, social worker, school social worker, marriage and family therapist, school counselor, or professional counselor and holds an advanced degree in one of the above areas with specialized training in child or adolescent mental health.

“(9) SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN CHILD OR ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH.—The term ‘specialized training in child or adolescent mental health’ means training that

“(A) is part of or occurs after completion of an accredited graduate program in the United States for training mental health service professionals;

“(B) consists of at least 500 hours of training or clinical experience in treating children or adolescents; and

“(C) is comprehensive, coordinated, developmentally appropriate, and of high quality to address the unique ethnic and cultural diversity of the United States population.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, Marley Prunty-Lara is here today in the gallery. She is an articulate young woman living with bipolar disorder, and she is a suicide attempt survivor.

She is in town because she was here to testify yesterday about her struggle with bipolar disorder, being forced to drop out of school and ultimately attempting to take her own life.

Marley's family attempted to find a psychiatrist in South Dakota to treat her, but they were told that they would have to wait over 4 months to get an initial appointment. Because her mother's insurance would not cover residential treatment and they were so desperate to find care, they took out a second mortgage on their house, and they drove over 350 miles to another State to get Marley the life-saving care that she needed.

Mr. Chairman, Marley's story is all too common. There are just not enough trained professionals to treat the mental health needs of our children. Surgeon General Carmona has said so. The President's New Freedom Commission has said so.

For the past three Congresses, my good friend from Florida Ms. ROSLEHTINEN and I have introduced legislation aimed at alleviating the shortage of child and adolescent mental health providers in this country.

While this amendment does not cover everything included in the previous three bills, it is a start.

Within the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005, there is a section that provides student loan forgiveness for service in areas of national need. Mr. Speaker, this is an area of national need.

For many families in this Nation, as Marley can readily attest, there is no higher need than the need for urgent mental health care for our children.

Our amendment would simply add child and adolescent mental health professionals to the list of high need professionals eligible for loan forgiveness.

Millions of American families need hope. Millions of them need help. The number of suicides are twice the rate of homicides in this country; 36,000 people

take their lives every year successfully. Every day in this country, 1,385 people attempt suicide. It is the third leading cause of death for young people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that needs addressing, and we need the number of providers out there to make sure it gets the attention it deserves.

This year alone, 1,400 college students will successfully take their lives. Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that we have adequate personnel to make sure that the services are delivered, and the services will never be delivered unless there are enough people to deliver them.

That is why this legislation is in order. That is why I would ask my colleagues to support it, and I thank you for the time in consideration of this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. He and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN address some very, very important problems of making sure we have adequate providers within the community for people with mental illness, and I would hope that everybody would support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Reclaiming my time, I would just like to point out to the gentleman from California, there may be questions, what is this going to cost? The question is, what is it going to cost us not to do this?

Let me give you some statistics. Two-thirds of those in juvenile detention facilities are being held there simply because they cannot get a mental health appointment because there is no one to provide an assessment of them, two-thirds. Any of my colleagues that are interested, I encourage them to go out to Oak Hill here in the District of Columbia and see for yourself 11- and 12-year-olds behind bars because their parents cannot handle their mental illness. They have no other choice but to call the police and get their children held in detention because there is nothing else for them to do.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, they could go to their own districts. This is common across the country. Young people are being held in locked detention because of the simple fact that we cannot get a diagnosis. We cannot put together a treatment plan because they are on a waiting list for the services. They do not get services. In many cases, those services have been ordered, but they do not get them. They get a waiting list, and you are right, then we pay this exorbitant cost to keep them in there, but more importantly, denying them the treatment that they need.

So, increasing the number of providers so that we can address these

concerns and these problems that young people have is just absolutely important.

The idea of making these providers eligible for loan forgiveness is a service to our community, and I am sure that the House will support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I thank Marley for her courage and her witness here today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members that it is not in order to refer to the presence of persons in the gallery.

Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I will claim the time in opposition; although I do not intend to oppose the bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for their efforts on this amendment, and again, I think it strengthens the bill, and I thank them for this and encourage support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote to demonstrate this House's support for mental health services in this country.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

At the end of part B of title IX of the Amendment add the following new section:

**SEC. . . RACIAL AND ETHNIC PREFERENCES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbids discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin by Federally-funded institutions, which includes nearly all colleges and universities.

(2) The United States Supreme Court has recently set out limitations on such considerations of race, color, and national origin.

(3) In order to ensure that these limitations are followed, schools must make public their use of race, color, and national origin, for admissions decisions so that Federal and State enforcement agencies and interested persons can monitor the schools.

(4) Citizens and taxpayers have a right to know whether Federally-funded institutions of higher education are treating student applications differently depending on the student's race, color, or national origin, and, if so, the way in which these factors are weighted and the consequences to students and prospective students of these decisions.

(b) REPORTS ON ADMISSIONS PROCESS REQUIRED.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Every academic year, each institution of higher education that receives funds from the Federal Government shall provide to the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education a report regarding its students admissions process, and the report shall be made publicly available.

(2) DISCLOSURE OF CONSIDERATION OF RACE, COLOR, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.—

(A) DISCLOSURE.—The report required by this section shall begin with a statement of whether race, color, or national origin is given any weight in the student admissions process.

(B) DEPARTMENTAL DISCLOSURES.—If different departments within the institution have separate admission processes and any of those departments give any weight to race, color, and national origin, then the report shall provide the information required by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and paragraph (3) for each department separately.

(3) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES.—If the disclosure required by paragraph (2) states that race, color, or national origin is given weight in the student admission process, then the report under this section shall also provide the following information:

(A) The racial, color, and national origin groups for which membership is considered a plus factor or a minus factor and, in addition, how membership in a group is determined for individual students.

(B) A description of how group membership is considered, including the weight given to such consideration and whether targets, goals, or quotas are used.

(C) A statement of why group membership is given weight, including the determination of the desired level claimed and, with respect to the diversity rationale, its relationship to the particular institution's educational mission.

(D) A description of the consideration that has been given to racially neutral alternatives as a means for achieving the same goals for which group membership is considered.

(E) A description of how frequently the need to give weight to group membership is reassessed and how that reassessment is conducted.

(F) A statement of the factors other than race, color, or national origin that are collected in the admissions process. Where those factors include grades or class rank in high school, scores on standardized tests (including the ACT and SAT), legacy status, sex, State residency, economic status, or other quantifiable criteria, then all raw admissions data for applicants regarding these factors, along with each individual applicant's race, color, and national origin and the admissions decision made by the school regarding that applicant, shall accompany the report in computer-readable form, with the name of the individual student redacted but with appropriate links, so that it is possible for the Office for Civil Rights or other interested persons to determine through statistical analysis the weight being given to race, color, and national origin, relative to other factors.

(G) An analysis, and also the underlying data needed to perform an analysis, of whether there is a correlation—

(i) between membership in a group favored on account of race, color, or national origin and the likelihood of enrollment in a remediation program, relative to membership in other groups;

(ii) between such membership and graduation rates, relative to membership in other groups; and



(iii) between such membership and the likelihood of defaulting on education loans, relative to membership in other groups.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to allow or permit preference or discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

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

While the Supreme Court has ruled that using racial and ethnic preferences in higher education admission policies are sometimes permissible under present law, it has also established limits for such policies. For example, Court decisions have asserted that admissions policies using racial preferences must be narrowly tailored to further a compelling interest and that these policies cannot involve the use of quotas.

The Court's also ruled that schools using racial preferences in admissions must consider race neutral alternatives and to limit it in time, for example, Justice O'Connor's remarks to revisit the decision in Michigan cases in perhaps 25 years.

My amendment would require all institutions of higher education who receive Federal funding to fully disclose details regarding their admissions policies. This information would be reported annually to the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights.

It has several reasons why we should pass this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and the first one is to ensure lawful admission policies are complied with by our institutes of higher learning who are receiving the Federal funds and that there are informed choices out there for the students as they apply to the various students, and as there are students who are beneficiaries of affirmative action programs, they need to have some sense of the performance expectations of those who have gone before them and benefited from affirmative action programs.

So what my amendment does is requires each institute of higher learning who uses Federal funds to report their policy. If they do not use preferences, they simply write a letter that says we do not use preferences. If they do use preferences, then they need to list a number of things, such as, are the preferences weighted? Did they use target goals or quotas? What was the purpose of their policies? And could they evaluate a racially neutral policy effectiveness as to opposed to one that is not racially neutral, a list of factors other than race, color or national origin that they might use such as test scores, sex, legacy status, residency, et cetera, Mr. Chairman?

□ 1230

And, in conclusion, an analysis of their respective progress of appointments under these programs?

So this gets the information back to Congress so we can better evaluate, and it also helps the institutions of higher learning comply with the Supreme Court decision. So I urge support for this.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I oppose this amendment and I hope most of the Members of the House will also oppose this amendment. The issues that are called into question in this amendment, the use of, the gentleman said preferences, but of any data, any factors in deciding the make-up of a university student body has already been decided by the Supreme Court.

The fact of the matter is that quotas are unlawful, but universities have a right to a diverse student population, and they are allowed to use a diverse range of factors in compiling that university. I believe that the King amendment goes beyond that decision, and the amendment also does not provide for the protection of student privacy. In fact, it does just the opposite of that.

The fact of the matter is this information is already available to those parties who are interested. They can get it through the Freedom of Information Act or the universities, obviously. At least in our State, they are continuously discussing operating and changing and reviewing their admissions policy because they are in constant determination of trying to provide diverse opportunities to a diverse population of qualified students.

I would hope that we would reject this amendment. It is interesting that we just had an amendment we adopted to reduce paperwork, and now we are going to put on a whole new set of requirements of annual reports and different kinds of data and how it has to be collected and weighed and all the rest of it, with no showing that it has been improperly done or anything wrong has happened. We are just going to load down the universities.

Mr. MCKEON has an effort where he is trying to reduce the cost of higher education by making sure universities are not engaged in those practices that are not necessary and that drive up the cost. And this comes along, outside of the Supreme Court decisions, outside the current practices of universities and suggests that somehow they should just continue to develop this information with no showing or grievance.

If a person has a grievance or showing, or people are interested from an academic point of view, from a social policy point of view, or from any point of view, the fact of the matter is that the information is currently available. I would hope that we would reject this amendment when it comes to a vote in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I really think this would lead to a violation of privacy and have a chilling effect upon that which the Supreme Court has permitted in the case against Bollinger from the University of Michigan where I attended.

It was a very narrow decision of the Supreme Court. I and my two sons attended the University of Michigan; and we, as members of the majority, benefited from a very sensitive, sensitivity to minorities. We benefited from that because we had a larger universe in which to study. So we gained from the fact that we were broadened out by the fact that there was a certain sensitivity towards minorities, very narrowly construed now by the Supreme Court.

So I think it is a win-win situation. We should leave it alone. The Supreme Court has made its decision. It is very clear that colleges are following this, and I think to have all this reporting serves no useful purpose and would also, I think, lead to a violation of privacy and would, because of the reporting, even have a chilling effect upon the use of this.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to be the core of the rebuttal argument we heard here is that this is a violation of student privacy and that we would be somehow looking into records that are confidential. I would direct the gentlemen who made those statements to page 4 of my amendment, lines 18 and 19, where it says with the name of the individual student redacted but with appropriate links so it is possible for the Office of Civil Rights to determine the overall statistical data, but not have any individual student data. It is specifically redacted in my bill.

I think it is appropriate and necessary for this Congress to review where our money is being spent and to see what kind of results we are getting from all of our institutions, and also to ensure that they are complying with the Supreme Court decision.

I have laid this out as three points that are important: lawful, conforming with the Supreme Court decisions that are on the two Michigan cases; and informed choices for students so that they can evaluate when they go to an institution.

This information is not available, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how any student would ever have access. And looking at how difficult it was to get some empirical data just out of Michigan on the way to the Supreme Court,

there is no way a high school junior or senior could ever have enough access to make an informed decision without these kinds of reports.

Then, of course, if a student is going to be the beneficiary of an affirmative action program, wouldn't they want to know what kind of results there were for those who have gone before them? Do they have a prospect of graduating? Do they have a prospect of a job afterwards? What is the future for them, or should they maybe take a path that is not quite so difficult? All of this is reasonable and it is logical.

And the paperwork, if a university is not using an affirmative action preference program, they simply send a letter that says we don't do that. But if they do use the information, if they do use it as criteria for admissions, then they simply file a report. Any institution should know this information as a matter of their professionalism. Sharing it with Congress is not a burden.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just say it is an interesting academic study, and I am sure some of the information would be of interest to people, but why don't you just have the Department of Education periodically sort of select some universities and test it, rather than putting the burden on every university, whether large or small, rich or poor, private or public that has to submit this information on an annual basis where in fact there may not have been any complaints or there is support for that policy, if it has been publicly reviewed or however they handle it.

The suggestion here that every university would have to go through this process is just kind of a mindless Federal Government approach to imposing these burdens on people without consideration of the cost, the need, the results, or any of the rest of it. I thought we were getting away from that policy. Talk about one-size-fits-all; here is one-size-fits-all. And when they say, well, we don't do that, who is going to check that that is really true? Yet you start this whole process.

And I would say, by the way, that the names aren't redacted. The Social Security numbers are not redacted.

Mr. KING of Iowa. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would point out, again, this information is information that any institution of higher learning should be interested in compiling to determine the effectiveness of their policy. We help them along with this process and ask to share in that process with them.

Additionally, Justice O'Connor's decision said perhaps we should revisit this in 25 years. If we can compile this data for 25 years, perhaps the Supreme Court can make an informed decision on affirmative action preference admis-

sion programs within our institutions of higher learning, and I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the primary academic freedom enjoyed by a university is the freedom to choose whom to admit. Most recently, this principle was reaffirmed in the 2003 decisions in *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*. The Supreme Court has also recognized that, in exercising this academic freedom, universities may constitutionally consider race and ethnicity, among other factors, to promote the educational benefits of a diverse student body. At the same time, universities must regularly review their admissions policies to ensure that they consider individual admissions factors only as needed to promote their institutional mission.

The King amendment tramples academic freedom and chills universities' willingness to consider diversity factors even in the narrowly tailored manner that the Supreme Court has upheld. It creates a burdensome reporting requirement that acts as a disincentive for universities to exercise their academic freedom as permitted by the Court. Furthermore, over reliance on admissions criteria such as standardized tests, which have been found to be culturally biased, may also get caught up in the King amendment.

The King amendment also jeopardizes the privacy and confidentiality of individual student applicants. Educational institutions are prohibited by law from disclosing personally identifiable information from students' education records without consent. In fact, even release of information for educational research purposes is permitted only if the information is released in such a way that student identities are not traceable. The King amendment would, in contradiction of this law, require release of raw admissions data for applicants in a manner that would not ensure applicant confidentiality.

The King amendment incorrectly assumes that there is a weight given to each admissions factor by universities. However, as the Supreme Court explained in *Gratz and Grutter*, admissions factors must be considered in an individualized holistic manner and therefore weight will necessarily vary from one application to the next.

Finally, the King amendment is opposed by the National Association for College Admission Counseling, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association and the American Council on Education.

Mr. Chairman, Congress should not trample on the rights of universities to exercise academic freedom. Nor should we pass an amendment that would violate student privacy rights. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by Mr. KING of Iowa. In my state of Michigan, we are currently fighting a deceptive ballot initiative that would undermine the progress which has been made to attain educational equality. Like that ballot measure, I believe that the King amendment is yet another deceptive attack on affirmative action.

While the amendment looks like a mere reporting requirement, its true purpose is to chill the willingness of universities to consider diversity factors—including not only race and ethnicity, but also gender—even in the nar-

rowly tailored manner that was upheld by the Supreme Court in the University of Michigan cases.

In *Gratz and Grutter*, the Court explicitly found that universities may constitutionally consider race and ethnicity, among other factors, to promote the educational benefits of a diverse student body. However, even with this ruling by the Court, the chilling factor on legally permissible policies and programs is very real. This month, the New York Times reported that hundreds of universities had modified or given up programs created to promote educational opportunity for minorities in the face of pressure from Washington and further litigation. As one Dean commented in the story, the question was how far these programs could be stretched by these pressures before gains were put at risk.

The chilling effect on university policy is made even worse by the fact that the amendment completely misapprehends the role that diversity factors play in the admission process. The proposed amendment would require universities annually to report the weight given to each factor—including race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, grades, high school class rank, standardized test scores, and so forth—considered in the admissions process.

As the Supreme Court explained in *Grutter and Gratz*, however, admissions factor must be considered in an individualized, holistic manner and the weight given to each factor will necessarily vary across applications. Consequently, a factor that was important (or even perhaps decisive) with respect to one application may have little weight with respect to another application.

As a result, it is impossible for a university to state definitively and universally the weight given to race or to any particular admissions factor. In fact, to do so would violate the Court's rulings, which expressly require flexibility in any governmental consideration of race or ethnicity.

Moreover, the proposed amendment contemplates only quantifiable admissions factors, and neglects the role of essays, personal statements, counsel recommendations, and other qualitative factors in the admissions process.

When amendments like this come forward, I believe that we should reflect on the path to equality. It was only 40 years ago that the Federal Government had to send troops into Little Rock to permit African-American children to attend Central High School. The Supreme Court took this into account in reaching its *Grutter and Gratz* conclusions and made its rulings. It's now time for Washington to step back and let our universities focus on education, instead of litigation and regulation.

I urge a strong "no" vote.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

At the end of section 601 add the following new subsection:

(k) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that due to the diplomatic, economic, and military importance of China and the Middle East, international exchange and foreign language education programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 should focus on the learning of Chinese and Arabic language and culture.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), as the designee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today to offer the Kirk-Larsen amendment to articulate our Nation's need to promote Chinese and Arabic cultural exchange and language education. I want to thank my fellow co-chair of the U.S.-China Working Group, Mr. KIRK of Illinois, on his work in drafting this important amendment.

Today's global landscape is increasingly interconnected. China and the Middle East play critical roles towards international peace and security. Our ability to effectively engage China and the Arab world rests on shared economic and political interests and mutual understanding.

From 1998 to 2002, foreign language enrollment in United States colleges and universities increased by 20 percent for Chinese and 92.3 percent for Arabic. By comparison, the learning of more traditional languages, such as French and German, grew by under 3 percent.

Our schools and universities are already leading the movement towards Chinese and Arabic language. Congress must build on this infrastructure and support the education of future diplomats, business professionals, and teachers who are proficient in Arabic and Chinese. We must answer the call for an increased American competitiveness and national security, and in today's world we cannot answer that call just in English.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, which is merely a sense of Congress amendment to promote language education in Arabic and Chinese.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't plan

to oppose the amendment. I just want to thank the gentleman from Washington and Mr. KIRK from Illinois for their work on this project.

I had the opportunity to lead a congressional delegation to China last year, and I think it is very important that we stress the importance of learning other languages so that we can communicate and do a better job of competing around the world, and so I encourage support of the amendment.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my partner, co-chair of the U.S.-China Working Group, on this amendment.

I had the honor of serving on the Paul Simon Exchange Commission for the United States to look at his vision of having a million Americans study abroad. That is a very important goal, very worthwhile because of America's position in the world.

But, quite frankly, I think there are two language groups vital to the future security, to the economy, and to the diplomacy of the United States, and that is Arabic and Chinese. This amendment highlights that priority for the United States, for our future.

Obviously, we know with the global war on terror the importance of the command of the Arabic language. But we also see China rising and projected by the IMF on 19th Street here in Washington, D.C. to be the second largest economy on Earth. And it makes sense for the United States to place its highest diplomatic priority on relations with the number two economy of the 21st century, which is China.

Currently, we have reports that there are over 200 million people in China who are or have studied English, but in the United States the total number of Americans who are studying or have studied Chinese number just 28,000. We need to redress that balance to make sure that we have a full engagement with China, with her rising economy, with her very important diplomacy with regard to North Korea, Iran, et cetera, and obviously with military developments there.

So I thank the chairman for his support, and I commend my co-chair of the U.S.-China Working Group, because I think in the necessary funding of exchanges we should place a priority on these two language groups.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their help and support on this.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 267, beginning on line 14, strike paragraph (8) and insert the following:

"(8) confirms as a part of its review for accreditation or reaccreditation that the institution has transfer policies that are publicly disclosed and specifically state whether the institution denies a transfer of credit based solely on the accreditation of the institution at which the credit was earned;

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1245

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Today I am offering an amendment with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) that will ensure students have greater access to information about a university's transfer-of-credit policies without placing new burdensome mandates on the institutions themselves.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, Chairman McKEON, for working with me and Mr. BISHOP over the last day on a compromise that I believe accomplishes our shared goal of greater transparency with regard to an institution's transfer of credit policies. If a student plans on transferring from a community college to a 4-year institution or from a proprietary school to a community college, they should know before they apply which of their credits will transfer.

The Souder-Bishop amendment will strengthen language in the underlying bill to ensure that all institutions of higher education publicly disclosed whether or not they deny credits based on the accreditation of the institution where the credits were earned.

We do not mandate the kind of policy a school must have; we just require greater transparency.

On principle, I believe it is not the role of the Federal Government to dictate what kind of transfer or credit policy an institution must have. In the interest of academic integrity, every college and university should be able to ensure that every graduate receiving a diploma from their institution has completed all of the required courses for a particular program at the level of rigor expected by that university.

If a university decides that the best way it can ensure an appropriate level of academic rigor is to only accept credits from certain kinds of institutions, it should be that school's prerogative to do so. The alternative for many schools would be costly and

time-intensive, requiring admissions counselors and professors to evaluate each of a transfer student's credits based on the quality of the sending institution, its professors, curricula, textbooks, materials, et cetera.

I want to make it clear that this amendment is meant in no way to diminish the value of any particular kind of institution. All institutions have their appropriate place in the higher education community. I am supportive of all types of institutions and want to encourage their growth because it will mean more individuals will be empowered to be productive workers in our growing economy. They are a critical part of my district in particular because of its manufacturing, engineering and business background, and without the proprietary schools and community college specialized courses, we could not function. But it is my hope that as an alternative to Federal mandates, more colleges and universities will work out voluntary articulation agreements between schools to ensure a more seamless transition between institutions.

This can be done quite effectively within a State or region where institutions can come together to agree upon which credits from one school are the equivalent of courses at another school.

In my own home district in Northeast Indiana, Indiana University, Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) and Ivy Tech Community College have worked out an agreement for students to be able to transfer credits from a specified list of over 150 courses. Several years ago, this was not possible. Now it is, and many more institutions in Indiana are following suit. I hope this kind of voluntary agreement multiply across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Souder-Bishop amendment. This bipartisan amendment is the culmination of several months of debate and compromise among Members on both sides of the aisle, the Education and the Workforce Committee, and the college community.

I want to thank Mr. SOUDER for offering this important amendment with me, and I would also like to thank Chairman MCKEON for his work on this issue.

Our amendment would simply require that, as part of its review for accreditation, colleges must publicly disclose their transfer of credit policies and specifically state whether the institution denies transfer of credit based solely on the accreditation of the sending institution. This language is, in our view, much improved from the original form and intent, and I proudly support it.

The original language in H.R. 609 included a provision that would have imposed a new transfer of credit mandate on colleges that would have created

costly new bureaucratic headaches for students and institutions. In our view, we should not be dictating how colleges evaluate the coursework of transferring students as the earlier language would have required. Transfer credit decisions are academic decisions, not administrative decisions, and in principle, Congress should not be interfering in the academic decisions made on college campuses. Colleges and universities are fully capable of developing and implementing fair and appropriate transfer-of-credit policies on their own; and most important, it is in the best interest of students to have these judgments made by those most qualified to make them, and that would be the faculty and staff of the institution they attend.

The amendment we are offering today strikes the correct balance between academic autonomy and transparency for students. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Souder-Bishop amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Souder-Bishop amendment, and I want to associate myself with their comments just made.

This amendment by Mr. SOUDER would revise the transfer-of-credit provisions in this bill. The transfer-of-credit provisions in this bill have been made less onerous since the reauthorization bill was first introduced. The Federal Government as a matter of policy should not be involved in decisions about the awarding of credit which is an institution's essential product.

The Souder-Bishop amendment really takes an important step towards alleviating these concerns, relying instead on additional disclosures to help students better understand an institution's transfer policies.

Once again, I strongly support this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment. In fact, the amendment is critical to final passage of the bill.

I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. BISHOP, both good members of the committee, for their efforts in working together to strengthen the bill through this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 7 printed in House Report 109-401 offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. REFERENCES; EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) 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 a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 3. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.**

Title II (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"PART C—CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE**

**"SEC. 231. PURPOSES; DEFINITIONS.**

"(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this part are—

"(1) to help recruit and prepare teachers, including minority teachers, to meet the national demand for a highly qualified teacher in every classroom; and

"(2) to increase opportunities for Americans of all educational, ethnic, class, and geographic backgrounds to become highly qualified teachers.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this part:

"(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible institution' means—

"(A) an institution of higher education that has a teacher preparation program that meets the requirements of section 203(b)(2) and that is—

"(i) a part B institution (as defined in section 322);

"(ii) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502);

"(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316);

"(iv) an Alaska Native-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b)); or

"(v) a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b));

"(B) a consortium of institutions described in subparagraph (A); or

"(C) an institution described in subparagraph (A), or a consortium described in subparagraph (B), in partnership with any other institution of higher education, but only if the center of excellence established under section 232 is located at an institution described in subparagraph (A).

"(2) HIGHLY QUALIFIED.—The term 'highly qualified' when used with respect to an individual means that the individual is highly qualified as determined under section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) or section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401).

"(3) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED READING RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically based reading research' has the meaning given such term in section 1208 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6368).

"(4) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically based research' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

**"SEC. 232. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.**

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary is authorized to award competitive grants to eligible institutions to establish centers of excellence.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants provided by the Secretary under this part shall be used to ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified, by carrying out one or more of the following activities:

“(1) Implementing reforms within teacher preparation programs to ensure that such programs are preparing teachers who are highly qualified, are able to understand scientifically based research, and are able to use advanced technology effectively in the classroom, including use for instructional techniques to improve student academic achievement, by—

“(A) retraining faculty; and

“(B) designing (or redesigning) teacher preparation programs that—

“(i) prepare teachers to close student achievement gaps, are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research (including scientifically based reading research), and challenging State student academic content standards; and

“(ii) promote strong teaching skills.

“(2) Providing sustained and high-quality preservice clinical experience, including the mentoring of prospective teachers by exemplary teachers, substantially increasing interaction between faculty at institutions of higher education and new and experienced teachers, principals, and other administrators at elementary schools or secondary schools, and providing support, including preparation time, for such interaction.

“(3) Developing and implementing initiatives to promote retention of highly qualified teachers and principals, including minority teachers and principals, including programs that provide—

“(A) teacher or principal mentoring from exemplary teachers or principals; or

“(B) induction and support for teachers and principals during their first 3 years of employment as teachers or principals, respectively.

“(4) Awarding scholarships based on financial need to help students pay the costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program.

“(5) Disseminating information on effective practices for teacher preparation and successful teacher certification and licensure assessment preparation strategies.

“(6) Activities authorized under sections 202, 203, and 204.

“(c) APPLICATION.—Any eligible institution desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such a time, in such a manner, and accompanied by such information the Secretary may require.

“(d) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—The minimum amount of each grant under this part shall be \$500,000.

“(e) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—An eligible institution that receives a grant under this part may not use more than 2 percent of the grant funds for purposes of administering the grant.

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part.

#### “SEC. 233. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”

#### SEC. 4. TITLE III GRANTS FOR AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

(a) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 316 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, Tribal Colleges and Universities are the following:

“(A) any of the following institutions that qualify for funding under the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 or is listed in Equity in Educational Land Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note): Bay Mills Community College; Blackfeet Community College; Cankdeska Cikana Community College; Chief Dull Knife College; College of Menominee Nation; Crownpoint Institute of Technology; Diné College; D-Q University; Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College; Fort Belknap College; Fort Berthold Community College; Fort Peck Community College; Haskell Indian Nations University; Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development; Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College; Leech Lake Tribal College; Little Big Horn College; Little Priest Tribal College; Nebraska Indian Community College; Northwest Indian College; Oglala Lakota College; Saginaw Chippewa Tribal College; Salish Kootenai College; Si Tanka University—Eagle Butte Campus; Sinte Gleska University; Sisseton Wahpeton Community College; Sitting Bull College; Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute; Stone Child College; Tohono O’odham Community College; Turtle Mountain Community College; United Tribes Technical College; and White Earth Tribal and Community College; and

“(B) any other institution that meets the definition of tribally controlled college or university in section 2 of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978, and meets all other requirements of this section.

“(2) INDIAN.—The term ‘Indian’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978.”

(b) DISTANCE LEARNING.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services, and the acquisition of real property adjacent to the campus of the institution on which to construct such facilities;”

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, or advanced degrees in tribal governance or tribal public policy;”

(3) in subparagraph (D), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, in tribal governance, or tribal public policy;”

(4) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (K);

(5) by redesignating subparagraph (L) as subparagraph (M); and

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following new subparagraph:

“(L) developing or improving facilities for Internet use or other distance learning academic instruction capabilities; and”

(c) APPLICATION AND ALLOTMENT.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(d) APPLICATION AND ALLOTMENT.—

“(1) INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive assistance under this section, a Tribal College or University shall be an eligible institution under section 312(b).

“(2) APPLICATION.—Any Tribal College or University desiring to receive assistance under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, and in such manner, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(3) MINIMUM GRANT.—The amount allotted to each institution under this section shall not be less than \$500,000.

“(4) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(A) CONCURRENT FUNDING.—For the purposes of this part, no Tribal College or University that is eligible for and receives funds under this section shall concurrently receive funds under other provisions of this part or part B.

“(B) EXEMPTION.—Section 313(d) shall not apply to institutions that are eligible to receive funds under this section.”

(d) CONSTRUCTION GRANTS.—After subsection (d) of section 316 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(d)), as amended by subsection (c) of this section, add the following new subsections:

“(e) CONSTRUCTION GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve 30 percent of such amount for the purpose of awarding 1-year grants of not less than \$1,000,000 to address construction, maintenance, and renovation needs at eligible institutions.

“(2) PREFERENCE.—In providing grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give preference to eligible institutions that have not yet received an award under this section.

“(f) ALLOTMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.—The Secretary shall distribute any funds appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year that remain available after the Secretary has awarded grants under subsection (e), to each eligible institution as follows:

“(1) 60 percent of the remaining appropriated funds shall be distributed among the eligible Tribal Colleges and Universities on a pro rata basis, based on the respective Indian student counts (as defined in section 2(a) of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)) of the Tribal Colleges and Universities; and

“(2) the remaining 40 percent shall be distributed in equal shares to the eligible Tribal Colleges and Universities.”

#### SEC. 5. PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS.

(a) PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS.—Part A of title III is amended by inserting after section 317 (20 U.S.C. 1059d) the following new section:

##### “SEC. 318. PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS.

“(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—

“(1) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

“(A) although Black Americans have made significant progress in closing the ‘gap’ between black and white enrollment in higher education—

“(i) Black Americans continue to trail whites in the percentage of the college-age cohort who enroll and graduate from college;

“(ii) the college participation rate of whites was 46 percent from 2000–2002, while that for blacks was only 39 percent; and

“(iii) the gap between white and black baccalaureate degree attainment rates also remains high, continuing to exceed 10 percent;

“(B) a growing number of Black American students are participating in higher education and are enrolled at a growing number of urban and rural Predominantly Black Institutions that have included in their mission the provision of academic training and education for both traditional and non-traditional minority students;

“(C) the overwhelming majority of students attending Predominantly Black Institutions come from low- and middle-income families and qualify for participation in the Federal student assistance programs or other need-based Federal programs; and recent data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study indicate that 47 percent of Pell grant recipients were black compared to only 21 percent of whites;

“(D) many of these students are also ‘first generation’ college students who lack the appropriate academic preparation for success

in college and whose parents lack the ordinary knowledge and information regarding financing a college education;

“(E) there is a particular national need to aid institutions of higher education that have become Predominantly Black Institutions by virtue of the fact that they have expanded opportunities for Black American and other minority students;

“(F) Predominantly Black Institutions fulfill a unique mission and represent a vital component of the American higher education landscape, far beyond that which was initially envisioned;

“(G) Predominantly Black Institutions serve the cultural and social advancement of low-income, Black American and other minority students and are a significant access point for these students to higher education and the opportunities offered by American society;

“(H) the concentration of these students in a limited number of two-year and four-year Predominantly Black Institutions and their desire to secure a degree to prepare them for a successful career places special burdens on those institutions who attract, retain, and graduate these students; and

“(I) financial assistance to establish or strengthen the physical plants, financial management, academic resources, and endowments of the Predominantly Black Institutions are appropriate methods to enhance these institutions and facilitate a decrease in reliance on governmental financial support and to encourage reliance on endowments and private sources.

“(2) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to assist Predominantly Black Institutions in expanding educational opportunity through a program of Federal assistance.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Predominantly Black Institution’ means an institution of higher education—

“(A) that is an eligible institution (as defined in paragraph (5)(A) of this subsection) with a minimum of 1,000 undergraduate students;

“(B) at which at least 50 percent of the undergraduate students enrolled at the institution are low-income individuals or first-generation college students (as that term is defined in section 402A(g)); and

“(C) at which at least 50 percent of the undergraduate students are enrolled in an educational program leading to a bachelor’s or associate’s degree that the institution is licensed to award by the State in which it is located.

“(2) LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘low-income individual’ has the meaning given such term in section 402A(g).

“(3) MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL BENEFIT PROGRAM.—The term ‘means-tested Federal benefit program’ means a program of the Federal Government, other than a program under title IV, in which eligibility for the programs’ benefits, or the amount of such benefits, or both, are determined on the basis of income or resources of the individual or family seeking the benefit.

“(4) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

“(5) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms defined by section 312 have the meanings provided by that section, except as follows:

“(A) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—

“(i) The term ‘eligible institution’ means an institution of higher education that—

“(I) has an enrollment of needy undergraduate students as required and defined by subparagraph (B);

“(II) except as provided in section 392(b), the average educational and general expenditure of which are low, per full-time equivalent

undergraduate student in comparison with the average educational and general expenditure per full-time equivalent undergraduate student of institutions that offer similar instruction;

“(III) has an enrollment of undergraduate students that is at least 40 percent Black American students;

“(IV) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which the institution awards a bachelors degree, or in the case of a junior or community college, an associate’s degree; and

“(V) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered, or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation.

“(ii) For purposes of the determination of whether an institution is an eligible institution under this subparagraph, the factor described under clause (i)(I) shall be given twice the weight of the factor described under clause (i)(III).

“(B) ENROLLMENT OF NEEDY STUDENTS.—The term ‘enrollment of needy students’ means the enrollment at an eligible institution with respect to which at least 50 percent of the undergraduate students enrolled in an academic program leading to a degree—

“(i) in the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, were Pell Grant recipients in such year;

“(ii) come from families that receive benefits under a means-tested Federal benefits program (as defined in subsection (b)(3));

“(iii) attended a public or nonprofit private secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which was eligible for assistance pursuant to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in any year during which the student attended that secondary school, and which for the purpose of this paragraph and for that year was determined by the Secretary (pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located) to be a school in which the enrollment of children counted under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 exceeds 30 percent of the total enrollment of that school; or

“(iv) are ‘first-generation college students’ as that term is defined in section 402A(g), and a majority of such first-generation college students are low-income individuals.

“(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) TYPES OF ACTIVITIES AUTHORIZED.—Grants awarded pursuant to subsection (d) shall be used by Predominantly Black Institutions—

“(A) to assist the institution to plan, develop, undertake, and implement programs to enhance the institution’s capacity to serve more low- and middle-income Black American students;

“(B) to expand higher education opportunities for title IV eligible students by encouraging college preparation and student persistence in secondary and postsecondary education; and

“(C) to strengthen the institution’s financial ability to serve the academic needs of the students described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(2) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants made to an institution under subsection (d) shall be used for one or more of the following activities:

“(A) The activities described in section 311(a)(1) through (11).

“(B) Academic instruction in disciplines in which Black Americans are underrepresented.

“(C) Establishing or enhancing a program of teacher education designed to qualify students to teach in a public elementary or secondary school in the State that shall include, as part of such program, preparation for teacher certification.

“(D) Establishing community outreach programs which will encourage elementary and secondary students to develop the academic skills and the interest to pursue postsecondary education.

“(E) Other activities proposed in the application submitted pursuant to subsection (e) that—

“(i) contribute to carrying out the purposes of this section; and

“(ii) are approved by the Secretary as part of the review and acceptance of such application.

“(3) ENDOWMENT FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A Predominantly Black Institution may use not more than 20 percent of the grant funds provided under this section to establish or increase an endowment fund at the institution.

“(B) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—In order to be eligible to use grant funds in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Predominantly Black Institution shall provide matching funds from non-Federal sources, in an amount equal to or greater than the Federal funds used in accordance with subparagraph (A), for the establishment or increase of the endowment fund.

“(C) COMPARABILITY.—The provisions of part C regarding the establishment or increase of an endowment fund, that the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this subsection, shall apply to funds used under subparagraph (A).

“(4) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the allotment of any Predominantly Black Institution may be available for the purpose of constructing or maintaining a classroom, library, laboratory, or other instructional facility.

“(d) ALLOTMENTS TO PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS.—

“(1) ALLOTMENT: PELL GRANT BASIS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each Predominantly Black Institution a sum which bears the same ratio to one-half that amount as the number of Pell Grant recipients in attendance at such institution at the end of the academic year preceding the beginning of that fiscal year bears to the total number of Pell Grant recipients at all institutions eligible under this section.

“(2) ALLOTMENT: GRADUATES BASIS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each Predominantly Black Institution a sum which bears the same ratio to one-fourth that amount as the number of graduates for such school year at such institution bears to the total number of graduates for such school year at all institutions eligible under this section.

“(3) ALLOTMENT: GRADUATES SEEKING A HIGHER DEGREE BASIS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each Predominantly Black Institution a sum which bears the same ratio to one-fourth of that amount as the percentage of graduates per institution who are admitted to and in attendance at, within 2 years of graduation with an associates degree or a baccalaureate degree, either a baccalaureate degree-granting institution or a graduate or professional school in a degree program in disciplines in which Black American students are underrepresented, bears to the percentage of such

graduates per institution for all eligible institutions.

“(4) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—(A) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), the amount allotted to each Predominantly Black Institution under this section shall not be less than \$250,000.

“(B) If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 399 for any fiscal year is not sufficient to pay the minimum allotment, the amount of such minimum allotment shall be ratably reduced. If additional sums become available for such fiscal year, such reduced allocation shall be increased on the same basis as it was reduced until the amount allotted equals the minimum allotment required by subparagraph (A).

“(5) REALLOTMENT.—The amount of a Predominantly Black Institution’s allotment under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) for any fiscal year, which the Secretary determines will not be required for such institution for the period such allotment is available, shall be available for reallocation to other Predominantly Black Institutions in proportion to the original allotment to such other institutions under this section for such fiscal year. The Secretary shall reallocate such amounts from time to time, on such date and during such period as the Secretary deems appropriate.

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—No Predominantly Black Institution shall be entitled to its allotment of Federal funds for any grant under subsection (d) for any period unless the institution submits an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(f) APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS.—Section 393 shall not apply to applications under this section.

“(g) PROHIBITION.—No Predominantly Black Institution that applies for and receives a grant under this section may apply for or receive funds under any other program under this part or part B of this title.

“(h) DURATION AND CARRYOVER.—Any funds paid to a Predominantly Black Institution under this section and not expended or used for the purposes for which the funds were paid within 10 years following the date of the grant awarded to such institution under this section shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1063h(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 318, \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”.

#### SEC. 6. GRANTS TO PART B INSTITUTIONS.

(a) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.—

(A) UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 323(a) (20 U.S.C. 1062(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) Construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services, and the acquisition of real property adjacent to the campus of the institution on which to construct such facilities.”.

(B) GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS.—Paragraph (2) of section 326(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or

services, and the acquisition of real property adjacent to the campus of the institution on which to construct such facilities;”.

(2) OUTREACH AND COLLABORATION.—Paragraph (11) of section 323(a) is amended to read as follows:

“(11) Establishing community outreach programs and collaborative partnerships between part B institutions and local elementary or secondary schools. Such partnerships may include mentoring, tutoring, or other instructional opportunities that will boost student academic achievement and assist elementary and secondary school students in developing the academic skills and the interest to pursue postsecondary education.”.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 323 (20 U.S.C. 1062) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An institution may not use more than 2 percent of the grant funds provided under this part to secure technical assistance services.

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES.—Technical assistance services may include assistance with enrollment management, financial management, and strategic planning.

“(3) REPORT.—The institution shall report to the Secretary on an annual basis, in such form as the Secretary requires, on the use of funds under this subsection.”.

(c) DISTANCE LEARNING.—Section 323(a)(2) (20 U.S.C. 1062(a)(2)) (as amended by subsection (a)(1)(A)) is further amended by inserting “development or improvement of facilities for Internet use or other distance learning academic instruction capabilities and” after “including”.

(d) MINIMUM GRANTS.—Section 324(d)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1063(d)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that, if the amount appropriated to carry out this part for any fiscal year exceeds the amount required to provide to each institution an amount equal to the total amount received by such institution under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of the preceding fiscal year, then the amount of such excess appropriation shall first be applied to increase the minimum allotment under this subsection to \$750,000”.

(e) ELIGIBLE GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS.—

(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 326(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “subsection (e) that”;

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, (B) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered, and (C) according to such an agency or association, is in good standing”.

(2) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.—Section 326(e)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (Q);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (R) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(S) Alabama State University qualified graduate program;

“(T) Prairie View A & M University qualified graduate program;

“(U) Coppin State University qualified graduate program; and

“(V) Delaware State University qualified graduate program.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 326(e)(3) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking “1998” and inserting “2005”; and

(B) by striking “(Q) and (R)” and inserting “(S), (T), (U), and (V)”.

(f) PROFESSIONAL OR GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS.—Section 326(f) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “\$26,600,000” and inserting “\$54,500,000”; and

(B) by striking “(P)” and inserting “(R)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “\$26,600,000, but not in excess of \$28,600,000” and inserting “\$54,500,000, but not in excess of \$58,500,000”; and

(B) by striking “subparagraphs (Q) and (R)” and inserting “subparagraphs (S), (T), (U), and (V)”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “\$28,600,000” and inserting “\$58,500,000”; and

(B) by striking “(R)” and inserting “(V)”.

(g) HOLD HARMLESS.—Section 326(g) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(g)) is amended by striking “1998” each place it appears and inserting “2005”.

#### SEC. 7. PELL GRANTS.

(a) TUITION SENSITIVITY.—Section 401(b) is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively.

(b) MULTIPLE GRANTS.—Paragraph (5) of section 401(b) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) YEAR-ROUND PELL GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, for students enrolled full time in a baccalaureate or associate’s degree program of study at an eligible institution, award such students two Pell grants during a single award year to permit such students to accelerate progress toward their degree objectives by enrolling in academic programs for 12 months rather than 9 months.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall limit the awarding of additional Pell grants under this paragraph in a single award year to students attending—

“(i) baccalaureate degree granting institutions that have a graduation rate as reported by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System for the 4 preceding academic years of at least 30 percent; or

“(ii) two-year institutions that have a graduation rate as reported by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems, in at least one of the last 3 years for which data is available, that is above the average for the applicable year for the institution’s type and control.

“(C) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the program under this paragraph and submit to the Congress an evaluation report no later than October 1, 2011.

“(D) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations implementing this paragraph.”.

#### SEC. 8. INTEREST RATE REDUCTIONS.

(a) FFEL INTEREST RATES.—Section 427A(l)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077a(l)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “6.8 percent” and inserting “3.4 percent”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that for any loan made pursuant to section 428H for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan”.

(b) DIRECT LOANS.—Section 455(b)(7)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans”;

(2) by striking “6.8 percent” and inserting “3.4 percent”; and

(3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and for any Federal Direct Unsubsidized Loan made for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective for loans made on or after July 1, 2006 and before July 1, 2007.

**SEC. 9. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR SERVICE IN AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.**

Section 428K (20 U.S.C. 1078–11) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 428K. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR SERVICE IN AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.**

“(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

“(1) to encourage highly trained individuals to enter and continue in service in areas of national need; and

“(2) to reduce the burden of student debt for Americans who dedicate their careers to service in areas of national need.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program of assuming the obligation to repay, pursuant to paragraphs (2) of subsection (c) and subsection (d), a qualified loan amount for a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this part or part D (other than loans made under section 428B and 428C and comparable loans made under part D), for any new borrower after the date of enactment of the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act of 2006, who—

“(A) has been employed full-time for at least 5 consecutive complete school, academic, or calendar years, as appropriate, in an area of national need described in subsection (c); and

“(B) is not in default on a loan for which the borrower seeks forgiveness.

“(2) AWARD BASIS.—Loan repayment under this section shall be on a first-come, first-served basis pursuant to the designation under subsection (c) and subject to the availability of appropriations.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

“(c) AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.—

“(1) STATUTORY CATEGORIES.—For purposes of this section, an individual shall be treated as employed in an area of national need if the individual is employed full time and is any of the following:

“(A) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS.—An individual who is employed as an early childhood educator in an eligible preschool program or child care facility in a low-income community, and who is involved directly in the care, development and education of infants, toddlers, or young children through age five.

“(B) NURSES.—An individual who is employed—

“(i) as a nurse in a clinical setting; or

“(ii) as a member of the nursing faculty at an accredited school of nursing (as those terms are defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)).

“(C) FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS.—An individual who has obtained a baccalaureate degree in a critical foreign language and is employed—

“(i) in an elementary or secondary school as a teacher of a critical foreign language; or

“(ii) in an agency of the United States Government in a position that regularly requires the use of such critical foreign language.

“(D) LIBRARIANS.—An individual who is employed full-time as a librarian in—

“(i) a public library that serves a geographic area within which the public schools have a combined average of 30 percent or more of their total student enrollments composed of children counted under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; or

“(ii) an elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which is eligible in such year for assistance pursuant to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and which for the purpose of this paragraph and for that year has been determined by the Secretary (pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located) to be a school in which the enrollment of children counted under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 exceeds 30 percent of the total enrollment of that school.

“(E) HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES.—An individual who—

“(i) is highly qualified as such term is defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

“(ii)(I) is employed as a full-time teacher of bilingual education; or

“(II) is employed as a teacher for service in a public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which is eligible in such year for assistance pursuant to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and which for the purpose of this paragraph and for that year has been determined by the Secretary (pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located) to be a school in which the enrollment of children counted under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 exceeds 40 percent of the total enrollment of that school.

“(F) FIRST RESPONDERS IN LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES.—An individual who—

“(i) is employed as a firefighter, police officer, or emergency medical technician; and

“(ii) serves as such in a low-income community.

“(G) CHILD WELFARE WORKERS.—An individual who—

“(i) has obtained a degree in social work or a related field with a focus on serving children and families; and

“(ii) is employed in public or private child welfare services.

“(H) SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGISTS.—An individual who is a speech-language pathologist, who is employed in an eligible preschool program or an elementary or secondary school, and who has, at a minimum, a graduate degree in speech-language pathology, or communication sciences and disorders.

“(I) ADDITIONAL AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.—An individual who is employed in an area designated by the Secretary under paragraph (2) and has completed a baccalaureate or advanced degree related to such area.

“(2) DESIGNATION OF AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.—After consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and community-based agencies and organizations, the Secretary shall designate areas of national need. In making such designations, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which—

“(A) the national interest in the area is compelling;

“(B) the area suffers from a critical lack of qualified personnel; and

“(C) other Federal programs support the area concerned.

“(d) QUALIFIED LOAN AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall repay not more than \$5,000 in

the aggregate of the loan obligation on a loan made under section 428 or 428H that is outstanding after the completion of the fifth consecutive school, academic, or calendar year, as appropriate, described in subsection (b)(1).

“(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan made under section 428 or 428H.

“(f) INELIGIBILITY OF NATIONAL SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—No student borrower may, for the same service, receive a benefit under both this section and subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

“(g) INELIGIBILITY FOR DOUBLE BENEFITS.—No borrower may receive a reduction of loan obligations under both this section and section 428J or 460.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section

“(1) CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term ‘child care facility’ means a facility, including a home, that—

“(A) provides for the education and care of children from birth through age 5; and

“(B) meets any applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements.

“(2) CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE.—The term ‘critical foreign language’ includes the languages of Arabic, Korean, Japanese, Chinese, Pashto, Persian-Farsi, Serbian-Croatian, Russian, Portuguese, and any other language identified by the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Defense Language Institute, the Foreign Service Institute, and the National Security Education Program, as a critical foreign language need.

“(3) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATOR.—The term ‘early childhood educator’ means an early childhood educator employed in an eligible preschool program who has completed a baccalaureate or advanced degree in early childhood development, early childhood education, or in a field related to early childhood education.

“(4) ELIGIBLE PRESCHOOL PROGRAM.—The term ‘eligible preschool program’ means a program that provides for the care, development, and education of infants, toddlers, or young children through age 5, meets any applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, and registration requirements, and is operated by—

“(A) a public or private school that may be supported, sponsored, supervised, or administered by a local educational agency;

“(B) a Head Start agency serving as a grantee designated under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(C) a nonprofit or community based organization; or

“(D) a child care program, including a home.

“(5) LOW-INCOME COMMUNITY.—In this subsection, the term ‘low-income community’ means a community in which 70 percent of households earn less than 85 percent of the State median household income.

“(6) NURSE.—The term ‘nurse’ means a nurse who meets all of the following:

“(A) The nurse graduated from—

“(i) an accredited school of nursing (as those terms are defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296));

“(ii) a nursing center; or

“(iii) an academic health center that provides nurse training.

“(B) The nurse holds a valid and unrestricted license to practice nursing in the State in which the nurse practices in a clinical setting.

“(C) The nurse holds one or more of the following:

“(i) A graduate degree in nursing, or an equivalent degree.



“(ii) A nursing degree from a collegiate school of nursing (as defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)).

“(iii) A nursing degree from an associate degree school of nursing (as defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)).

“(iv) A nursing degree from a diploma school of nursing (as defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)).

“(7) **SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST.**—The term ‘speech-language pathologist’ means a speech-language pathologist who meets all of the following:

“(A) the speech-language pathologist has received, at a minimum, a graduate degree in speech-language pathology or communication sciences and disorders from an institution of higher education accredited by an agency or association recognized by the Secretary pursuant to section 496(a) of this Act; and

“(B) the speech-language pathologist meets or exceeds the qualifications as defined in section 1861(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x).

“(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”.

#### **SEC. 10. ADDITIONAL CONSOLIDATION LOAN CHANGES.**

(a) **ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 428C(b)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1078-3(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking everything after “under this section” the first place it appears in subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking “(i) which” and all that follows through “and (ii)” in subparagraph (C);

(3) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (E);

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) that the lender of the consolidation loan shall, upon application for such loan, provide the borrower with a clear and conspicuous notice of at least the following information:

“(i) the effects of consolidation on total interest to be paid, fees to be paid, and length of repayment;

“(ii) the effects of consolidation on a borrower’s underlying loan benefits, including loan forgiveness, cancellation, deferment, and reduced interest rates on those underlying loans;

“(iii) the ability of the borrower to prepay the loan, pay on a shorter schedule, and to change repayment plans;

“(iv) that borrower benefit programs may vary among different loan holders, and a description of how the borrower benefits may vary among different loan holders;

“(v) the tax benefits for which borrowers may be eligible;

“(vi) the consequences of default; and

“(vii) that by making the application the applicant is not obligated to agree to take the consolidation loan; and”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE FOR SINGLE HOLDER AMENDMENT.**—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to any loan made under section 428C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-3) for which the application is received by an eligible lender on or after July 1, 2006.

#### **SEC. 11. SIGNIFICANTLY SIMPLIFYING THE STUDENT AID APPLICATION PROCESS.**

(a) **IMPROVEMENTS TO PAPER AND ELECTRONIC FORMS.**—

(1) **COMMON FINANCIAL AID FORM DEVELOPMENT AND PROCESSING.**—Section 483(a) (20 U.S.C. 1090(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (5);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (6), and (7), as paragraphs (9), (10), (11), and (12), respectively;

(C) by inserting before paragraph (9), as redesignated by subparagraph (B), the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in cooperation with representatives of agencies and organizations involved in student financial assistance, shall produce, distribute, and process free of charge common financial reporting forms as described in this subsection to be used for application and reapplication to determine the need and eligibility of a student for financial assistance under parts A through E (other than subpart 4 of part A). These forms shall be made available to applicants in both paper and electronic formats and shall be referred to as the ‘Free Application for Federal Student Aid’ or the ‘FAFSA’.

“(2) **EARLY ESTIMATES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall permit applicants to complete such forms as described in this subsection in the 4 years prior to enrollment in order to obtain a non-binding estimate of the family contribution, as defined in section 473. The estimate shall clearly and conspicuously indicate that it is only an estimate of family contribution, and may not reflect the actual family contribution of the applicant that shall be used to determine the grant, loan, or work assistance that the applicant may receive under this title when enrolled in a program of postsecondary education. Such applicants shall be permitted to update information submitted on forms described in this subsection using the process required under paragraph (5)(A).

“(B) **EVALUATION.**—Two years after the early estimates are implemented under this paragraph and from data gathered from the early estimates, the Secretary shall evaluate the differences between initial, non-binding early estimates and the final financial aid award made available under this title.

“(C) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall provide a report to the authorizing committees on the results of the evaluation.

“(3) **PAPER FORMAT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall produce, distribute, and process common forms in paper format to meet the requirements of paragraph (1). The Secretary shall develop a common paper form for applicants who do not meet the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(B) **EZ FAFSA.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and use a simplified paper application form, to be known as the ‘EZ FAFSA’, to be used for applicants meeting the requirements of section 479(c).

“(ii) **REDUCED DATA REQUIREMENTS.**—The form under this subparagraph shall permit an applicant to submit, for financial assistance purposes, only the data elements required to make a determination of whether the applicant meets the requirements under section 479(c).

“(iii) **STATE DATA.**—The Secretary shall include on the form under this subparagraph such data items as may be necessary to award State financial assistance, as provided under paragraph (6), except that the Secretary shall not include a State’s data if that State does not permit its applicants for State assistance to use the form under this subparagraph.

“(iv) **FREE AVAILABILITY AND PROCESSING.**—The provisions of paragraph (7) shall apply to the form under this subparagraph, and the data collected by means of the form under this subparagraph shall be available to insti-

tutions of higher education, guaranty agencies, and States in accordance with paragraph (9).

“(v) **TESTING.**—The Secretary shall conduct appropriate field testing on the form under this subparagraph.

“(C) **PROMOTING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC FAFSA.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall make an effort to encourage applicants to utilize the electronic forms described in paragraph (4).

“(ii) **MAINTENANCE OF THE FAFSA IN A PRINTABLE ELECTRONIC FILE.**—The Secretary shall maintain a version of the paper forms described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) in a printable electronic file that is easily portable. The printable electronic file will be made easily accessible and downloadable to students on the same website used to provide students with the electronic application forms described in paragraph (4) of this subsection. The Secretary shall enable students to submit a form created under this subparagraph that is downloaded and printed from an electronic file format in order to meet the filing requirements of this section and in order to receive aid from programs under this title.

“(iii) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary shall report annually to Congress on the impact of the digital divide on students completing applications for title IV aid described under this paragraph and paragraph (4). The Secretary will also report on the steps taken to eliminate the digital divide and phase out the paper form described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph. The Secretary’s report will specifically address the impact of the digital divide on the following student populations: dependent students, independent students without dependents, and independent students with dependents other than a spouse.

“(4) **ELECTRONIC FORMAT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall produce, distribute, and process common forms in electronic format to meet the requirements of paragraph (1). The Secretary shall develop common electronic forms for applicants who do not meet the requirements of subparagraph (C) of this paragraph.

“(B) **STATE DATA.**—The Secretary shall include on the common electronic forms space for information that needs to be submitted from the applicant to be eligible for State financial assistance, as provided under paragraph (6), except the Secretary shall not require applicants to complete data required by any State other than the applicant’s State of residence.

“(C) **SIMPLIFIED APPLICATIONS: FAFSA ON THE WEB.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and use a simplified electronic application form to be used by applicants meeting the requirements under subsection (c) of section 479 and an additional, separate simplified electronic application form to be used by applicants meeting the requirements under subsection (b) of section 479.

“(ii) **REDUCED DATA REQUIREMENTS.**—The simplified electronic application forms shall permit an applicant to submit for financial assistance purposes, only the data elements required to make a determination of whether the applicant meets the requirements under subsection (b) or (c) of section 479.

“(iii) **STATE DATA.**—The Secretary shall include on the simplified electronic application forms such data items as may be necessary to award state financial assistance, as provided under paragraph (6), except that the Secretary shall not require applicants to complete data required by any State other than the applicant’s State of residence.

“(iv) **AVAILABILITY AND PROCESSING.**—The data collected by means of the simplified

electronic application forms shall be available to institutions of higher education, guaranty agencies, and States in accordance with paragraph (9).

“(v) TESTING.—The Secretary shall conduct appropriate field testing on the forms developed under this subparagraph.

“(D) USE OF FORMS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the use of the forms developed by the Secretary pursuant to this paragraph by an eligible institution, eligible lender, guaranty agency, State grant agency, private computer software provider, a consortium thereof, or such other entities as the Secretary may designate.

“(E) PRIVACY.—The Secretary shall ensure that data collection under this paragraph complies with section 552a of title 5, United States Code, and that any entity using the electronic version of the forms developed by the Secretary pursuant to this paragraph shall maintain reasonable and appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to ensure the integrity and confidentiality of the information, and to protect against security threats, or unauthorized uses or disclosures of the information provided on the electronic version of the forms. Data collected by such electronic version of the forms shall be used only for the application, award, and administration of aid awarded under this title, State aid, or aid awarded by eligible institutions or such entities as the Secretary may designate. No data collected by such electronic version of the forms shall be used for making final aid awards under this title until such data have been processed by the Secretary or a contractor or designee of the Secretary, except as may be permitted under this title.

“(F) SIGNATURE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may permit an electronic form under this paragraph to be submitted without a signature, if a signature is subsequently submitted by the applicant.

“(5) STREAMLINING.—

“(A) STREAMLINED REAPPLICATION PROCESSES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop streamlined reapplication forms and processes, including both paper and electronic reapplication processes, consistent with the requirements of this subsection, for an applicant who applies for financial assistance under this title—

“(I) in the academic year succeeding the year in which such applicant first applied for financial assistance under this title; or

“(II) in any succeeding academic years.

“(ii) MECHANISMS FOR REAPPLICATION.—The Secretary shall develop appropriate mechanisms to support reapplication.

“(iii) IDENTIFICATION OF UPDATED DATA.—The Secretary shall determine, in cooperation with States, institutions of higher education, agencies, and organizations involved in student financial assistance, the data elements that can be updated from the previous academic year's application.

“(iv) REDUCED DATA AUTHORIZED.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary to reduce the number of data elements required of reapplicants.

“(v) ZERO FAMILY CONTRIBUTION.—Applicants determined to have a zero family contribution pursuant to section 479(c) shall not be required to provide any financial data in a reapplication form, except that which is necessary to determine eligibility under such section.

“(B) REDUCTION OF DATA ELEMENTS.—

“(i) REDUCTION ENCOURAGED.—Of the number of data elements on the FAFSA on the date of enactment of the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act of 2006 (including questions

on the FAFSA for the purposes described in paragraph (6)), the Secretary, in cooperation with representatives of agencies and organizations involved in student financial assistance, shall continue to reduce the number of such data elements following the date of enactment. Reductions of data elements under paragraph (3)(B), (4)(C), or (5)(A)(iv) shall not be counted towards the reduction referred to in this paragraph unless those data elements are reduced for all applicants.

“(ii) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually report to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the progress made of reducing data elements.

“(6) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall include on the forms developed under this subsection, such State-specific data items as the Secretary determines are necessary to meet State requirements for State need-based financial aid under section 415C, except as provided in paragraphs (3)(B)(iii) and (4)(C)(iii) of this subsection. Such items shall be selected in consultation with State agencies in order to assist in the awarding of State financial assistance in accordance with the terms of this subsection, except as provided in paragraphs (3)(B)(iii) and (4)(C)(iii) of this subsection. The number of such data items shall not be less than the number included on the form on October 7, 1998, unless a State notifies the Secretary that the State no longer requires those data items for the distribution of State need-based financial aid.

“(B) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct an annual review process to determine which forms and data items the States require to award State need-based financial aid and other application requirements that the States may impose.

“(C) STATE USE OF SIMPLIFIED FORMS.—The Secretary shall encourage States to take such steps as necessary to encourage the use of simplified application forms, including those described in paragraphs (3)(B) and (4)(C), to meet the requirements under subsection (b) or (c) of section 479.

“(D) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—The Secretary shall publish on an annual basis a notice in the Federal Register requiring State agencies to inform the Secretary—

“(i) if the State agency is unable to permit applicants to utilize the simplified application forms described in paragraphs (3)(B) and (4)(C); and

“(ii) of the State-specific data that the State agency requires for delivery of State need-based financial aid.

“(E) STATE NOTIFICATION TO THE SECRETARY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each State agency shall notify the Secretary—

“(I) whether the State permits an applicant to file a form described in paragraph (3)(B) or paragraph (4)(C) of this subsection for purposes of determining eligibility for State need-based financial aid; and

“(II) the State-specific data that the State agency requires for delivery of State need-based financial aid.

“(ii) ACCEPTANCE OF FORMS.—In the event that a State does not permit an applicant to file a form described in paragraph (3)(B) or paragraph (4)(C) of this subsection for purposes of determining eligibility for State need-based financial aid—

“(I) the State shall notify the Secretary if the State is not permitted to do so because of either State law or because of agency policy; and

“(II) the notification under subclause (I) shall include an estimate of the program cost to permit applicants to complete simplified application forms under paragraphs (3)(B) and paragraph (4)(C) of this subsection.

“(iii) LACK OF NOTIFICATION BY THE STATE.—If a State does not notify the Secretary pursuant to clause (i), the Secretary shall—

“(I) permit residents of that State to complete simplified application forms under paragraphs (3)(B) and paragraph (4)(C) of this subsection; and

“(II) not require any resident of that State to complete any data previously required by that State under this section.

“(7) CHARGES TO STUDENTS AND PARENTS FOR USE OF FORMS PROHIBITED.—

“(A) FEES PROHIBITED.—The FAFSA, in whatever form (including the EZ-FAFSA, paper, electronic, simplified, or reapplication), shall be produced, distributed, and processed by the Secretary and no parent or student shall be charged a fee for the collection, processing, or delivery of financial aid through the use of the FAFSA. The need and eligibility of a student for financial assistance under parts A through E of this title (other than under subpart 4 of part A) may only be determined by using the FAFSA developed by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection. No student may receive assistance under parts A through E of this title (other than under subpart 4 of part A), except by use of the FAFSA developed by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection. No data collected on a form for which a fee is charged shall be used to complete the FAFSA.

“(B) NOTICE.—Any entity that provides to students or parents, or charges students or parents for, any value-added services with respect to or in connection with the FAFSA, such as completion of the FAFSA, submission of the FAFSA, or tracking of the FAFSA for a student, shall provide to students and parents clear and conspicuous notice that—

“(i) the FAFSA is a free Federal student aid application;

“(ii) the FAFSA can be completed without professional assistance; and

“(iii) includes the current Internet address for the FAFSA on the Department's web site.

“(8) APPLICATION PROCESSING CYCLE.—The Secretary shall enable students to submit a form created under this subsection in order to meet the filing requirements of this section and in order to receive aid from programs under this title and shall initiate the processing of applications under this subsection as early as practicable prior to January 1 of the student's planned year of enrollment.”

(2) MASTER CALENDAR.—Section 482(a)(1)(B) (20 U.S.C. 1089) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) by March 1: proposed modifications, updates, and notices pursuant to sections 478, 479(c)(2)(C), and 483(a)(6) published in the Federal Register;”

(b) INCREASING ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY.—Section 483 (20 U.S.C. 1090) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ADDRESSING THE DIGITAL DIVIDE.—The Secretary shall utilize savings accrued by moving more applicants to the electronic forms described in subsection (a)(4) to improve access to the electronic forms described in subsection (a)(4) for applicants meeting the requirements of section 479(c).”

(c) EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF AN INDEPENDENT STUDENT.—Section 480(d) (20 U.S.C. 1087vv(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) is an orphan, in foster care, or a ward of the court, or was in foster care or a ward of the court until the individual reached the age of 18;”

**SEC. 12. DISCRETION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS.**

Section 479A(a) (20 U.S.C. 1087tt(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS.—“(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—”;

(2) by inserting before “Special circumstances may” the following:

“(2) SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES DEFINED.—”;

(3) by inserting “a student’s status as a ward of the court at any time prior to attaining 18 years of age, a student’s status as an individual who was adopted at or after age 13, a student’s status as a homeless or unaccompanied youth (as defined in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act),” after “487,”;

(4) by inserting before “Adequate documentation” the following:

“(3) DOCUMENTATION AND USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.—”;

(5) by inserting before “No student” the following:

“(4) FEES FOR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—”.

**SEC. 13. POSTBACCALAUREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR HISPANIC AMERICANS.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Title V is amended—

(1) by redesignating part B as part C;

(2) by redesignating sections 511 through 518 as sections 521 through 528, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 505 (20 U.S.C. 1101d) the following new part:

**“PART B—PROMOTING POSTBACCALAUREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR HISPANIC AMERICANS**

**“SEC. 511. PURPOSES.**

“The purposes of this part are—

“(1) to expand postbaccalaureate educational opportunities for, and improve the academic attainment of, Hispanic students; and

“(2) to expand the postbaccalaureate academic offerings and enhance the program quality in the institutions that are educating the majority of Hispanic college students and helping large numbers of Hispanic and low-income students complete postsecondary degrees.

**“SEC. 512. PROGRAM AUTHORITY AND ELIGIBILITY.**

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of funds appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary shall award competitive grants to Hispanic-serving institutions determined by the Secretary to be making substantive contributions to graduate educational opportunities for Hispanic students.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—For the purposes of this part, an ‘eligible institution’ means an institution of higher education that—

“(1) is an eligible institution under section 502(a)(2); and

“(2) offers a postbaccalaureate certificate or degree granting program.

**“SEC. 513. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**

“Grants awarded under this part shall be used for one or more of the following activities:

“(1) Purchase, rental, or lease of scientific or laboratory equipment for educational purposes, including instructional and research purposes.

“(2) Construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement of classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services.

“(3) Purchase of library books, periodicals, technical and other scientific journals, microfilm, microfiche, and other educational materials, including telecommunications program materials.

“(4) Support for needy postbaccalaureate students including outreach, academic support services, mentoring, scholarships, fel-

lowships, and other financial assistance to permit the enrollment of such students in postbaccalaureate certificate and degree granting programs.

“(5) Support of faculty exchanges, faculty development, faculty research, curriculum development, and academic instruction.

“(6) Creating or improving facilities for Internet or other distance learning academic instruction capabilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services.

“(7) Collaboration with other institutions of higher education to expand postbaccalaureate certificate and degree offerings.

“(8) Other activities proposed in the application submitted pursuant to section 514 that—

“(A) contribute to carrying out the purposes of this part; and

“(B) are approved by the Secretary as part of the review and acceptance of such application.

**“SEC. 514. APPLICATION AND DURATION.**

“(a) APPLICATION.—Any eligible institution may apply for a grant under this part by submitting an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as determined by the Secretary. Such application shall demonstrate how the grant funds will be used to improve postbaccalaureate education opportunities in programs and professions in which Hispanic Americans are underrepresented.

“(b) DURATION.—Grants under this part shall be awarded for a period not to exceed 5 years.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not award more than one grant under this part in any fiscal year to any Hispanic-serving institution.”.

(b) COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 524(a) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) (20 U.S.C. 1103c(a)) is amended by inserting “and section 513” after “section 503”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 528 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section) (20 U.S.C. 1103g) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—

“(1) PART A.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part A and part C of this title \$96,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

“(2) PART B.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B of this title \$59,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”.

**SEC. 14. CANCELLATION OF STUDENT LOAN INDEBTEDNESS FOR SURVIVORS OF VICTIMS OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, ATTACKS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC SERVANT.—The term “eligible public servant” means an individual who, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary—

(A) served as a police officer, firefighter, other safety or rescue personnel, or as a member of the Armed Forces; and

(B) died (or dies) or became (or becomes) permanently and totally disabled due to injuries suffered in the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001.

(2) ELIGIBLE VICTIM.—The term “eligible victim” means an individual who, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, died (or dies) or became (or becomes) permanently and totally disabled due to injuries suffered in the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001.

(3) ELIGIBLE PARENT.—The term “eligible parent” means the parent of an eligible victim if—

(A) the parent owes a Federal student loan that is a consolidation loan that was used to

repay a PLUS loan incurred on behalf of such eligible victim; or

(B) the parent owes a Federal student loan that is a PLUS loan incurred on behalf of an eligible victim.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

(5) FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN.—The term “Federal student loan” means any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) RELIEF FROM INDEBTEDNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the discharge or cancellation of—

(A) the Federal student loan indebtedness of the spouse of an eligible public servant, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, including any consolidation loan that was used jointly by the eligible public servant and his or her spouse to repay the Federal student loans of the spouse and the eligible public servant;

(B) the portion incurred on behalf of the eligible victim (other than an eligible public servant), of a Federal student loan that is a consolidation loan that was used jointly by the eligible victim and his or her spouse, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, to repay the Federal student loans of the eligible victim and his or her spouse;

(C) the portion of the consolidation loan indebtedness of an eligible parent that was incurred on behalf of an eligible victim; and

(D) the PLUS loan indebtedness of an eligible parent that was incurred on behalf of an eligible victim.

(2) METHOD OF DISCHARGE OR CANCELLATION.—A loan required to be discharged or canceled under paragraph (1) shall be discharged or canceled by the method used under section 437(a), 455(a)(1), or 464(c)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a), 1087e(a)(1), 1087d(c)(1)(F)), whichever is applicable to such loan.

(c) FACILITATION OF CLAIMS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) establish procedures for the filing of applications for discharge or cancellation under this section by regulations that shall be prescribed and published within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and without regard to the requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) take such actions as may be necessary to publicize the availability of discharge or cancellation of Federal student loan indebtedness under this section.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PAYMENTS.—Funds available for the purposes of making payments to lenders in accordance with section 437(a) for the discharge of indebtedness of deceased or disabled individuals shall be available for making payments under section 437(a) to lenders of loans as required by this section.

(e) APPLICABLE TO OUTSTANDING DEBT.—The provisions of this section shall be applied to discharge or cancel only Federal student loans (including consolidation loans) on which amounts were owed on September 11, 2001. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any refunding of any repayment of a loan.

**SEC. 15. GENERAL EXTENSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) EXTENSION OF DURATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the authorization of appropriations for, and the duration of, each program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) shall be extended through July 1, 2012.

(b) PERFORMANCE OF REQUIRED AND AUTHORIZED FUNCTIONS.—If the Secretary of

Education, a State, an institution of higher education, a guaranty agency, a lender, or another person or entity—

(1) is required, in or for fiscal year 2004, to carry out certain acts or make certain determinations or payments under a program under the Higher Education Act of 1965, such acts, determinations, or payments shall be required to be carried out, made, or continued during the period of the extension under this section; or

(2) is permitted or authorized, in or for fiscal year 2004, to carry out certain acts or make certain determinations or payments under a program under the Higher Education Act of 1965, such acts, determinations, or payments are permitted or authorized to be carried out, made, or continued during the period of the extension under this section.

(c) EXTENSION AT CURRENT LEVELS.—Unless the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program described in subsection (a) is otherwise amended by another section of this Act, the amount authorized to be appropriated for such a program during the period of extension under this section shall be the amount authorized to be appropriated for such program for fiscal year 2004, or the amount appropriated for such program for such fiscal year, whichever is greater. Except as provided in any amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965 enacted during fiscal year 2005 or 2006, the amount of any payment required or authorized under subsection (b) in or for the period of the extension under this section shall be determined in the same manner as the amount of the corresponding payment required or authorized in or for fiscal year 2004.

(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND OTHER ENTITIES CONTINUED.—Any advisory committee, interagency organization, or other entity that was, during fiscal year 2004, authorized or required to perform any function under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), or in relation to programs under that Act, shall continue to exist and is authorized or required, respectively, to perform such function for the period of the extension under this section.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Democratic substitute has been made in order to address some critical shortcomings in the underlying bill. My cosponsors, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA, join me in offering this substitute.

First and foremost, this substitute will make a downpayment on the first year's effort to reduce college costs to those students most in need by cutting the interest rate, the new fixed rate interest rate, in half from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent in July of this year. This will be the first effort to reverse the most egregious action that this Republican-led Congress did to America's families and to the students and children who are trying to pursue a college education when they took \$12.5 billion out of the student aid accounts, took it and whisked it away to tax cuts for the oil companies, tax cuts for the wealthy-

est people in this country, and raised the cost of education to America's families and students at a time when the cost of education is outstripping the ability of those families to pay for it.

This amendment would also establish a new predominantly black-serving institutions programs to boost college participation rates for low-income black students, including students in rural areas who attend 2-year colleges. It creates a new graduate Hispanic-serving institution program and significantly simplifies the student aid application process by creating a simplified and short application, repeals the anti-consumer single lender rule so that borrowers can choose with which lender they want to consolidate their loans, and does a number of other things in the underlying bill.

But the critical point here is to reverse the rate on student aid, to reverse the largest cuts in the history of the program. Why do we say that is necessary? Because here is the situation. This is the trend line on the percentage of the college education that a maximum Pell Grant will cover. In 2000, it was about 41 percent. Now what we see is it is drifting down to 30 percent, and it is headed down to 27 percent because of that.

In this legislation, the Republicans will tell you that they have authorized an additional \$200 on the Pell Grant. That will barely have any effect on this graph. But more importantly, last night, their Budget Committee did not report out a budget that has that money in it. So it is interesting rhetoric, but it does not have any money for these same low-income students that are losing their ability to cover the cost of an education.

It used to be, this year and last year, if this student worked full time during the summer, if this student worked part time during school, they could cover this gap. That is no longer true. This year, they are not going to be able to cover it with the jobs that most students have during the school year, and that gap is getting worse and it is widening.

That is why it is essential that we vote for the substitute amendment to make a downpayment on reversing the new costs that are imposed on these families and these students who are struggling to purchase an education. That raid on student aid last year was the most expensive raid to families in the history of this program.

They can talk all they want about the additional money going to Pell Grant, it is an entitlement program, but the fact of the matter is the money that students are getting is covering a lower percentage of the cost that they encounter when they go to school.

This is a fundamental determination. Pick your side, folks. You can be on the side of tax cuts for the oil companies, or you can decide you are going to help families and students that are struggling to get what is now absolutely essential to their future participation in America's economy.

As we saw from 1995 to 2000, the questions employers were asking was not your race, not your ethnicity, not your religion, they wanted to know if you had the skills and talents to do the job. Most often today, those skills and that talent requires a higher education. A college education is going to have to become as common as a high school education.

But if families can cannot meet this gap, if they cannot provide that money, if the government will not help, you are talking about millions of students who are not going to be able to participate. That is not good for those students, it is not good for those families, it is not good for the economy, and it is not good for America.

This is a chance to reverse that action. This is a chance to make a downpayment on reducing the cost, increasing the affordability. All of the studies tell us that the increasing costs are outrunning the ability of families and students to pay for that education.

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

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

This is an interesting debate we have had to this point. This is a bill we have been working on now for 3 years. Up until 2 days ago, it was totally a bipartisan effort. As you can see in their substitute, they include many of the things that we have in the underlying bill. We have a basic difference of opinion that the gentleman has pointed out.

I look at it a little differently than he does. I feel it is not totally the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for all of higher education. When I introduced a bill a few years ago to try to keep the cost of higher education down, because it has been going up for the last 20 years at four times the ability of people to pay, I said it is important that the Federal Government, the State government, the schools, the lending institutions, the parents, the students all come together to solve this problem, and I still feel that way. I feel it is important for all of us to come together to solve this problem, not simply the Federal Government to pick up whatever the difference is. As schools continue to increase their fees and tuition, the Federal Government should not have the responsibility of picking up all of the difference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education to let him further go into some of the differences and some of the things that we have done in the past and some of the things that we do in the underlying bill for the importance of higher education for our students of this country.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the American people are entitled to some straight talk when it comes to higher education funding. This bill

strengthens Pell Grants. It expands Perkins student loans and increases access to college for millions of students.

Now Mr. MILLER has a substitute that he would like us to vote for, but it has three critical flaws. The first flaw is the name itself, "Reverse the Raid on Student Aid." Don't believe the hype. Not one student in America will receive less financial aid under our bill. Not one.

The heart of our bill is Pell Grants, the heart of all financial aid on the Federal level.

Now let's look at the history of Pell Grant funding over the 20 years, and see if Republicans are in fact making, quote, "a raid on student aid." The yellow here shows the time period of 10 years when Democrats were in control of Congress, and the red shows when Republicans were in control of Congress. You see a dramatic increase in the maximum Pell Grant award. Does this look like a raid on student aid to you? You have got to be kidding me.

In fact, what is really instructive is, if you look at the last 3 years when the Democrats were in control, they had a Democrat House and a Democrat President, Bill Clinton, and they actually cut Pell Grant funding 3 years in a row. It went from \$2,400 down to \$2,300.

The second critical flaw with the Miller substitute is this amendment does not retain the \$6,000 maximum Pell Grant award that our legislation has. In fact, they stay with the same old \$5,800 maximum award. So this substitute legislation, Reverse the Raid on Student Aid, provides less for Pell Grants.

□ 1300

Instead of \$6,000, \$5,800—how could that possibly be that we have a Democrat substitute that actually calls for less awards of Pell Grants? Well, don't call it a comeback. We have been here for years. It happened before. Their last 3 years in power cut Pell Grants. Here we have another attempt to do the same thing.

It has a third flaw. It says that we are going to have a 3.4 percent interest rate for 1 year that is going to cost \$2.7 billion, but it has no offsets whatsoever. How do they pay for it? They don't tell us. Well, if it is just a gimmick to have a lower rate without any way to pay for it, why make it 3.4 percent? Why not 2 percent? Why not 1 percent? Why not interest-free loans? It is crazy. The truth of the matter is in 2002 Republicans and Democrats and student groups all got together and decided in a bipartisan manner what would be a fair fixed interest rate. They decided on 6.8 percent. They voted in favor of this in 2002, the Democrats who offer this motion. In fact, in December of this last year when we supposedly cut all this money, it was going to be the interest rates were going to remain at 6.8 percent. That is the existing law. And, in fact, in July they would go to 6.8 percent. How much is the interest rate in our bill? 6.8 per-

cent. No increase whatsoever. And so now they are opposing something that they all thought was a good idea.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that we have a pretty darn good bill that we can be proud of, a bill that increases Pell Grants, a bill that expands Perkins loans, a bill that is going to make it possible for young people all across America to go to college. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Miller substitute and vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

Mr. MCKEON. 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. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, I would like to be down here on the floor to say that H.R. 609 is a genuine bipartisan reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. That is really not the case. Two months after the \$12 billion heist on student aid, we are considering another bill that is a missed opportunity. I am proud to join Ranking Member MILLER, along with Representatives BOBBY SCOTT, DANNY DAVIS, and RAUL GRIJALVA in offering a higher education bill that is in touch with the needs of everyday Americans.

Instead of missing another opportunity to expand college access, this substitute seizes this opportunity to make college more affordable by slashing interest rates in half for the next year. This is a down payment on reversing the raid on student aid. Additionally, it will expand college participation rates for minority students by establishing a graduate Hispanic-serving institution program and a predominantly black institution program and by providing additional assistance for tribal colleges.

Instead of supporting the Missed College Opportunity Act, I ask my colleagues to seize this opportunity to act in the interest of students and families. America's students and families deserve better. Vote "no" on H.R. 609. Vote "yes" on the Democratic substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

You know, I have listened to this debate for the last several days, and even several weeks. And how you can take \$12 billion out of the pot and then tell us that you are going to expand and increase student aid, I just can't reconcile that. I just don't know how to reconcile that kind of language.

But I do stand in strong support of the Miller-Kildee-Scott-Davis-Grijalva substitute because it cuts interest rates in half for the borrowers, for the students, those who need the money the most. It would make college affordable for large numbers of individuals who otherwise will never see the light of day. But it also would establish pro-

grams for individuals who are missing out already.

There is nothing more important than the opportunity to achieve some form of higher education, and, Mr. Chairman, I just had hoped that I was going to be able to vote for a bill that expanded opportunities. Unfortunately, this bill will not expand opportunities. Therefore, I will have to vote against it and urge that we vote in favor of the Miller substitute.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a member of the committee.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of interesting things about this substitute. One is that, as we just heard from Subcommittee Chairman KELLER, it is apparently a guideline of the House that when the Democrats do cuts, and they are real cuts in education, it is not a cut. But when the Republicans actually increase, it is somehow a cut. And apparently the reason is because they are pro-education and we are anti-education. So if we increase the money, it is still a cut. But if when they were in power they cut the money, it is not a cut. And it becomes very confusing to the American people because they thought the way you measure a cut is if the spending goes down like it did under Democrat control. And they thought the way you measure an increase is when the spending goes up, not just based on a claim that you are more pro-education or anti-education.

Another interesting thing here is that when the Republicans float out things for 1 year, as 1-year proposals, we hear it is a gimmick, it is a gimmick, they are merely trying to posture for the election. But when the Democrats roll out a 1-year rollback, apparently that is not posturing for an election. That is real serious policy trying to benefit the students of America because there is a terrible raid on the student loan system. But a 1-year moratorium from the other side couldn't possibly be a gimmick because Democrats don't do gimmicks. Only Republicans do gimmicks. Democrats don't do cuts in education because only Republicans do cuts in education.

Now, fundamentally, we have had a lot of misinformation and struggling about this student loan question. At least we aren't hearing about the failed policies of direct lending. We are now arguing how you do this in the domestic market because, in fact, the private sector market showed you could more efficiently do student loans and you could manage student loans better and have fewer bad debts and get the rates down for students. And that is why we are not arguing direct lending today; we are arguing, in fact, a process of what happened in the budgetary accounting of when we went to a fixed rate versus a variable rate. In fact, the rate for student loans is higher right now than it is in the bill, 6.8. But because of the variable rate that was left

in the previous bill, it was scored differently.

Now, in fact, the government has to pick up the difference. If the rate goes higher, we fix the students at 6.8. Now, if there is a criticism to be made of the Republicans, it is that the alleged savings may not be real if the interest rates go up. But there is no cut to student loans to students. It is cheaper for students, and we have guaranteed now a fixed rate so they don't have this bubble that hits. And just because there is a lot of confusion, because of the accounting of how you do student lending doesn't mean that you can come to the House floor and demagogue like we have cut student loans, that we have taken the money out.

Furthermore, there is no offset to this. To the degree that we are going to give them a 1-year gimmick loan, how are we going to pay for it?

My friend and colleague who I have known for many years and I know he is very passionately in favor of education, the only thing he mentioned as an offset are tax cuts for the rich, which apparently we have different definitions of rich, but apparently this means, as we have battled on this House floor, increasing the taxes again on families who have the child credit, because that is what we are trying to extend and which is being blocked. And you can't give a 1-year bonus to a family by subsidizing at the Federal level the student loan and then take it back by taking away their child credit. What does that do? That is more than the loan. And it is not 1 year; it is for multiple years.

Furthermore, they favor taking away the dividend and capital gains credits. Well, how do people get jobs? So if you don't grow jobs in Indiana and the rest of the country and then you say good luck getting a student loan, to work where? If we don't keep the economy growing, if we tax the economy to fund a temporary 1-year gimmick in the student loan and kill the economy, why do we need to go to college?

Now, we all know that, as Mr. MILLER said, everybody is going to need a college degree if you are going to compete in the world economy; and a graduate degree is going to be like the old days of the college degree. And we have to tackle this spending question. Every time we reduce student loans, tuition goes up. And quite frankly, in Indiana and elsewhere, we have increased money dramatically in Washington. Where are the States?

Individuals have a responsibility too. It isn't just the Federal Government that has to meet this challenge in funding it; but the States need to, endowments need to, and the private sector needs to. We have a share of that. We are guaranteeing most of these loans. We have increased the Pell Grants. We have increased the pool. We have made a stable interest rate now. We have lowered the cost of education and increased the Federal funding. And I urge a strong "no" to this Democrat substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), a member of the committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic substitute. I was proud to put my name on that substitute because I believe that it does more for students than the underlying bill in front of us today, and because, quite frankly, I want our children and our grandchildren to be able to afford to go to college.

H.R. 609, coupled with the \$12 billion Congress cut from student aid and the President's zero funding of key student loan programs, is setting us back, not forward. I remember when the Federal Government actually helped students go to college, when a Pell Grant covered almost all of tuition expenses in a public university. Today, a maximum Pell Grant barely covers a third.

I oppose 609 because it includes many provisions that hurt students in the long run and omits many others that would have helped them.

If the Rules Committee would have allowed the amendment to prevent the Department of Education from carrying out the \$664 million recall of the Federal Perkins loan fund, a recall mandated by the President's 2007 budget, that is potentially 463,000 lower-class and middle-class students and their families who will lose out on a key part of financial aid. We did nothing about that.

Another example is the single definition of an institution of higher learning I think poses a dangerous threat. It opens the door to potential future abuse of Federal aid by for-profit institutions. We should be protecting our students from fraud, not welcoming it through the door.

H.R. 609 falls short again on funding Pell Grants. A \$200 increase through the year 2013 barely covers the real costs, and the President has frozen the maximum grant at 4,050 for 4 consecutive years.

I think the substitute does provide for the real value of Federal aid in helping students realize their dream and helping their families realize the dreams of their kids going to college.

But I think what the substitute says, above all, is that we can and we must do better. In December, the House Republicans voted to cut \$12 billion from the Federal student aid program. Democrats came out in force and not one of us voted in favor of that bill. I ask my colleagues to join me again in opposing H.R. 609 because it is not enough, and support the Democratic alternative and then vote "no" on the final passage of the Missed College Opportunity Act.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the committee, we have come to the end of this debate, and we must address a fundamental distinction between these bills.

□ 1315

One of these bills recognizes the affordability gap, if you will, between the cost of a college education and the struggles of American families and students to purchase that education. I appreciate all the discussion by the previous speakers as to how they have authorized an increase in the cap and they have done all this. The fact of the matter is, there is no money for that authorization. The President promised that he was going to raise it to \$5,100, no money has been forthcoming. In fact, if you look over the last 5 years, there is \$16 billion in additional spending for education that is over and above what the Republicans have reported out of the appropriations cycle over those last 5 years. So this promise of additional money some time in the future if you vote for this authorization is brought to you by the very same people who, over the last 5 years, have been cutting education over and over and over. And that is why you see this gap, this gap between the cost of an education and the ability of a family to pay for it and what a full-time Pell grant means to these students, that we are down now to about 30 percent of the real cost of that education.

What does that mean? That means that these students are struggling and in many instances fully qualified students are not able to take advantage of going to college. That is just unacceptable in this country.

They said that they did not do more of this because they did not think it was totally the responsibility of the Federal Government to pay for an education. Well, let me explain to them, students are deeper in debt. Families are deeper in debt. They are borrowing more money than ever. You have raised the limits on how much they can borrow because they have to borrow. More students are working more hours to try to make up for the money that they cannot borrow, the money that they do not get in grants. And what we are suggesting is for the students and the families in the most need, in the most need, that we roll back the increased cost that you are going to saddle them with in July and go to a 3.4 percent interest rate rather than a 6.8 percent interest rate.

There is no way to suggest that somehow this would make it totally the responsibility of the Federal Government. That is laughable around every kitchen table in America. As families are sitting down with their young people and trying to put their aid packages together, the loans, the grants, the borrowing, the family contribution, the work of their students, to see whether or not they can acquire a 2-year or 4-year education, they would laugh in your face if you said, well, this is all the responsibility of the Federal Government. No. The Federal Government made a decision after World War II that we thought that people should not be turned away from college because they cannot afford it.

And that is the people that we are trying to help, and that is the people, those most in need, that we are trying to help with this substitute, with Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KILDEE, and myself, because those are the people who tragically and unfortunately and unnecessarily are making a decision.

The other charge was that the only thing I could suggest where you could pay for this was tax cuts to the wealthy. I will give you another one. How about the tax cuts to the oil companies that you did in the energy bill? Maybe you can take those oil companies that have world record-breaking profits and maybe you could ask them to give back some of the tax cuts you gave to them last month or the month before and use that to help pay for the education of those families and children most in need.

So this legislation just shows two real differences between the parties: The party that continues to cut education almost \$16 billion more than what Congress finally reported out because the Democrats took them dragging and screaming, and the party that is going to decide that we are going to help these families. And we are either going to roll back that raid on student aid with this down payment or you are going to neglect the needs of these families and students. And I hope that people will vote for the substitute and against the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate. I hope those who have followed it have followed it closely. I think if you have listened to most of what the other side has talked about, they are complaining about what we did a couple of months ago in the Deficit Reduction Act to try to bring some controls to the budget. There have not been many challenges to the bill, and you can see the substitute that they are putting in now, most of what they have in the substitute we have in our bill.

The new graduate Hispanic-serving institutions program, very important. Year-round Pell Grants. These are things we have in the bill.

As you can see this chart shows how public 4-year institutions' and private 4-year institutions' costs, tuition and fees, have been going up in the last 10 years. If we carried it back further, you can see it is even worse. For over 20 years, the cost of college university higher education has gone up at four times people's ability to pay. We are very concerned about that. That is why it is important that we do the things that we are doing in this bill to bring more affordability, more accessibility, more accountability to higher education.

In the bill, we strengthen Pell Grants. We provide students and parents with more information, and we shine a spotlight on excessive tuition rates. And we enhance American com-

petitiveness. All very important things that we are dealing with at the current time.

One of the other things they have in their substitute is they lower student loan interest rates. Now, interest rates are really an interesting thing. I remember back about 30 years ago when Mr. Carter was President, interest rates got up to 19, 20, 21 percent, and that just seemed to be the norm. It looked like it was going to go on forever. When we passed the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1998, we lowered interest rates, and we have been living with lower interest rates for students even though their loans have gone up from \$8,000 average to \$18,000 average. They are still paying about the same amount of interest in repayment. That was due to the work that Mr. KILDEE, myself and the Congress did in 1998. That was a good thing for students. Now they are talking about how bad the interest rate of 6.8 percent is. The Fed increased the interest rate this last week. Interest rates are going up. Who knows what they are going to be like in the future?

Let me read what Mr. MILLER said when we worked together in 2002 to set the interest rate: "Over the last several months, PIRG has worked closely with other student advocates and the lending community to develop a compromise that will deliver low-cost loans to student borrowers and maintain the stability of the guaranteed student loan program. We're confident that S. 1762 does this, and we applaud the passage of the provision."

What that did was set interest rates at 6.8 percent.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That was a 6.8 cap with a variable rate underneath.

Mr. MCKEON. You were not alone, Mr. MILLER. The Student Association said: "The advocates say they arrived at the proposed 6.8 percent by determining the average rate that borrowers would pay over the next 10 years, as projected by the Congressional Budget Office, if the formula change were to take effect. 'Financially we believe that this would be a very good deal for students,' said Corye Barbour, legislative director for the United States Student Association. 'We also think this would add much needed simplicity to the student loan program.'" 6.8 percent, what this law that we are asking you to support puts into effect.

We really need to come together, the Federal Government, State government, schools, lenders, parents, students, to solve this problem. The bill that we have before us today, H.R. 609, goes a long way to making that happen. I encourage my colleagues to vote against the substitute; vote for the underlying bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Republican leadership brought their

higher education bill to the floor. Their claim was that it would strengthen and improve the nation's higher education system by expanding college access for low- and middle-income students. But in reality it fails to provide urgently needed assistance for millions of low- and middle-class families that are trying to figure out how to pay for their children to go to college.

This past December House Republicans voted to cut the student loan programs by \$12 billion and these cuts included many significant changes to the Higher Education Act, none of which expand access to college or make college more affordable for students and their families. The bill put forward by the majority does nothing to make up for these draconian cuts.

Today Mr. Chairman, we offer our substitute in an attempt to make students whole again. Our substitute offers real financial assistance to needy families. It cuts interest rates in half for borrowers in most need by lowering the cost of college by \$2.4 billion for students and their families. It lowers the cost of student loan interest rates for middle and low-income families. Specifically, we offer a 3.4 percent fixed interest rate to students who take out subsidized loans between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007.

Our Substitute also helps boost college participation rates for minority students. It establishes a graduate Hispanic Serving Institution program. It establishes a Predominantly Black Institution program that would boost college opportunities for low-income and first-generation Black college students. Our substitute also increases the tribal college minimum grant and stabilizes tribal college construction by ensuring that funds for used for construction under HEA are guaranteed.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of tuition should not stand between a qualified student and a college education. Congress should not miss an opportunity to help American families pay for college. Our bill offers families a real solution to the problem of rising tuition costs. We make good on our promise to put a college education within the reach of American students and families. I urge my colleagues to support this substitute.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005, H.R. 609, and in support of the Democratic Substitute.

Helping millions of Americans reach the fullness of their potential is the 40 year legacy of the Higher Education Act that we are called to honor in the reauthorization bill before us today. Unfortunately, H.R. 609 falls short of fully embracing this legacy, for it fails to ensure that those who wish to better themselves through a postsecondary education are able to realize that goal unrestrained by the shackles of financial disadvantage.

Make no mistake, in today's global economy characterized by competition and transformation, a postsecondary education has never been so vital to so many. The Bureau of Labor Statistics recognized this when it concluded that a postsecondary education will be necessary for 42 percent of the jobs created in this decade.

The U.S. Census Bureau acknowledged this fact when it reported that those with a bachelor's degree earn on average \$1 million more over their lifetime than those with only a high school diploma. The fruits of a postsecondary

education also frequently include improved access to high-quality healthcare, housing, childcare, and a host of other social benefits that typify the fulfillment of the American dream.

With limited Federal resources, dramatic tuition increases, and our nation's continuing shift to a knowledge-based economy, the need to ensure that the programs authorized under the Higher Education Act are effective and efficient has never been greater.

Unfortunately, the bill before us would be more aptly named the "Missed College Opportunities Bill." To begin, H.R. 609 represents a wasted opportunity to deal with the \$12 billion that was viscerated in student aid programs under the recently passed reconciliation bill.

At a time when we should be using the reauthorization of the HEA to right the wrongs of reconciliation by redirecting those funds to expand and strengthen grants and low-interest loans, H.R. 609 simply does too little, too well.

More specifically, I am deeply troubled that H.R. 609 does not include a mandatory increase in the Pell Grant, the cornerstone program of federal financial aid.

The maximum Pell Grant award for the last three years has been frozen at \$4,050 and its purchasing power has withered away to cover just 30 percent of the average cost of attendance at a four-year public college.

Yet H.R. 609 authorizes only a paltry increase of \$200 in the Pell Grant. Moreover, the bill does not comprehensively lessen the college loan burden at a time when the average college graduate now owes \$17,500.

The bill also continues to encourage the waste of billions of tax payer funds by not encouraging the utilization of the Direct Loan program, which a large body of evidence has shown to be the more cost effective Federal loan program.

Surprisingly, just months after the President acknowledged in his State of the Union address that we need to expand our commitment in the fields of math, science, and engineering to maintain our economic preeminence, H.R. 609 fails to address this National crisis in any comprehensive manner.

The Democratic Substitute would correct these inadequacies, cutting in half interest rates on loans for low- and middle-income students most in need of help—from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent—starting in July 2006. The Substitute also establishes a Predominantly Black Institution program; a graduate Hispanic Serving Institution program; and, provides additional assistance for tribal colleges.

On balance, there are some features in the base bill that I support. I am encouraged by: (1) the inclusion of Coppin State University as a qualified graduate program, in my district; (2) the authorization of year-round Pell Grants; (3) the creation of new loan forgiveness provisions in areas of national need; and (4) the change in the needs analysis that permits early estimates to help students and families anticipate financial aid eligibility. But these changes are not enough to overcome the bill's shortcomings.

Mr. Chairman, the measure of our commitment to postsecondary education is found not in the quality of our towering words, but by the quality of our actions that help needy students and families afford a first-rate higher education that is relevant in the 21st Century.

By providing students in our Nation with such an education, we help save our children

from the clutches of poverty, crime, drugs, and hopelessness, and we help safeguard our Nation's prosperity for generations yet unborn.

If the Democratic substitute to H.R. 609 is not adopted, I encourage my colleagues to vote against H.R. 609 on final passage.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic alternative to H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act that would help more students and families pay for higher education.

With millions of American families struggling to pay for college, it is critical that Congress act to make college more affordable. Unfortunately, H.R. 609 does little to increase the access and affordability of higher education and actually cuts \$8.7 billion from student aid programs. This bill would, among other things, freeze the authorized level of maximum Pell Grant scholarships \$200 above the current level through 2013. With the cost of tuition rising more than 6 percent every year, a flat-lined \$200 increase provides no relief for the 37,500 students in my home state of Connecticut that receive Pell Grants.

According to the College Board, the typical student who borrows to finance a bachelor's degree at a public college or university graduates with \$15,500 of debt and at private non-profit institutions graduates with \$19,400 debt. To assist students and families struggling with this debt, Congress passed legislation in 2002 that lowered the interest rate cap on student loans to 6.8 percent starting in July of 2006. However, the bill on the floor today would raise the interest rate cap to 8.25 percent. As a result, the typical student borrower, with \$17,500 in debt, would be forced to pay as much as \$2,600 more in interest on those loans.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative would cut interest rates in half for students with subsidized loans—from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent—which means \$2.5 billion in interest rate relief for middle and low income families. The Democratic substitute would also create a pilot program for year round Pell Grants, simplify the student loan application process, and provide loan forgiveness for nurses, highly-qualified teachers in bi-lingual and low-income communities, librarians, first responders and other public servants.

As a nation, we must invest in higher education if we are going to boost America's economic competitiveness and continued prosperity. Hardworking families and students deserve better. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the underlying bill and supporting the Democratic alternative that would truly make college more accessible and affordable to more Americans.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 109-401.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I have a pro forma amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 742, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment you on the great job you have done with this bill and let you know how heartily I support it.

There is a national program that you are aware of, Project GRAD, which has proven highly effective in increasing the number of low-income students who graduate from high school and enroll in college by reaching out to students beginning in kindergarten and staying with them through college. Project GRAD has four sites in my home State and several theater schools.

Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the committee that this bill will allow funding for this type of program?

Mr. MCKEON. Yes. H.R. 609 incorporates a new use of funds under the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education for integrated education reform services in order to improve college access and opportunity. Under this allowable use, Project GRAD will be able to compete for Federal funding.

I recently had the opportunity, at your urging, to visit a Project GRAD program in my home State of California, and they are doing a wonderful job and generating very impressive results. I am grateful to you and Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. MCCARTHY for your diligent efforts in this.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the chairman so very much for his willingness to include this language in the bill and for his efforts to support this valuable program.

I would like now to yield to the gentlewoman from New York, who has been a tireless advocate for Project GRAD and a leader on this issue.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I too would like to thank the chairman for his comments and support. We are fortunate to have a Project GRAD program in my district on Long Island. It is making a critical difference in the lives of many of the students. I appreciate all the help. I hope we can eventually get funding for these programs.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I also would like to acknowledge the hard



work of Congressman TIBERI on this issue as well and thank him for his efforts and, once again, thank the chairman.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I too want to congratulate you for the hard work that you have put into this legislation and thank you for that.

I know that you agree that peer to peer piracy is a serious challenge on college and university campuses. This activity is not only theft but also exposes college and university information technology infrastructures to security risks from spyware. There is bipartisan agreement that these institutions should have effective policies and punishments in place to deter this illegal activity, and I am asking if you would commit to working with me to combat peer to peer piracy on college and university campuses.

Mr. MCKEON. I certainly understand and share the gentleman's belief that illegal downloading of copyrighted material on college campuses is a serious matter. I strongly believe that policymakers, institutions of higher education, and those in the recording and motion picture industries have to make a renewed commitment to address the important issue of piracy on college campuses. You have my commitment to work with you on this issue.

I now yield to the gentleman from California for his comments.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the chairman for yielding. I congratulate him on his new position.

The gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from California, myself, and a number of other Members of the House are driven by our concerns related to the lack of information available from the university community about their antipiracy efforts. A Judiciary subcommittee, chaired by Mr. SMITH of Texas, has issued a request to the Government Accountability Office to gather data on whether schools have adopted strong acceptable use policies, enforcement mechanisms, in addition to whether they are taking action on DMCA notices, and monitoring local agency networks where much of this piracy is taking place. This information is important so that the extent of the problem can be assessed.

□ 1330

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his work on this issue. I am aware that there has been resistance to efforts to gather this information. I hope it is clear to the university community that Congress will continue to monitor such efforts.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. BONO).

Mrs. BONO. I thank the chairman for your willingness to address the issue, and I also want to congratulate you.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, do I have 5 minutes?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to the chairman for the purpose of these colloquies.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BONO. What perfect timing, Mr. Chairman. I can thank you again and congratulate you again on your position and also thank the ranking member for his generosity.

I want to join my colleagues to remind everybody that in college, plagiarism can be an expellable offense. Colleges play a key role in teaching us that stealing someone else's work by plagiarism is just not acceptable.

Just imagine the positive contributions colleges and universities could lend our economy and way of life if they took the lead in teaching students the value of intellectual property.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will work with me and my colleagues to create such a new environment, including possibly holding a hearing before the House Education and the Workforce Committee. I look forward to doing so with you and with your leadership.

I yield to you for your comments.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for her leadership on this issue and share her concerns. We will work on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman. The gentleman from California and I have cochaired a caucus on copyrights. We have worked very closely with Mr. GOODLATTE, and my good friend, Mr. BERMAN.

I do want to acknowledge that the education community and the entertainment community have been working cooperatively, Mr. Chairman, for more than 2 years to develop ways to reduce illegal file sharing and develop legal alternatives.

Some universities are true leaders, in fact, in combating piracy on campus. But we have no data, Mr. Chairman, that ensures that all institutions are aggressive in their efforts to educate students on piracy and in deterring this activity. I thank the gentleman for agreeing to work with us on this critically important issue, and I yield back to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his work on this issue. As this bill moves through the process, I will work with the gentleman, with my good friend from the State of California (Mr. BERMAN), my good friend from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); you can see this is a coast-to-coast issue; and others to ensure that we have additional compliance from the higher education com-

munity on the illegal downloading of copyrighted material, including working on report language during the conference committee to ensure that colleges and universities take seriously their obligation to aggressively tackle this problem.

Schools should have policies in place accompanied by strong punishments to notify students that unauthorized downloading and sharing is illegal. I thank the gentleman for his strong leadership on this issue and for bringing attention to this issue.

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

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. And the gentleman from California has?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for entering into these colloquies, especially the colloquy on the question of intellectual properties and the protection of intellectual properties.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I would simply say that I think with the substitute that we will be voting on here in a few minutes and the other votes, and finally the vote on final passage, that we will have a clear choice in this House.

I would hope that Members of the House would join a very broad array of education organizations across the country, from the American Federation of State and Municipal Employees, to the American Federation of Teachers, the American Medical Students Association, the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities, Lutheran Educational Conference, Minnesota's Private Colleges, the National Association of College Admission Counselors, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the National Education Association, the Service Employees Union, State Public Interest Research Group, St. Mary's College in California, my father's alma mater, as a matter of fact, the United States Students Association, the University of Michigan Women's College Coalition, to vote "no" on this legislation, and joining the organizations like NAICU that say that they will not support this legislation, but like myself and others, they want to continue to work with the chairman as this legislation moves forward into a conference committee, hopefully soon with the Senate.

But I think the correct vote here at this time for America's families who are struggling to pay for the cost of college, for the students who are struggling to pay for the cost of college, and for the contribution that these students, should they successfully complete their college education, the contribution that they will make to our

society and to our economy, it is most important that we take this step provided in the substitute to make a down payment on reversing that raid on student aid and making a down payment on the future of these students, their families, our communities and this country.

There is no other way to do it, because with the current aid that we are providing, and the increases in the costs that will come on line on July 1, because of the actions this Congress took just a couple of months ago, I know they want to divorce these two bills, but they are both parts of the Higher Education Act in this Congress.

Because of the actions they took, these families, unless you vote for the substitute, they will be saddled with higher interest costs. Those families are being put on notice now as they are seeking out the loans necessary to pay for that education.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should send them some good news as they gather around that kitchen table to try to determine whether or not they will be able to take the opportunity available to them in this country for a college education, an opportunity that should never, ever be foreclosed, simply because somebody cannot afford to take advantage of it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the substitute, and to vote no on the bill on final passage, and as I say, to join a very wide array of educational organizations, private, public, small, large, all across this country that have very serious problems with this legislation. Let's not turn it into the missed opportunity that we believe it is.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a good debate. I want my colleagues to understand we urge a "no" vote on the substitute. We urge an "aye" vote on final passage.

Before I conclude I would like to thank all who helped to make this bill possible. I do want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member KILDEE, Subcommittee Chairman KELLER and all of those who have worked on this bill.

I want to thank Ellen Bammon for the good work she did, and the members of the staff on the other side of the aisle. I want to thank Amy Raaf on our committee, who has been working night and day to get us to this point.

I want to thank Krisann Pearce, who will be departing from the committee, who has done yeoman's work. I mentioned yesterday Sally Lovejoy, who has been with the committee for 25 years, who is leaving.

I want to thank Heath Weems from my personal staff; Bob Cochran, my chief of staff, who have all done great work on this.

I want to thank Kathleen Smith and Alison Griffin, who have been working on this project for years and have since left the committee.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 609, the Higher Education Reauthorization Bill. Today the House of Representatives wasted an opportunity to help millions of American students achieve a higher education and a more secure future. Just 2 months after Republicans cut student aid by \$12 billion in the budget reconciliation bill to, the largest cut in history, they are again making higher education less affordable by placing the burden of financing tax cuts for the wealthy on the backs of students and their families.

It is ironic that this bill is entitled the College Access and Opportunity Act, because in reality it restricts access and denies opportunity. This bill breaks a promise to lower interest rates to 6.8 percent for student borrowers. The bill could reduce the number of doctors by making it overly cost prohibitive for students to study medicine by further restricting their ability to consolidate debt or to receive a lower rate. Additionally, the bill freezes the maximum Pell grant award and the Federal Work Study Program for the next 6 years; so much for access and opportunity.

I voted against H.R. 609 because there is a better option—the Democratic substitute. The substitute would have re-directed Federal dollars recently cut from student aid to low interest loans or grants to help students. But that better option was voted down by the Republican majority. The substitute would have cut interest rates for students with subsidized loans in half, providing \$2.5 billion in interest relief for America's middle and low income families. The substitute would also have established a new Black Serving Institution Program and a new graduate Hispanic Serving Institution Program to boost college participation rates of low-income, black, and Hispanic students and to encourage minority students on campus. Sadly, Republicans rejected the amendment.

Congress has a responsibility to help hard-working young men and women realize their potential through educational opportunities so that they can achieve the American dream. At a time when college costs are rising faster than inflation, we should not be restricting student financial aid, we should be encouraging young men and women to continue their education, so that they can compete in the 21st century global marketplace.

I am saddened that this Congress passed up the opportunity to create real access and real opportunity for the men and women of my district in western New York, but I want them to know that I will keep fighting on their behalf.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 609.

I ask you, when will the raid on student aid stop?

H.R. 609 continues to deepen the wound already inflicted by the Republican tax reconciliation bill that cut \$12 billion in student loans, and continues the damage in President's proposed budget.

Mr. Chairman, today's students are taking out more loans, working longer hours, and graduating with record amounts of debt, yet this bill does nothing to increase the Pell grant.

The goal should be to make college affordable and accessible for all. Yet again, with this bill the Republican leadership's rhetoric is out of step with its actions. Attempts to make this misguided bill better have been stifled.

Mr. Chairman, for example, I offered an amendment with the purpose of helping those who help our students.

Unfortunately, my amendment hasn't been made in order.

My amendment would include those who work as school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists in the student loan forgiveness program.

Currently, the U.S. national average student-to-counselor ratio is 488: 1. In contrast, the maximum recommended student-to-counselor ratio is 250: 1. Sadly, some schools don't even have one full-time counselor.

Mr. Chairman, my home State of California ranks last in student-to-counselor ratios, at the astounding rate of 945 students for every 1 counselor.

School counselors provide valuable skills and coping strategies for dealing with issues as diverse as home issues, career counseling, college placement and academic issues, conflict resolution, and drug and alcohol issues.

Congress intended loan forgiveness to encourage education professionals to serve in needy areas of the country.

Counselors do a great deal to help improve students' readiness to learn, their quality of life at school, and their consequent educational achievement.

Mr. Chairman, let's make sure we are making our future the priority, and stop this ongoing raid on student aid.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the Republican higher education bill, the College Access and Opportunity Act, H.R. 609, represents a missed opportunity to make college more affordable, boost America's economic competitiveness, and invest in America's future.

At its core, the Higher Education Act, HEA, historically has sought to improve access to a college education for our Nation's most needy students. The current reauthorization bill does little to fulfill this premise and has the potential to greatly detract from that important goal. The goal of Congress and this bill should be to expand higher education opportunities, not restrict them.

Despite Republican leadership's claims, H.R. 609, the "Missed College Opportunities Act," does little to help the students it claims to help. Just a month after cutting student aid by \$12 billion, Republicans continue to be out of touch with the needs of American students and families.

H.R. 609 fails to provide a real increase in student aid.

H.R. 609 fails to lower college loan interest rates.

H.R. 609 freezes the authorized level of the maximum Pell Grant scholarship—at just \$200 above current levels—through 2013 and it does not include any mandatory increase in Pell.

The Democratic substitute, which was not adopted, would have cut interest rates in half for the borrowers, from a fixed rate of 6.8 percent to a low fixed rate of 3.4 percent. As a result the costs of college would be lowered by \$2.4 billion for low- and middle-income students.

In addition to making college more affordable, the Democratic legislation would have boosted college opportunities for minority students by:

Establishing a new Predominantly Black Serving Institutions program to increase college participation rates of low-income black students;

Creating a new Graduate Hispanic Serving Institutions program; and

Creating a pilot program for year round Pell grants.

Traditionally, higher education legislation has enjoyed widespread bipartisan participation and support but today I will vote against this higher education bill. American students and families are struggling to pay for college. Congress should pass legislation to control tuition costs and increase student aid and not miss this opportunity to help American families.

I strongly support the Democratic substitute. I will vote against the underlying bill, H.R. 609, because it does not make college more affordable for American students and families.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, America's economic prosperity, security, and health are more dependent than ever on students' access to higher education opportunities. Unfortunately, the rising importance of college for individuals and our society has corresponded with skyrocketing tuition costs, causing students to take on massive amounts of loan debt—\$17,000 on average; to work long hours that interfere with academic success; or to forgo college altogether.

H.R. 609 contains some positive provisions. I am pleased that the bill includes year round Pell grants for all colleges, including community colleges at least on a provisional basis. I am pleased that the bill includes up to \$5,000 of student loan forgiveness if you are an elementary or secondary school teacher of a critical foreign language or a government employee who a critical foreign languages. The bill also authorizes Mathematics and Science Honors Scholarships to students pursuing a baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral degree, or a combination thereof, in physical, life, or computer sciences, mathematics, and engineering. The bill also creates Mathematics and Science Education Coordinating Councils, composed of education, business, and community leaders, which will implement State-based reform agendas that improve mathematics and science education; and support services that lead to better teacher recruitment and training, increased student academic achievement, and reduced need for remediation at all levels.

Unfortunately, H.R. 609 comes on the heels of the budget reconciliation bill, which cut \$12.76 billion in Federal student financial aid by increasing interest rates, charging students more fees on their loans, and reducing subsidies to lenders. This was the largest cut in the history of Federal student financial assistance. The result will be nearly \$8 billion in new charges that will raise the cost of college loans for millions of American students and families who borrow to pay for college. For the typical student borrower, already saddled with \$17,000 in debt, these new fees and higher interest charges could cost up to \$5,800. New Jersey students and families were hit hard—over 125,000 college students in New Jersey will be affected. H.R. 609 fails to reverse this raid on student aid.

Congress' recent policies with regard to student aid have abrogated the responsibility that the Federal Government accepted with the Higher Education Act. Supporting students and families who take out college loans is an investment in the American economy and our society at large. Congress should lower interest rates and provide additional benefits for student borrowers to encourage responsible

repayment and support this educational borrowing. Instead, H.R. 609 fails to make loans more affordable. Rather than increasing opportunity, H.R. 609 freezes the authorized level of the maximum Pell grant scholarship—at just \$200 above current levels—through 2013 well below the historic value of Pell grants.

H.R. 609 should be doing more to provide access to college. Pell grants should be doubled, not frozen at a level that will mean a reduction in value over time. Perkins loans should be increased, and work study should be increased. As currently written, H.R. 609 will not help us maintain our competitive edge in the global community.

Together we can do better.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition of the single holder rule, and in support of Americans pursuing secondary education.

As the law currently stands, student loan borrowers attempting to refinance and consolidate their loans face unfair restrictions from the so-called "single holder rule." This rule limits the search of these students to their current lender for a Consolidation Loan, if the current lender is the holder of all of the Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL) they wish to consolidate.

Mr. Chairman, with tuition prices on the rise, it should be the role of the Federal Government to help those Americans pursuing higher education, not impede them. Competition amongst the lender industry for these Consolidation loans would help lower interest rates for these loans, lowering the cost of secondary education for countless Americans. At a time when the dream of higher education has become farther out of reach for many families, it would be irresponsible for this Congress to stand in the way of the elimination of these restrictive provisions.

Furthermore, we have learned a great deal in recent months of increased competition from overseas in the areas of math and science. In order for our Nation to remain a leader in innovation, and maintain our status in the international economy, we must make educating the next generation of Americans a priority. The single holder rule serves only as a barrier to this critical education.

I do not stand alone in my support of the elimination of the single holder rule. Rather, I am lending my voice to a bipartisan chorus. The Conference Report on the 2003 Omnibus Appropriations Act urged the authorizing committees to repeal the single holder rule to "ensure borrowers have the best options available to them in order to manage their student loan obligations."

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that both the House and Senate versions of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to pass out of conference would finally repeal the single holder rule. This rule does nothing more than pander to the student loan industry special interests at the expense of America's students. While I will not be lending my support to H.R. 609 today for other reasons, I applaud the efforts of both Republicans and Democrats to eliminate this harmful rule.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, we stand here today with a historic opportunity to improve higher education in this country. The average tuition and fees for four-year public colleges have risen over 40 percent since 2001. The average student now leaves school with

\$17,500 in debt. Above anything else, it is absolutely essentially that any legislation reauthorizing the Higher Education Act help make a college education more affordable, so that we can expand this great opportunity to more young people across the country. I know this issue is immensely important to many of my constituents in Michigan.

Unfortunately, the misnamed "College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005" does absolutely nothing to reduce the costs of a college education. When Pell Grants were first enacted to help low-income families, it covered 72 percent of the average cost of a four-year public college, today it pays for only 30 percent. This bill would increase the maximum amount a Pell Grant could cover by a pathetic \$200 while the President's proposed budget continues to flat fund this vital program.

It is now just two months after this Republican Congress voted to cut Federal student aid by \$12 billion—the largest cut in the history of the program. Most of the cuts in mandatory spending in that bill were generated by cutting back on excessive lender fees on student loans. Yet instead of investing this additional revenue into scholarships and reductions in student loan fees, Republicans chose to put this money towards tax cuts for the super wealthy.

At a time when we are faced with fierce global competition from countries like India and China, it is absolutely essential that we invest in higher education. Last year China graduated more English-speaking engineers than we graduated here the United States. I wonder how it is that the majority would have us believe that an investment in tax cuts for the very rich would help us to remain an economic superpower.

A report by Michigan's Lt. Governor John Cherry's Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth spelled out how Michigan's economic future is directly linked to our ability to accelerate the completion of degrees of higher education. Two-thirds of the jobs created in the next decade will require post-secondary education and training. I wonder how it is that the majority believes that cutting student loans will make it easier for the thousands affected by the manufacturing jobs crisis in Michigan.

Republicans here in Congress would have us believe that \$12 billion in cuts to the student loan program and reauthorizing the Higher Education Act are unrelated. I say they couldn't be more out of touch.

Democrats have offered an alternative. This substitute would begin to reverse the damaging cuts made to student aid by cutting interest rates on loans for low and middle income students in half starting in July of 2006. This would lower the cost of college by \$2.4 billion for students and their families. This measure is a down payment on the future of our Nation's students who are, after all, the key to the success of our Nation in the days that come. I will vote against this harmful legislation today, and in favor of the Democratic substitute.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005 (H.R. 609). This Republican bill represents a significant missed opportunity to rollback the raid on student aid and make higher education more affordable and accessible for America's students.

When it comes to helping families pay for college, Republicans never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity. But when their campaign contributors say jump, Republicans always ask how high.

In December, The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that while Chairman of the House Education and Workforce Committee, Representative BOEHNER assured nervous private lenders—who in 2003–2004 contributed more than \$250,000 to his campaign—that they would gain rather than lose under the Deficit Reduction Act. “Relax. Stay calm,” BOEHNER told the Consumer Bankers Association. “At the end of the day, I believe you’ll be at least satisfied, or even perhaps happy. Know that I have all of you in my two trusted hands.”

Instead of reducing lender subsidies as was originally proposed, Congressional Republicans subsequently raised interest rates on parent borrowers and required student borrowers to continue paying excessive, above-market interest rates. In total, Republicans cut \$12 billion from student loan programs—the largest cut in our nation’s history.

Today, Representative BOEHNER is back to his old tricks, protecting the bottom lines of private lenders rather than the pocketbooks of hard-working students. H.R. 609 does nothing to restore the much-needed student loan subsidies cut under the Deficit Reduction Act. Rather, this legislation keeps student loan interest rates for low- and middle-income Americans at an unnecessarily high 6.8 percent, guaranteeing private lenders a profit and students mountains of debt after graduation.

Further, H.R. 609 continues to underfund the Pell Grant program, even as the program’s purchasing power declines on annual basis. The bill freezes through 2013 the authorized maximum for a Pell Grant scholarship—at just \$200 above current levels. Even as the cost of education rises, the purchasing power of Pell Grant loans declines.

It is past time that we had a higher education bill that makes college more affordable, boosts America’s economic competitiveness, and invests in America’s continued prosperity. This legislation does none of the above. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 609 so we can bring forth a bill that actually does what’s needed for higher education.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the global economy demands a highly trained, educated workforce, Congress is making it more difficult for our students to succeed. The Higher Education Reauthorization Act represents a missed opportunity at a critical time for improving education.

All across America, communities are struggling to deal with education funding for preschools through high schools. Many of these communities are recovering from difficult economic times and have financially stressed the local education systems. Many states have responded to budget crunches by reducing their support for postsecondary education at a time when we need to be desperately training students for their own as well as the country’s future. It is expected by 2020, the U.S. will experience a shortage of up to 12 million college-educated workers. We are providing less support as a percentage of overall educational costs than ever before.

In part, it is because of a tragic decision of the Republican majority to sacrifice education for \$70 billion in tax benefits for America’s

wealthiest individuals. This has made the funding problem even worse than it needs to be. There are opportunities to simplify financial aide forms, to increase access to higher education and to improve higher education, but instead that focus is lost. Had a truly bipartisan approach been taken by Congress a much better bill would have been possible.

Tuition and fees have already climbed by 46 percent at four-year public colleges since 2001, nearly six times faster than Pell Grant Scholarships. Students are taking on record high loan debt and working longer hours in order to attend college. There are over 90,000 Oregonians borrowing money to attend college. While costs are going up and burdens on families are greater, there is less federal support.

Many of the higher education professionals that I have worked with suggests they would rather have another extension of the current law than this reauthorization, quite an indictment and a signal of what we should be doing. I am hopeful that as this bill works its way through the legislative process that logic and the needs of students, families and our society for a well educated citizenry will prevail. Although, I am pleased the bill includes the bipartisan Blumenauer-Ehlers-Wu amendment to convene a summit of higher education experts working in the area of sustainable operations and programs, we can make this bill better and until that happens I cannot support it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my opposition to legislation on the floor, H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005. Many of my colleagues have renamed this bill “the Missed College Opportunities Act” for good reason.

Two months ago my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for a budget reconciliation bill that slashed funding for student aid programs by \$12.7 billion—the single largest cut to the Federal student aid program in its 40-year history. This “raid on student aid” could not have come at a worse time for American families, as the cost of a college education today continues to rise while more and more working families fall into poverty. At a time when our government should be increasing access to higher education, this bill is taking away this opportunity for many young students.

The ultimate goal behind the Higher Education Act has always been to improve access to college education for those in greatest need. Today’s students are increasingly taking on higher loan debts, working longer hours or, in some cases, forgoing college altogether. Increasing access to higher education is critical to the development of a highly skilled workforce, which will ensure that America remains competitive in the global marketplace. Today’s economy demands that workers are better educated and this bill does little to make college more affordable. As it is now, the average student owes \$17,500 when he or she graduates.

Not only is this legislation troublesome for our students, it is also troublesome for our colleges and universities. The bill in its current form includes provisions that undermine the autonomy of colleges and universities by creating intrusive new reporting requirements. In particular H.R. 609 imposes price controls on colleges through the new “College Affordability Index” which would compare tuition increases

to the Consumer Price Index without taking into consideration what individual institutions have done to offset tuition increases. Cost increases can be attributed to a combination of different factors, all of which vary between different institutions, making the College Affordability Index a poor measure of the affordability of an individual college or university.

Furthermore, a proposed amendment to this legislation would create an unnecessary burden on our universities’ admission policies by requiring institutions that receive any Federal funding, including grants and scholarships, to submit to the Department of Education an annual report stating whether race, color, or national origin is considered in the student admissions process.

This amendment is unnecessary and redundant because universities already publicly disclose their admission policies, as required by the Supreme Court in *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*. The amendment will only burden university staff members with unnecessary and extensive paperwork. Additionally, the amendment jeopardizes individual applicants’ privacy and confidentiality in violation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, FERPA, which generally prohibits educational institutions from disclosing personally identifiable information from students’ education records without consent.

The proposed amendment, by contrast, would require universities to submit to the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, OCR—and from OCR to the public—“all raw admissions data for applicants” on each quantifiable factor considered in admissions except for the name of the applicant. Publication of raw data in this form—without any corresponding safeguards on use of the raw data—will almost certainly permit OCR and others to ascertain the identities of individual applicants. In so doing, it will be possible to determine individual applicants’ test scores, high school grades, and so forth—all in violation of FERPA.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly agree that more should be done so that all deserving students have the opportunity to receive a higher education, which is why I support the Miller-Kildee-Scott-Davis-Grijalva alternative. The Democratic alternative would cut interest rates in half for the borrowers in most need—lowering the cost of college by \$2.4 billion for students and their families. It would also create a pilot program for year round Pell grants to allow students to accelerate their degree. We must never let a student’s economic situation hinder his or her ability to obtain access to a college or postgraduate degree.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues join me in reversing the Republican raid on student aid by opposing H.R. 609 and supporting the Democratic alternative.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, anyone in need of proof that Federal control follows Federal funding need only examine H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act. H.R. 609 imposes several new mandates on colleges, and extends numerous mandates imposed on that previous Congress imposed on colleges. H.R. 609 proves the prophetic soundness of people who warned that Federal higher education programs would lead to Federal control of higher education.

Opponents of increasing Federal control over higher education should be especially concerned about H.R. 609’s “Academic Bill of

Rights.” This provision takes a step toward complete Federal control of college curriculum, grading, and teaching practices. While this provision is worded as a “sense of Congress,” the clear intent of the “bill of rights” is to intimidate college administrators into ensuring professors’ lectures and lesson plans meet with Federal approval.

The Academic Bill of Rights is a response to concerns that federally funded institutions of higher learning are refusing to allow students to express, or even be exposed to, points of view that differ from those held by their professors. Ironically, the proliferation of “political correctness” on college campuses is largely a direct result of increased government funding of colleges and universities. Federal funding has isolated institutions of higher education from market discipline, thus freeing professors to promulgate their “politically correct” views regardless of whether this type of instruction benefits their students—who are, after all, the professors’ customers. Now, in a perfect illustration of how politicians use the problems created by previous interventions in the market as a justification for further interventions, Congress proposes to use the problem of “political correctness” to justify more Federal control over college classrooms.

Instead of fostering open dialog and wide-ranging intellectual inquiry, the main effect of the Academic Bill of Rights will be to further stifle debate about controversial topics. This is because many administrators will order their professors not to discuss contentious and divisive subjects in order to avoid a possible confrontation with the Federal Government. Those who doubt this should remember that many TV and radio stations minimized political programming in the 60s and 70s in order to avoid running afoul of the Federal “fairness doctrine.”

I am convinced that some promoters of the Academic Bill of Rights would be unhappy if, instead of fostering greater debate, this bill silences discussion of certain topics. Scan the websites of some of the organizations promoting the Academic Bill of Rights and you will also find calls for silencing critics of the Iraq war and other aspects of American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 609 expands Federal control over higher education; in particular through an Academic Bill of Rights which could further stifle debate and inquiry on America’s college campuses. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 609, the Republican higher education bill.

I am reluctant to oppose H.R. 609 because it contains my amendment to add Fayetteville State University, in my congressional district, to the list of eligible schools under title III B for Historically Black Graduate Institutions. Fayetteville State University holds the distinction of being one of the Nation’s most racially diverse educational institutions. Receiving funding under title III would enable the university both to enhance its existing graduate programs and to develop additional graduate programs in disciplines in which African-Americans are underrepresented in the Nation.

I am grateful to the committee chairman for adding the Etheridge amendment to H.R. 609 to include this outstanding institution of higher learning among its expanded lists of participants in title III B to enhance its historic mis-

sion of expanding opportunity in America. Unfortunately, the underlying bill is fundamentally flawed. H.R. 609 represents a major missed opportunity to make college more affordable and accessible, to boost America’s economic competitiveness, and to invest in America’s continued prosperity. Just 2 months after Republicans in Congress voted to raid \$12 billion from Federal student aid, this bill does very little to help American students and families to pay for college.

H.R. 609 fails to reverse the Republican raid on student aid. H.R. 609 fails to make college loans more affordable. H.R. 609 freezes the authorized level of the maximum Pell grant scholarship through 2013 and it does not contain any mandatory increase in Pell. I support the Miller substitute to H.R. 609 that would cut interest rates for borrowers in most need and lower the cost of college by \$2.4 billion for students and their families. In addition to making college more affordable, the Miller substitute would boost college participation for minority students by establishing a predominantly black institution program and establishing a graduate Hispanic serving institution program.

I hope as this legislation moves forward, the shortcomings can be corrected, and I can support the conference report on this important bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act, I want to highlight the teacher recruitment and retention provisions that have been included in this legislation.

In order to keep pace with anticipated teacher retirements and the growing student population, local school districts will need to hire an estimated 2.5 million teachers over the next 10 years. And not just any warm body will do. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, every teacher must be “highly-qualified” by the current 2005–2006 school year, a goal I suspect has not yet been achieved. In order to meet these challenges, we must embark on an unprecedented teacher recruitment and retention effort.

Fortunately, we already have evidence of what works. In 1986, the North Carolina General Assembly established the Teaching Fellows program, which currently produces 500 highly qualified and enthusiastic new teachers each year. I believe it offers a model for national emulation, and that is why I reintroduced the Teaching Fellows Act as H.R. 1801 early in the current Congress.

In the 108th Congress, I was pleased that the bipartisan committee leadership worked with me and former Congressman Cass Ballenger to enhance the teacher recruitment provisions of the Ready to Teach Act in accordance with the Teaching Fellows Act—H.R. 1805, 108th Congress. Much as we envisioned in the Teaching Fellows Act, the Ready to Teach Act would authorize State scholarship programs to attract the best students to the teaching profession, and provide support and mentoring programs that will help teachers make a long-term commitment to the field.

Those provisions have again been included in the comprehensive higher education legislation we are considering today. I want to commend Representatives MCKEON and KILDEE and other committee members for their willingness to work with me on this particularly important component of the bill.

With provisions added from the Teaching Fellows Act, H.R. 609 would establish scholar-

ships for those coming out of high school or in their sophomore year of college, when students would perhaps be better prepared to make a mature choice about committing to a teaching career.

In addition, through partnerships with community colleges, H.R. 609 would offer fellowships to students, particularly those being trained as teaching assistants, to go on and obtain a bachelor’s degree and full teaching certification. Students attending community colleges are often deeply rooted in their local communities, including rural and inner-city areas where the need for well qualified teachers is the greatest. So identifying and training a cadre of “homegrown” teachers is a promising strategy for meeting our most pressing teacher recruitment challenges.

These programs do not merely throw money at individual students but seek, through rich extracurricular programs, to promote esprit de corps and collaborative learning, to strengthen professional identity, and to provide a support system as students first enter the classroom as teachers. Students would participate in various community and school-based internships and experiences that go well beyond normal teacher preparation. These enrichment programs could feature a variety of components ranging from school system orientations and educational seminars to Outward Bound programs and international travel.

In exchange, scholarship recipients would be required to teach in a public school for a minimum of 1 year plus a period of time equivalent to the length of their scholarship. The idea of reciprocal obligation and community service are essential to the success of these programs.

Although I am pleased with these teacher recruitment and retention components of the bill, H.R. 609 is, in my view, lacking in serious ways. First, it seeks to make college affordable by squeezing colleges and universities. The bill’s College Affordability Index would insert the Federal Government into the decision processes of institutions of higher education regarding tuition-setting, essentially establishing price controls. Secondly, it seeks to make college accessible by squeezing students and families. The bill would provide a very modest increase of \$200 in the maximum Pell grant through 2013.

I am also concerned about the bill’s provision to create a Title VI International Higher Education Advisory Board that would have an inappropriate and unnecessary role in curriculum decisions at colleges and universities.

We desperately need to enact a long-term reauthorization of higher education programs, and I hope we can make improvements to this bill in conference and achieve that goal prior to adjournment. I look forward to working with Members from both sides of the aisle to encourage our best and brightest students to enter and remain in the field of teaching.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I believe my Republican colleagues are sending a mixed message by offering this legislation.

This bill increases the authorization for the maximum Pell grant to \$6,000, reauthorizes funding for Hispanic-serving institutions and historically Black colleges and universities.

From the looks of this authorization bill, you would think the majority leadership in this Congress cared about getting low- and middle-income students through college.

However, this authorization bill does not fund these programs. Just 2 months ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to cut student aid by \$12 billion by passing the budget reconciliation bill.

I don't understand why my Republican colleagues care more about giving tax breaks to the wealthy than helping low- and middle-income families send their children to college.

The budget reconciliation bill raised interest rates on parent student loans, raised loan consolidation fees, and required that student and parent borrowers pay a 1 percent insurance fee on college loans.

We need to do something to help people get through college, not charge them a 1 percent insurance fee and make their education even more expensive than it is now.

Since 2001, college tuition in this country has increased 40 percent. Students are graduating with over \$17,000 of debt. And what has Congress done?

We've consistently flat-funded Pell and raised the maximum Pell award by small amounts that don't keep up with rising tuition rates, including this increase.

When Pell first started, it covered over 70 percent of the average cost of a 4-year education. Now, it pays for 30 percent of the cost of a college education.

While I appreciate the effort of the bill sponsors to increase the Pell maximum grant, it is still not enough to truly help low-income families send their children to college.

I hope in the future appropriators will enable us to show a true commitment to higher education by bringing us an appropriations bill that reflects the priorities outlined in H.R. 609.

Working families need more than the numbers offered in this bill, they need to see real dollars put into these programs.

My Republican colleagues have not adequately funded the very programs they are on the floor supporting today.

I hope that in the future, we fund the programs that are so important to us today.

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of Rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the "ayes" prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

AYES—418

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hostettler
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Hulshof
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Alexander	Davis (TN)	Hyde
Allen	Davis, Jo Ann	Inglis (SC)
Andrews	Davis, Tom	Inslee
Baca	Deal (GA)	Israel
Bachus	DeFazio	Istook
Baird	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Baker	DeLahunt	Jefferson
Baldwin	DeLauro	Jenkins
Barrett (SC)	DeLay	Jindal
Barrow	Dent	Johnson (CT)
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Dicks	Johnson, Sam
Bean	Dingell	Jones (NC)
Becerra	Doggett	Jones (OH)
Berkley	Doolittle	Kanjorski
Berman	Doyle	Kaptur
Berry	Drake	Keller
Biggett	Dreier	Kelly
Bilirakis	Duncan	Kennedy (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Kennedy (RI)
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	Kildee
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Kilpatrick (MI)
Blackburn	Engel	Kind
Blumenauer	English (PA)	King (IA)
Blunt	Eshoo	King (NY)
Boehlert	Etheridge	Kingston
Boehner	Everett	Kirk
Bonilla	Farr	Kline
Bonner	Fattah	Knollenberg
Bono	Feeney	Kolbe
Boozman	Ferguson	Kucinich
Boren	Filner	Kuhl (NY)
Boswell	Fitzpatrick (PA)	LaHood
Boucher	Flake	Langevin
Boustany	Foley	Lantos
Boyd	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Bradley (NH)	Ford	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Latham
Brady (TX)	Fossella	LaTourette
Brown (OH)	Fox	Leach
Brown (SC)	Frank (MA)	Lee
Brown, Corrine	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Brown-Waite,	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Burgess	Gerlach	Lewis (KY)
Burton (IN)	Gibbons	Linder
Butterfield	Gillmor	Lipinski
Buyer	Gingrey	LoBiondo
Calvert	Gohmert	Lofgren, Zoe
Camp (MI)	Gonzalez	Lowey
Campbell (CA)	Goode	Lucas
Cannon	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Cantor	Gordon	E.
Capito	Granger	Lynch
Capps	Graves	Mack
Capuano	Green (WI)	Maloney
Cardin	Green, Al	Manzullo
Cardoza	Green, Gene	Marchant
Carnahan	Grijalva	Markey
Carson	Gutierrez	Marshall
Carter	Gutknecht	Matheson
Case	Hall	Matsui
Castle	Harman	McCarthy
Chabot	Harris	McCaul (TX)
Chandler	Hart	McCollum (MN)
Chocola	Hastings (FL)	McCotter
Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	McCreery
Clyburn	Hayes	McDermott
Coble	Hayworth	McGovern
Cole (OK)	Hefley	McHenry
Conaway	Hensarling	McHugh
Conyers	Herge	McIntyre
Cooper	Herseth	McKeon
Costa	Higgins	McKinney
Costello	Hinche	McMorris
Cramer	Hinojosa	McNulty
Crenshaw	Hobson	Meehan
Crowley	Hoekstra	Meek (FL)
Cubin	Holden	Melancon
Cuellar	Holt	Mica
Culberson	Honda	Michaud
Cummings	Hooley	

Millender-McDonald	Ramstad	Souder
Miller (MI)	Rangel	Spratt
Miller (NC)	Regula	Stark
Miller, Gary	Rehberg	Stearns
Miller, George	Reichert	Strickland
Mollohan	Renzi	Stupak
Moore (KS)	Reyes	Sullivan
Moore (WI)	Reynolds	Sweeney
Moran (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Tancredo
Moran (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Tanner
Murphy	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Nadler	Ross	Terry
Napolitano	Rothman	Thomas
Neal (MA)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Neugebauer	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Ney	Rush	Thornberry
Northup	Ryan (OH)	Tiahrt
Norwood	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Nunes	Ryun (KS)	Tierney
Nussle	Sabo	Towns
Oberstar	Salazar	Turner
Obey	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (CO)
Olver	T.	Udall (NM)
Ortiz	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Osborne	Sanders	Van Hollen
Otter	Saxton	Velázquez
Owens	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Oxley	Schiff	Walden (OR)
Pallone	Schmidt	Walsh
Pascrell	Schwartz (PA)	Wamp
Pastor	Schwarz (MI)	Wasserman
Paul	Scott (GA)	Schultz
Payne	Scott (VA)	Waters
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pelosi	Serrano	Waxman
Pence	Sessions	Weiner
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Shays	Weller
Pickering	Sherman	Westmoreland
Pitts	Sherwood	Wexler
Platts	Shimkus	Whitfield
Poe	Shuster	Wicker
Pombo	Simmons	Wilson (NM)
Pomeroy	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Porter	Skelton	Wolf
Price (GA)	Slaughter	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Wynn
Putnam	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Snyder	Young (FL)
Rahall	Sodrel	
	Solis	

NOES—2

Edwards Musgrave

NOT VOTING—12

Beauprez	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Clay	Issa	Ruppersberger
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Watson
Evans	(TX)	
Franks (AZ)	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1402

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, DELAY, MANZULLO, MARCHANT, DAVIS of Illinois, CHANDLER and ANDREWS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 77, I unintentionally voted "no". I would like the RECORD to show that it was my intention to vote "aye" on rollcall No. 77.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF RHODE ISLAND

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 38, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—380

Abercrombie Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins  
 Ackerman Davis, Tom Jindal  
 Aderholt Deal (GA) Johnson (CT)  
 Alexander DeFazio Johnson (IL)  
 Allen DeGette Johnson, E. B.  
 Andrews Delahunt Jones (NC)  
 Baca DeLauro Jones (OH)  
 Bachus Dent Kanjorski  
 Baird Diaz-Balart, L. Kaptur  
 Baker Diaz-Balart, M. Keller  
 Baldwin Dicks Kelly  
 Barrett (SC) Dingell Kennedy (MN)  
 Barrow Doggett Kennedy (RI)  
 Bartlett (MD) Doyle Kildee  
 Barton (TX) Drake Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Bass Dreier Kind  
 Bean Edwards King (NY)  
 Beauprez Emanuel Kirk  
 Becerra Emerson Kline  
 Berkley Engel Knollenberg  
 Berman English (PA) Kolbe  
 Berry Eshoo Kucinich  
 Biggert Etheridge Kuhl (NY)  
 Bilirakis Everett LaHood  
 Bishop (GA) Farr Langevin  
 Bishop (NY) Fattah Lantos  
 Blackburn Ferguson Larsen (WA)  
 Blumenauer Filner Larson (CT)  
 Blunt Fitzpatrick (PA) Latham  
 Boehlert Foley LaTourette  
 Boehner Forbes Leach  
 Bonilla Ford Lee  
 Bonner Fortenberry Levin  
 Bono Fossella Lewis (CA)  
 Boozman Foxx Lewis (GA)  
 Boren Frank (MA) Lewis (KY)  
 Boswell Frelinghuysen Linder  
 Boucher Gallegly Lipinski  
 Boustany Gerlach LoBiondo  
 Boyd Gibbons Lofgren, Zoe  
 Bradley (NH) Gillmor Lowey  
 Brady (PA) Gingrey Lucas  
 Brown (OH) Gohmert Lungren, Daniel  
 Brown (SC) Gonzalez E.  
 Brown, Corrine Goode Lynch  
 Burgess Goodlatte Mack  
 Burton (IN) Gordon Maloney  
 Butterfield Granger Marchant  
 Buyer Graves Markey  
 Calvert Green (WI) Marshall  
 Camp (MI) Green, Al Conyers  
 Capito Green, Gene Davis (FL)  
 Capps Grijalva McCarthy  
 Capuano Gutierrez McCaul (TX)  
 Cardin Cardin McCollum (MN)  
 Cardoza Hall McCotter  
 Carnahan Harman McDermott  
 Carson Harris McGovern  
 Case Hart McHugh  
 Castle Hastings (FL) McIntyre  
 Chabot Hastings (WA) McKeon  
 Chandler Hayes McKinney  
 Chocola Hayworth McMorris  
 Cleaver Herger McNulty  
 Clyburn Herseeth Meehan  
 Coble Higgins Meek (FL)  
 Cole (OK) Hinchey Melancon  
 Conaway Hinojosa Mica  
 Cooper Hobson Michaud  
 Costa Hoekstra Millender-  
 Costello Holden McDonald  
 Cramer Holt Miller (NC)  
 Crenshaw Honda Miller, Gary  
 Crowley Hooley Miller, George  
 Cubin Hoyer Mollohan  
 Cuellar Hulshof Moore (KS)  
 Cummings Hyde Moore (WI)  
 Davis (AL) Inglis (SC) Moran (KS)  
 Davis (CA) Inslee Moran (VA)  
 Davis (IL) Israel Murphy  
 Davis (KY) Jackson (IL) Murtha  
 Davis (TN) Jefferson Musgrave

Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Ney  
 Northup  
 Norwood  
 Nunes  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Osborne  
 Otter  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Pickering  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Pomo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)

NOES—38

Akin  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Carter  
 Culberson  
 DeLay  
 Doolittle  
 Duncan  
 Ehlert  
 Feeney  
 Flake

NOT VOTING—14

Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Cantor  
 Clay  
 Conyers  
 Davis (FL)

□ 1410

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schwartz (PA)  
 Schwarz (MI)  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Sodrel  
 Solis  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Strickland  
 Stupak

Neugebauer  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Rohrabacher  
 Royce  
 Shadegg  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Wamp

Evans  
 Gilchrest  
 Issa  
 Istook  
 Jackson-Lee (TX)

Meeks (NY)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Watson

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 337, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—83

Aderholt  
 Bachus  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Blackburn  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Burton (IN)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Chocola  
 Coble  
 Conaway  
 Crenshaw  
 Cubin  
 Culberson  
 Deal (GA)  
 DeLay  
 Doolittle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Feeney

NOES—337

Cramer  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis (TN)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Davis, Tom  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Drake  
 Edwards  
 Ehlert  
 Emanuel  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Everett  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Fitzpatrick (PA)  
 Flake  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Ford  
 Fortenberry  
 Fossella  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbons  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Granger  
 Green (WI)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Harman  
 Harris  
 Hart  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Herger  
 Herseeth  
 Higgins  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hobson  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hyde  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jefferson  
 Jindal  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy (MN)  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirk  
 Kolbe  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 LaHood  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Leach  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Manullo  
 Marchant  
 Markey  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy  
 Murtha  
 Musgrave

Marshall Peterson (PA)  
 Matheson Pickering  
 Matsui Platts  
 McCarthy Pombo  
 McCaul (TX) Pomeroy  
 McCollum (MN) Porter  
 McCotter Price (GA)  
 McCrery Price (NC)  
 McDermott Pryce (OH)  
 McGovern Rahall  
 McHugh Ramstad  
 McIntyre Rangel  
 McKeon Regula  
 McKinney Rehberg  
 McNulty Reichert  
 Meehan Renzi  
 Meek (FL) Reyes  
 Melancon Reynolds  
 Mica Rogers (AL)  
 Michaud Rogers (KY)  
 Millender Rogers (MI)  
 McDonald Ros-Lehtinen  
 Miller (MI) Ross  
 Miller (NC) Rothman  
 Miller, George Roybal-Allard  
 Mollohan Rush  
 Moore (KS) Ryan (OH)  
 Moore (WI) Ryan (WI)  
 Moran (KS) Sabo  
 Moran (VA) Salazar  
 Murphy Sanchez, Linda  
 Murtha T.  
 Nadler Sanchez, Loretta  
 Napolitano Sanders  
 Neal (MA) Saxton  
 Ney Schakowsky  
 Northup Schiff  
 Nunes Schmidt  
 Nussie Schwartz (PA)  
 Oberstar Schwarz (MI)  
 Obey Scott (GA)  
 Olver Scott (VA)  
 Ortiz Serrano  
 Osborne Shadegg  
 Owens Shaw  
 Oxley Shays  
 Pallone Sherman  
 Pascrell Sherwood  
 Pastor Shimkus  
 Paul Simmons  
 Payne Simpson  
 Pelosi Skelton  
 Peterson (MN) Slaughter

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.  
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 220, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]  
 AYES—200

Abercrombie Harman  
 Ackerman Hastings (FL)  
 Allen Herseth  
 Andrews Higgins  
 Baca Hinchey  
 Baird Hinojosa  
 Baldwin Holden  
 Barrow Holt  
 Bean Honda  
 Becerra Hooley  
 Berkley Hoyer  
 Berman Inslee  
 Berry Israel  
 Bishop (GA) Jackson (IL)  
 Bishop (NY) Jefferson  
 Blumenauer Johnson (CT)  
 Boren Johnson (IL)  
 Boswell Johnson, E. B.  
 Boucher Jones (OH)  
 Boyd Kanjorski  
 Brady (PA) Kaptur  
 Brown (OH) Kennedy (RI)  
 Brown, Corrine Kildee  
 Butterfield Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Capps Kind  
 Capuano Kucinich  
 Cardin Langevin  
 Cardoza Lantos  
 Carman Carnahan  
 Carson Larson (CT)  
 Case Leach  
 Chandler Lee  
 Cleaver Levin  
 Clyburn Lewis (GA)  
 Conyers Lipinski  
 Cooper LoBiondo  
 Costa Skelton, Zoe  
 Costello Lowey  
 Cramer Lynch  
 Crowley Maloney  
 Cuellar Markey  
 Cummings Marshall  
 Davis (AL) Matheson  
 Davis (IL) Matsui  
 Davis (TN) McCarthy  
 DeFazio McCollum (MN)  
 DeGette McDermott  
 Delahunt McGovern  
 DeLauro McIntyre  
 Dicks McKinney  
 Dingell McNulty  
 Doggett Meehan  
 Doyle Meek (FL)  
 Edwards Melancon  
 Emanuel Michaud  
 Engel Miller (NC)  
 Eshoo Miller, George  
 Etheridge Mollohan  
 Farr Moore (KS)  
 Fattah Moore (WI)  
 Filner Moran (VA)  
 Ford Murtha  
 Frank (MA) Nadler  
 Gonzalez Napolitano  
 Green, Al Neal (MA)  
 Green, Gene Oberstar  
 Grijalva Obey  
 Gutierrez Olver

Ehlers Kirk  
 Emerson Kline  
 English (PA) Knollenberg  
 Everett Kolbe  
 Feeney Kuhl (NY)  
 Ferguson LaHood  
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Latham  
 Flake LaTourette  
 Foley Lewis (CA)  
 Forbes Lewis (KY)  
 Fortenberry Linder  
 Fossella Lucas  
 Foxx Lungren, Daniel  
 Franks (AZ) E.  
 Frelinghuysen Mack  
 Gallegly Manzullo  
 Garrett (NJ) Marchant  
 Gerlach McCaul (TX)  
 Gibbons McCotter  
 Gillmor McCrery  
 Gingrey McHenry  
 Gohmert McHugh  
 Goode McKeon  
 Goodlatte McMorris  
 Gordon Mica  
 Granger Millender-  
 Graves McDonald  
 Green (WI) Miller (MI)  
 Gutknecht Miller, Gary  
 Rybal-Allard Moran (KS)  
 Hall  
 Harris Murphy  
 Hart Musgrave  
 Hastings (WA) Myrick  
 Hayes Neugebauer  
 Hayworth Ney  
 Hefley Northup  
 Hensarling Norwood  
 Herger Nunes  
 Hobson Nussie  
 Hoekstra Osborne  
 Otter Hostettler  
 Hulshof Oxley  
 Hunter Paul  
 Hyde Pearce  
 Inglis (SC) Pence  
 Istook Peterson (PA)  
 Jenkins Petri  
 Jindal Pickering  
 Johnson, Sam Pitts  
 Jones (NC) Poe  
 Keller Pombo  
 Kelly Porter  
 Kennedy (MN) Price (GA)  
 King (IA) Pryce (OH)  
 King (NY) Putnam  
 Kingston Radanovich

Ramstad  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Renzi  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Saxton  
 Schmidt  
 Schwarz (MI)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Sodrel  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Sweeney  
 Tancredo  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Clay Issa  
 Davis (FL) Jackson-Lee  
 Evans (TX)  
 Gilchrest Johnson (CT)  
 Gohmert Meeks (NY)

□ 1419

Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. ING-LIS of South Carolina changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 79 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

NOES—220

Aderholt Bono  
 Akin Boozman  
 Alexander Boustany  
 Bachus Bradley (NH)  
 Baker Brady (TX)  
 Barrett (SC) Brown (SC)  
 Bartlett (MD) Brown-Waite,  
 Barton (TX) Ginny  
 Bass Burgess  
 Beauprez Burton (IN)  
 Biggert Buyer  
 Bilirakis Calvert  
 Bishop (UT) Camp (MI)  
 Blackburn Campbell (CA)  
 Blunt Cannon  
 Boehlert Cantor  
 Boehner Capito  
 Bonilla Carter  
 Bonner Castle

Chabot  
 Chocola  
 Coble  
 Conaway  
 Crenshaw  
 Cubin  
 Culberson  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 DeLay  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Doolittle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Duncan

NOT VOTING—12

Clay  
 Cole (OK)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (FL)  
 Evans  
 Gilchrest  
 Issa  
 Jackson-Lee  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Ruppberger  
 Watson

□ 1427

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 80, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 80, my intent was to vote “yes” on this, as opposed to “nay” on it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the



State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 609) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 742, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—221

Aderholt DeLay Jindal  
 Akin Dent Johnson (IL)  
 Alexander Diaz-Balart, L. Johnson, Sam  
 Baker Diaz-Balart, M. Keller  
 Barrett (SC) Doolittle Kelly  
 Bartlett (MD) Drake Kennedy (MN)  
 Barton (TX) Dreier King (NY)  
 Bass Duncan Kingston  
 Beauprez Ehlers Kirk  
 Biggart Emerson Kline  
 Bilirakis English (PA) Knollenberg  
 Bishop (UT) Everett Kolbe  
 Blackburn Ferguson Kuhl (NY)  
 Blunt Fitzpatrick (PA) LaHood  
 Boehlert Foley Latham  
 Boehner Forbes LaTourrette  
 Bonilla Fortenberry Lewis (CA)  
 Bonner Fossella Lewis (KY)  
 Bono Foxx Linder  
 Boozman Franks (AZ) Lucas  
 Boren Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel  
 Boustany Gallegly E.  
 Bradley (NH) Gerlach Mack  
 Brady (TX) Gibbons Manzullo  
 Brown (SC) Gillmor Marchant  
 Brown-Waite, Gingrey McCaul (TX)  
 Ginny Gohmert McCotter  
 Burgess Gonzalez McCreery  
 Burton (IN) Goode McHenry  
 Buyer Goodlatte McHugh  
 Calvert Granger McKeon  
 Camp (MI) Graves McMorris  
 Cannon Green (WI) Melancon  
 Cantor Gutknecht Mica  
 Capito Hall Miller (MI)  
 Carter Harris Miller, Gary  
 Castle Hart Murphy  
 Chabot Hastings (WA) Musgrave  
 Chocola Hayes Myrick  
 Coble Hayworth Neugebauer  
 Cole (OK) Herger Ney  
 Conaway Hinojosa Northup  
 Cramer Hobson Norwood  
 Crenshaw Hoekstra Nunes  
 Cubin Hostettler Nussle  
 Cuellar Hulshof Ortiz  
 Culberson Hunter Osborne  
 Davis (KY) Hyde Otter  
 Davis, Jo Ann Inglis (SC) Owens  
 Davis, Tom Istook Oxley  
 Deal (GA) Jenkins Pearce

Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Pombo  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyd  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardin  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carson  
 Case  
 Chandler  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (TN)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Feeney  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Ford  
 Frank (MA)  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gordon  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene

Bachus  
 Clay  
 Davis (FL)

Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Salazar  
 Schmidt  
 Schwarz (MI)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Sodrel  
 Souder  
 Sullivan  
 Sweeney

NOES—199

Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hefley  
 Hensarling  
 Herseth  
 Higgins  
 Hinchey  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Jones (TX)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Leach  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Markey  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McKinney  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meeke (FL)  
 Michaud  
 Millender-  
 McDonald  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Molohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murtha

NOT VOTING—12

Evans  
 Gilchrest  
 Issa

Tancredo  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Pomeroy  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sabo  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz (PA)  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Shadegg  
 Sherman  
 Simmons  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Wexler  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn

Miller (FL)  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Tiahrt  
 Watson

□ 1446

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote 81, final passage of H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act. Please record that I would have voted "aye."  
 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 81 because I was on official travel. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005.  
 Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was inadvertently detained during rollcall vote No. 81. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a personal explanation of the reasons I missed rollcall votes Nos. 75–81 on March 30, 2006. I was down in my district on official business and unfortunately could not make it back in time for votes.

If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall vote No. 75, A motion to adopt the rule for H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act, "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 76, A motion to table the Pelosi Privileged Resolution, "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 77, Gohmert's Amendment to H.R. 609, to strike certain reporting requirements for colleges and universities within Sec. 131(f). The amendment also strikes Sec. 495(a)(1) that would allow States to apply to the Secretary of Education to become recognized accreditors, "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 78, Patrick Kennedy Amendment to H.R. 609, to make child and adolescent mental health professionals eligible for loan forgiveness for high need professions "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 79, Steve King Amendment to H.R. 609, require institutions that receive any Federal funding whatsoever (including grants and scholarships) to submit to the U.S. Department of Education an annual report answering two questions. First, the report must state whether race, color, or national origin is considered in the student admissions process. If race, color, or national origin is considered in the student admissions process, then the report must contain a subsequent analysis of how these factors are considered in the process, "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 80, G. Miller Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute for H.R. 609, to lower student loan interest rates; establish a new Predominantly Black Serving Institution program to boost college participation rates of low-income, black students; establish a new graduate Hispanic Serving Institution program; provide for year-round Pell grants; and repeal the Single Lender rule, "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 81, Final Passage of H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act, "aye".

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. 2349. An act to provide greater transparency in the legislative process.

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4755.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the majority leader (Mr. BOEHNER), for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week, and any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 on Tuesday evening.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the 527 reform bill, which was reported from the Committee on House Administration. The House will also consider the concurrent resolution on the budget. The Budget Committee completed its work last night.

We are scheduled to work through Friday next week. I can tell my colleague that if we were to get our work finished before that, the House would then adjourn for the district work period.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman indicates that we will be considering the 527 reform bill. My understanding is that is a free-standing bill. We expected it might be in the lobbying reform bill, but am I correct that the lobbying reform bill will come later and the 527 bill deals only with 527s?

Mr. BOEHNER. Only with 527s.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Can he tell me when he expects to move lobbying reform legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Next week the five committees that are involved in putting together the lobby and ethics reform bills, all of those committees will be marking up their relative portion of that bill. Once they have completed their work next week, there has been no decision made on how to proceed from there in terms of the consideration of those issues here on the floor.

Mr. HOYER. So, in any event, it would not occur until after the Easter break.

Mr. BOEHNER. I would expect that the first week or two back it is likely that we will see those issues on the floor in some manner.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that information. The concurrent resolution on the budget, you indicate Thursday and Friday. Is there a possibility we might start it on Wednesday and then complete it on Thursday, or do you expect to have it on the floor and hopefully completed on Thursday itself from the comments that you made?

Mr. BOEHNER. If the gentleman will yield, really, there are no decisions yet on just what the timing of these bills are next week. There just hasn't been a decision on what bill will come when. But I would hope that the 527 bill would be up Wednesday. Maybe we could start the budget debate on Wednesday. I think it is too early to tell.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, would I be correct in advising my colleagues that the probability is, and that the plan is, as it has been in years past, to allow such substitutes that are offered: the Black Caucus usually has a substitute, the Progressive Caucus has a substitute, Mr. SPRATT obviously we think will have a substitute. I don't know if there are others. In the past, of course, they have been made in order. Is it your expectation we would follow that same practice?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. It is.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that. That will facilitate a fuller consideration of the budget issues.

Mr. Leader, the tax reconciliation and pension conferences have been in meetings, I presume, or at least have been authorized for some period of time now. Can you bring us up to date on, if you know, the status of both the tax reconciliation conference and the pension conference. I know there was some concern on your side of the aisle and on ours, I think, to get the pension conference done prior to April 15. It appears that that might not happen at this point in time. Can you bring us up to date?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Both of those bills are, in fact, in conference. There have been informal conversations and, for that matter, formal conference meetings on both of those bills. The pension conference, on which I sit, has made some progress, but there is an awful lot of work to do, and I think the members of the conference are concerned about making sure that this bill is right and there are no unintended consequences. And it seems unlikely to me at this point that that conference could conclude by the end of next week.

Closely related would be the tax conference. I don't sit on the conference, and I don't have as good a feel as what the timing might be.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, not since you have been leader, but in times past, as you know, our side of the aisle has been very concerned about the way conferences have proceeded. Senator ENZI, who is one of the Chairs of the, I guess, the pension conference, has indicated he wanted to see a bipartisan conference, a full conference, a conference, frankly, as I historically remember them.

My understanding, frankly, is from both now, the two ranking Democrats of the relevant committees, particularly the ranking Democrat of the Ways and Means Committee, but also the ranking Democrat, I guess, of the Education and Labor Committee, there is a concern that the conference is now proceeding essentially in a partisan fashion, that is to say, Democrats are not being included in the discussions. In fact, we believe that Mr. THOMAS is negotiating the tax and pension provision with Republicans as if the two conferences were one.

I want to tell you, Mr. Leader, obviously, we have some substantial concerns about that, as we have had in the past in terms of our ability to participate in putting our views forth in the conferences themselves. I don't know whether you have any comment on that, but I would be certainly very interested to hear it so I could relate to my colleagues what they might expect.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding. I have talked to Democrats here in the House. I have talked to Democrats in the Senate about the pension provisions in conference. And everyone should know that at this point there have been some conversations amongst the majority party in each Chamber in order to try to put some framework together. But no one should have any anticipation that we are rapidly moving without our Democrat colleagues in the room. Senator ENZI and I had a conversation about this particular issue, on the involvement of our friends across the aisle, just yesterday; and so I understand the gentleman's concerns.

I do believe that there are times when discussions have to occur amongst the principals before you bring the rest of the members into the conference, and I expect it will happen with these two bills as well.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the sentiments of the majority leader. I know the majority leader has a history in dealing with his bills of pursuing them in that fashion, and we have appreciated it, as the gentleman knows. I have expressed that to him in the past. It has not always been our experience. Clearly, these bills are of extraordinary consequence to working men and women in this country, particularly as it relates to the pension bill as well as the tax reconciliation.

Without trying to catch you up on your words, but if I could just somewhat, perhaps humorously, I hope, but

you said that you are not moving ahead rapidly, but you will let us know, and you will not do so until the Democrats are in the room. Frankly, Mr. Leader, our concern is, and the concern of Democrats has been, that once the Democrats get back in the room it moves exceedingly rapidly, without really an opportunity for Democrats to make substantive contributions, whether they win or lose in the conference.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Now, as the gentleman is well aware, I believe that all of us were elected by our constituents, regardless of what side of the aisle we are on, and we all have a constitutional right and duty to participate in this legislative process; and the gentleman is well aware that there were a lot of conferences that I and members of my party never saw before they were completed. And as the gentleman is well aware, there are times when having the right people in the room is important. And every bill is different.

So on the pension bill particularly, as I said, I have talked to Members on your side of the aisle, I have talked to Democrats in the Senate as well, and I would hope that sometime soon you will see Members, more Members, brought into the room to try to help move this process along.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the comments of the majority leader, and I have confidence that he will work towards that end, and we look forward to it. I thank the gentleman for both his information and for his concerns about doing it in that fashion.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
APRIL 3, 2006, AND HOUR OF  
MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 4,  
2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 2006 for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY NEXT.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of April 3 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2007. The Committee on the Budget ordered the concurrent resolution reported late last night.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 2006. Members are advised that the text of the concurrent resolution should be made available on the Budget and the Rules Committees Web sites no later than March 31, Friday. As in past years, the Rules Committee intends to give priority to amendments offered as complete substitutes.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional Award Board:

Mr. CHOCOLA, Indiana

□ 1500

#### WELCOME HOME, RANDAL McCLOY

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Randal McCloy back to his home in Simpson, West Virginia. Randal was one of the 13 miners trapped in the Sago mine on January 2 and was the lone survivor. He suffered severe injuries to his heart, lungs, and kidneys and was in a coma for several weeks due to a lack of oxygen during the 40 hours he was trapped below the surface.

With all of the sadness West Virginians have experienced in the coal fields this year, today we can rejoice that Randal has recovered enough to leave the rehabilitative hospital and return home to his family and friends.

West Virginians have come together over the past 3 months to offer prayers and support for the families of those who have lost loved ones. The families of the Sago miners have made our

State proud, advocating for increased mine safety tools to help ensure other families do not experience the tragedy they have endured.

But today is the McCloys' day. We continue to support Randal McCloy; his wife, Anna; and their children as their family's road to recovery continues, and we will always remember the sacrifice made by his 12 co-workers.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). 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.

#### IRAQ AND A COMMONSENSE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, with this Congress blindly passing each and every one of the President's requests for more money for the war in Iraq, which is soon to exceed \$300 billion in total costs, the time is long overdue for a little common sense about how we spend the American people's money.

Earlier this month I introduced new legislation, the Common Sense Budget Act of 2006, legislation that puts some sanity back into the Nation's fiscal policy. This bill already has the support of more than 35 cosponsors.

It is beyond dispute that this administration, in tandem with the Republican Congress, has been, to put it mildly, less than fiscally responsible. And are they spending on the neediest Americans, those who need a hand up quite often just to make it from one day to the next? No, of course not. Instead, they fattened up the Pentagon and lavished wealthy special interests with subsidies and tax breaks.

Last fall's budget debate actually exposed the staggering hypocrisy of it all because the very same congressional majority that is responsible for the fiscal decadence of the last several years suddenly started lecturing about thrift and responsibility. They were shocked, shocked, that spending had been going on around here.

Federal money for Katrina reconstruction, they decided, had to be offset by budget cuts. Deficit spending is okay, apparently, when it comes to upper-bracket tax cuts, but not for poor people whose homes are under water.

Well, guess what they chose to cut. The social safety net: Medicaid, food stamps, public housing, students loans, and on and on. Just the kinds of programs that saved my life and my children's lives when I was a single mom on welfare 35 years ago. To help people on the gulf coast who lost everything, they took from the people who have virtually nothing. That is your Republican fiscal policy in a nutshell.

Well, enough of that. It is time we invested more in our people and less in our defense contractors. My Common-Sense Budget Act would trim \$60 billion in waste from the Pentagon budget and put it to work on behalf of the people and the programs that truly strengthen America. The money would be distributed as follows: \$5 billion a year for homeland security to make up for funding shortfalls in emergency preparedness, infrastructure upgrades, and grants for first responders; \$10 billion each year for energy independence, to kick the imported oil habit that we have in this Nation by investing in efficient, renewable energy sources; \$5 billion devoted to putting a dent in the \$8.2 trillion national debt; and for children's health care, \$10 billion annually to provide health care coverage for the millions of uninsured American children; \$10 billion over 12 years to rebuild and modernize every public K-12 school in this country; \$5 billion a year to retrain 250,000 Americans who have lost their jobs because of foreign trade; medical research, \$2 billion a year to restore recent cuts to the National Institutes of Health budget; and \$13 billion a year in humanitarian assistance that allows poor nations to feed 6 million children who are at risk of dying from starvation every year, to end global hunger.

The money is there to make an extraordinary difference in people's lives. We just need to challenge the entrenched interests and take on the sacred cows.

General Larry Korb worked with the Progressive Caucus and me to draft this model alternative, and Ben Cohen from Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream and the organization Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities also helped make the introduction of this bill possible.

There are models of good corporate citizenship, you see, businesses that understand that the return on these investments will benefit the entire society: a skilled workforce, healthy children, modern schools, fewer fossil fuels, better fire departments, scientific progress, less debt. These socially responsible businesses understand what makes America strong and safe, and it is not a bloated Pentagon budget that continues to invest in Cold War.

#### GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, gas prices are rising and someone is to blame.

The root cause of the rising gasoline prices, as an editorial in this week's Wall Street Journal rightly states, is the incredible shrinking of supply of a gasoline additive called MTBE. The production of MTBE has been for 15 years the direct result of a Federal mandate that such oxygenates be included in the Nation's gas supply. It was mandated by a Democrat Congress seeking to help clean the environment.

Now, that mandate is expiring in May, in large part owed to the discovery of MTBE in some water supplies, a discovery that has trial lawyers salivating as they count down the days. And the main culprit for its seeping into water supplies is faulty, unrepared, leaking underground storage tanks.

But the producers of those do not have the deep pockets of MTBE producers. Thus, when MTBE producers' liability protection expires in May, as the editorial states: "Producers and refiners will face far greater liability, which has set off a race to exit the market" because, as history has shown, the vultures in the lawsuit-happy trial bar will pounce on those with the deepest pockets.

In other words, the Federal Government mandated the production and addition of MTBE as a clean air additive to the Nation's fuel. But now the government says that mandate, while good for clean air, turns out actually to have been bad for groundwater. Now the government wants to let trial lawyers hold the industry accountable for environmental problems the government itself created with its original mandate. Meanwhile, the Nation's ethanol producers, who must now fill the additive void created by the widespread and predictable MTBE pullout, have already admitted they cannot meet the new market demand.

No MTBE and not enough ethanol will mean less gasoline on the market, less gasoline that can be prepared for the market, creating a shortage of supply and thus higher prices. In other words, come Memorial Day, gas prices, which are already higher than they have been since the early days after Hurricane Katrina, stand to spike even higher.

All of this economic analysis in the Journal's editorial, regrettably, is true. What is not true is the editorial's insinuation that congressional Republicans are to blame for it.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans fought for years to include MTBE-liability protection in the energy bill. The bill was shelved in 2003 when a Democrat-led filibuster, joined by liberal Republicans, succeeded in killing it, an outcome brought about, the then-Democrat leader said, by "the House Republican leadership's insistence on inclusion of retroactive liability protections for MTBE."

So in 2004 the energy bill effectively died when the Senate Energy and Natural Resources chairman unilaterally pulled the MTBE provisions from the Senate version of the legislation. So, finally, in 2005 the MTBE-protection provision was described by the House minority leader as a "disgraceful . . . giveaway." Enough Senate Republicans agreed with this false assessment to ensure that the energy bill was finally passed, after 4 years of effort, without the desperately needed MTBE provisions that House Republicans advocated for so long.

The result: the ethanol-MTBE fiasco, as the Journal puts it, is not the fault of Republicans on Capitol Hill, broadly speaking, but only about seven of them, all Senators, Senators who joined obstructionist Democrats and eco-extremists to punish an innocent industry.

House Republicans warned all along about the MTBE pullout, the ethanol shortfall, and the resulting spike in gas prices just in time for the 2006 summer traveling season, and we were right.

MTBE liability protection is the only thing standing between the American people and \$3-a-gallon gas this summer. And the only thing standing between MTBE-liability and the President's signature is a collection of Senators, the long-term effects of whose shortsighted grandstanding are only now starting to be felt.

So, Americans, when it hits \$3 a gallon, call the Senate.

Hopefully, yesterday's editorial will give MTBE-protection new life in Congress. And if not, drivers, especially in those States of Senators from New Mexico, Arizona, Maine, Vermont, Iowa, Illinois, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and New Hampshire, will know who to thank.

□ 1515

#### THE ECONOMY IS NOT AS ROSY AS REPUBLICANS CLAIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, if you look at the headline economic numbers and listen to the Bush Administration's talking points, you could get the impression that the economy is in pretty good shape.

But when we talk to our constituents, we get a very different picture. We hear anxiety about the economy, and a feeling that things are not going very well for the typical American family. The White House seems puzzled by this discrepancy, but it is very simple.

The benefits of the economic recovery from the 2001 recession have not been going to ordinary Americans. President Bush likes to cite statistics on how fast the economy is growing and how much productivity has increased.

But what he does not mention is that, on his watch, the economy went through the most protracted job slump in decades. There is still considerable evidence of hidden unemployment and that the benefits of productivity growth have been showing up in the profits of companies rather than in the paychecks of ordinary American workers.

Yes, workers have become more productive. They produce more and more in each hour that they work, but they have not been getting this reward in

their own paycheck for their productivity. Average hourly earnings have not kept up with inflation for the past 2 years, and they barely kept even the year before that.

Median family income has failed to keep up with inflation every year under President Bush. Mr. Speaker, even more disturbing than the general stagnation in wages and incomes is the growing gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" in this country, as income earnings disparities have widened.

This is an extremely troubling trend for everyone in our country. Those who are already well-to-do are indeed doing very well in the Bush economy. But the typical American family is struggling to make ends meet in the face of high costs for energy, health care and college education for their children.

This chart illustrates the problem very clearly. The red bars show the growth in the inflation adjusted usual weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers under President Bush at different points in the earnings distribution.

You have to be in the upper half of the distribution to have seen any gain. Earnings at the top have grown fastest relative to inflation, and earnings at the bottom have fallen farthest behind inflation.

I would note the contrast with the last 5 years of the Clinton Administration, which is illustrated with the blue bars when earnings and gains were strong and spread throughout the earnings distribution.

Mr. Speaker, the economic policies of the Bush Administration are not benefiting ordinary American families. The Bush economy and Bush economic policies have produced a widening gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots," and they have produced a legacy of deficits and debt that leaves us unprepared to deal with the budget challenges posed by the retirement of the baby-boom generation.

And that weakens the future standard of living of our children and grandchildren. We need to do better. We can do better if we focus on policies that address the economic challenges facing the ordinary American worker.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PROBLEMS WITH MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the countdown to the Bush drug tax, 44 days before May 15, May 15.

Last week, during the break, I held six town hall meetings throughout my district on the new Medicare Part D prescription drug program. And I would encourage all of my colleagues to do the same. Not only did it give my constituents a chance to get the help that they needed and answered their questions, it gave me an opportunity to really find out how the new program is working or, should I say, not working.

Unfortunately, I heard a lot of horror stories from a lot of people. Not only is picking a plan extremely complicated, but the arbitrary date of May 15 makes absolutely no sense. I have been an elected official for over 25 years. And this is the first time I have seen people who are going to be penalized for the rest of their lives if they do not sign up by a certain date, May 15.

Not only having them to set a ridiculous short time to sign up for this complicated plan, but the next time seniors can sign up will be November 15 through December 31, that includes both Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. So it is very complicated for seniors.

The Republican leadership wrote a bill that prevents the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating the price of the drug, even though both the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of DOT are negotiating these prices right now.

Can you imagine what would happen if Wal-Mart, if we told Wal-Mart they could not get a reduction price on bulk buying? Every Republican in this House would be on this floor screaming bloody murder. But when it is the needs of our seniors, there is a deaf ear; you do not hear them.

This bill allows the private plans to take drugs off of their approved lists and even charge more for drugs during that year. They can charge more, while seniors are locked in and cannot change plans until the next year.

It also turns seniors into criminals. Yes, criminals. What do I mean? If they buy drugs that are cheaper, let us say in Mexico or Canada, they will be criminals.

And one of the most troubling aspects of this bill, and the one that most people talk about is the doughnut. What do you mean doughnut? Well, no coverage is provided after you spend \$2,250 until your cost reaches \$5,001. That is \$3,000 out-of-pocket.

Lastly, I want to talk about the independent pharmacists. This bill is killing your small town pharmacists who have been in business for years. They still know their customers by name. They are the only pharmacists who are

still delivering medicine to seniors who cannot come out of the house or after hours when someone needs an emergency prescription.

This Congress needs to do the right thing for our parents and grandparents and extend this silly deadline date of May 15, allow the Secretary to negotiate bulk prices, and should make the appropriate changes that will save America's local pharmacies from extinction.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to hold their meetings and talk to their seniors and pharmacies about the drug plan. And seniors, for God's sake, please look at this: May 15, you need to sign up. But if you have questions, call Medicare counselors at 1-800-Medicare, that is, 1-800-633-4227. That is May 15. That is the drop-dead date. Thank you.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### AMERICA'S POLICIES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Iraq on a congressional delegation trip with Senator MCCAIN. And I wanted to report to my constituents.

The first thing that I have concluded in looking at the situation there and in visiting there is that we need a special envoy sent by the President of the United States to move forward with a national unity government.

Things on the ground are not going well. Things are deadlocked. There has been no government since 3 months after the election. We have a lame duck government, and we have a crucial international situation going on.

The current government is riddled by corruption and inertia. So, Mr. President, we need to send a special envoy.

Secondly, I visited the troops in Iraq, some New Mexicans and many others from across the country. And when I think of what they have done since the invasion over 3 years ago, it makes me very proud. Saddam Hussein and his sons are out of commission. We have held three elections, and the Iraqis have adopted a constitution.

We have trained over 224,000 troops to the highest levels of training, more than 100,000 police and security personnel. We have spent billions of dollars in reconstruction.

The Iraqis have made progress, and I do not know what more we can ask of our troops. But overall this visit solidified my belief that it is time for the Iraqi people to step forward and take control of the situation in their country.

Our troops are caught in the middle of religious and ethnic disputes. Sectarian violence is rampant in many areas. Iraqis must step up to the plate and resolve these disputes themselves.

As President Kennedy said of South Vietnam in the summer of 1961, "In the end, it is their country, and they are going to have to fight for it."

Therefore, we need a change of course in our foreign policy. Staying the course is no longer acceptable. We need to take two actions: One is announce a phased redeployment of our troops outside of Iraq. This redeployment should be complete by the end of this year, by 2006. Number two, we need to put the Iraqis on notice that they must assume responsibility. Of course, as we phase this redeployment, we need to assist them and train them and do everything we can during that period to make sure they have the best chance of success.

But this is their fight at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BUTTERWORTH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### YUCCA MOUNTAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning, I came to the floor of the House and stood in the well to tell the American people about a cartoon character by the name of Yucca Mountain Johnny that the Department of Energy has created which has been funded by the taxpayers of the United States of America.

The purpose of creating this cartoon character is to help convince the children of the State of Nevada that storing radioactive toxic nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, is okay for them. It is bad enough that the Department of Energy has been trying to convince the people of the State of Nevada and the United States of America that shipping 77,000 tons of toxic nuclear waste across 43 States to be buried in a hole in the middle of the Nevada desert

where we have got groundwater problems, seismic activity, volcanic activity, is good for the health and well being of this Nation.

It is not. And Yucca Mountain Johnny has got to be dumped before there is a nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain. But the latest thing that has just occurred that I want to share with the American people, through you, Mr. Speaker, is it makes Yucca Mountain Johnny pale in comparison.

□ 1530

Let me read to you what came over the wire today that I read: "The U.S. military plans to detonate a 700-ton explosive charge that will send a mushroom cloud over Las Vegas. 'I don't want to sound glib,' says the head of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, 'but it is the first time in Nevada that you will see a mushroom cloud over Las Vegas since we stopped testing nuclear weapons.'"

Well, it isn't glib to me, Mr. Speaker. It is a very serious thing when I have an administration official, the head of an agency, stating that he is going to detonate a 700-ton bomb that is going to send a mushroom cloud over the community that I represent, where my parents live, my children live, and 700,000 Nevadans live as well. So I called this gentleman, and I asked him to please explain this quote.

Glib? He is going to send a mushroom cloud, detonate a mushroom cloud over Las Vegas, Nevada. Well, he said, it was a poor choice of words, but that is what we are going to do. So I asked him, When is it going to take place? It is going to take place in June. I said, Is it really going to be a mushroom cloud over the State of Nevada. Isn't that a tad insensitive given the fact that we had nuclear experiments and weapons detonated at the Nevada test sites in the fifties and the sixties? He said, Well, it might have been a little insensitive, but that's what we are doing.

So I said, Well, is it going to be over Las Vegas? Well, not really Las Vegas. I misspoke. It is going to be at the Nevada test site. I said, Well, will we be able to see it from Las Vegas? Yes, you're going to be able to see it from Las Vegas. Well, how big is it going to be? Well, we don't know yet how big it is going to be. I said, Well, where at the Nevada test site is it going to be detonated? He said, Well, we are doing studies, and it is going to be detonated in a place that is safe.

I said, Well, how can it be safe when there were over 900 nuclear detonations in the fifties and sixties and that land is very toxic and very radioactive? He said, Well, we are going to do it in a place that isn't radioactive, although he couldn't tell me where, he couldn't tell me how.

If I can continue reading this, he says: "We also have," are you ready for this, this man doesn't realize how serious what he is proposing is, "we also have," are you ready for this, "a 700-ton explosively formed charge that

we're going to be putting in a tunnel in Nevada."

So I said to him, Well, if it's in a tunnel, how come we are going to get a mushroom cloud? Oh, well, I wasn't quite right about that either. It's not really in a tunnel. It's going to be above ground. I said, Well, how can it be above ground at the Nevada test site and not disturb the dirt that is radioactive? He said, Well, we're taking care of that too. I said, What happens if there's wind? Is the wind going to be blowing this mushroom cloud to Las Vegas? Is it going to Utah? He couldn't tell me that either.

This is a serious issue for the people of the State of Nevada. It's bad enough that we didn't get prior notice, and obviously the congressional delegation wasn't briefed; but the people of the State of Nevada haven't been briefed either. But if you look further at this press release that has been sent out, it says the Russians, the Russians have been notified of this test. So we have notified the Russians. We just neglected to notify the Americans?

I think this is a bad idea. We need more information. And before you start detonating 700-ton explosive devices at Nevada test site, we'd better do a thorough study of the environmental impact. Because if you are going to be disturbing that dirt that is radioactive and having a mushroom cloud out of Las Vegas, the people of Las Vegas, the people of the State of Nevada better know about it, and we better stop this madness if that is what is going to happen.

So I call upon this Defense Threat Reduction Agency to work with my office, work with the congressional delegation from Nevada, and let's figure out if we can maybe put this explosive detonation some place else where there aren't 1.6 million southern Nevadans and hundreds of thousands of tourists in the Las Vegas area at the time.

#### REFORM LIBERAL LUNACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about 527s. 527s are groups, shadowy groups, that work outside of campaign finance disclosure laws. They work outside of our campaign finance reforms that we passed just a few years ago. They are groups that do not disclose their donors in the way that other traditional campaign groups do. They are groups that have unlimited contributions. They are groups that come in and perhaps target members in different races or candidates in different races, yet they do not actually say who they are.

So today I want to say that as a conservative and as a Member of this House what I am fighting for is openness and full disclosure and allowing sunshine on this political process that we as Americans grow to trust.

Look, in 527s last year, in the 2004 campaign cycle, there is \$370 million. \$370 million, Mr. Speaker, that flowed through these groups outside of campaign disclosure. These groups can come in and do all sorts of campaigning, but yet they do not have to disclose like a campaign would. So the voters do not know who is working, who is out there putting this information out. \$370 million, Mr. Speaker, flowed through 527s. That is more than both the Kerry and Bush campaigns combined spent on the Presidential election. This was done outside of campaign disclosure.

Over one-fifth of the \$370 million funded through 527s came from four individuals; one-fifth of the \$370 million, four individuals. So much for taking big money out of politics, which is what my colleagues on the left wanted to do through campaign finance reform and many active in politics wanted to do. So much for taking big money out.

We created a loophole that 527s are allowed to use, or have taken advantage of, I should say. Over 80 percent of 527 donors gave at least a quarter of a million dollars. Think about that. That is truly big money in politics, Mr. Speaker. Forty-six individuals gave at least a million dollars to 527 groups. That is even bigger money. So we have created a two-tier system in campaign finance: one where people have to disclose; another where they shadow a group's act.

Look, the biggest big daddy of them all for 527s was a billionaire, what I like to call the Daddy Warbucks of the Democrat Party, George Soros, the Daddy Warbucks of the Democrat Party. He is pumping wads of cash into 527s to influence elections for his left wing agenda. Soros is one of the richest men in the world. He spent \$18 million on campaign finance reform to root out big money in politics. How hypocritical is that? He spent all that money for campaign finance reform, yet once campaign finance reform is passed, what does he do? He pumps wads of cash, millions, tens of millions of dollars to those shadowy 527 groups.

Fortune Magazine called him the world's angriest billionaire. He is without a doubt the most powerful Democrat in the country right now. He has a far left agenda and you cannot move any farther left to him until you go down south to Havana, to be honest with you.

Soros is an example of liberal lunacy, and it goes to the heart of what my colleagues on the left have been articulating, which is a culture of hypocrisy. A culture of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, that we need to take on as the majority in the House. As a Republican and as a conservative, I am going to point out the culture of hypocrisy that the 527 groups that the left wing in this body are taking advantage of.

That is why I think we need to come forward with true campaign finance reform, make the 527 groups accountable and disclose to the American people

who their donors are and abide by the same rules and regulations that all campaign groups must abide by.

The original intent from the Democrats was to root out big money in politics. They said not just a few years ago, not but just a few years ago, "... money that threatens to drown out the voice of the average voter of average means, money that creates the appearance that a wealthy few have a disproportionate say over public policy." Yet today, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats and the left in this body are more beholden than ever to big money politics and 527 groups and we will reform this liberal lunacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized 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 gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF 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 Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN 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 Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is once again an honor to come before the House. As you know, those of us that are in the 30-something Working Group, we come to the floor to share not only with the Members but the American people about what is happening under the Capitol dome here, or what is not happening.

We want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to come to the floor again: Leader PELOSI and Mr. STENY HOYER, our whip, and also the chairman, Mr. JIM CLYBURN, and our vice chairman in assisting us in moving towards a stronger message to the American people.

I am so glad to be here with my good friend and colleague in the struggle for the truth and to make sure that we move America forward in many areas, even though we are serving in the minority here in the Congress. I think our constituents and also the American people, Mr. Speaker, look for us to use every avenue possible to be able to make their lives more secure, to be able to make sure we stand up on behalf of their health care, that we make sure that future generations have a better environment than what they have right now.

So with that, Mr. RYAN, it is so good to come back to the floor with you again, sir. We usually come to the floor and it is dark outside. It happens the sun is out; and as you know, the Congress is recessed for the week, but we are still here working, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, my friend. One quick piece of business that has been mentioned several times here today is the countdown to the Bush prescription drug tax.

Now, for those Members who do not remember, the Republican Congress voted this boondoggle a few months back, told us it was \$400 billion before we cast a vote on it, and it ended up being \$700 billion. The real number was actually hidden from Members of the United States Congress before they voted.

What happens is through this bill seniors have until May 15 to sign up for the prescription drug plan, and if they do not sign up by May 15, they are going to be penalized with the Bush prescription drug tax, which means that there will be an increase in monthly premiums by 1 percent for every month they do not sign up. So if they do not sign up by May 15, they will not be eligible to sign up, I think, until January of 2007 to begin again. That means there will be a 7 percent increase if seniors do not sign up by May 15.

This is a complex plan, a complicated plan; and we are rushing and forcing our seniors to make a decision. So we just want to put a little X here on Thursday, March 30, a couple days before the Final Four begins, so our seniors know that the countdown is on and

they have several weeks before this President will levy a tax on them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House had an opportunity to witness a strong message again of commitment towards security; and those of us that are in the minority party have been working very, very hard to increase security here in the United States, especially homeland security. We are going to talk a little bit about that today. And I think when we were here, I know when we were here the night before last, we talked about the fact that just because the majority side says that we have security does not really mean we have security.

□ 1545

The majority side has said that we are going to make sure that we are fiscally responsible, but we found out later and we know now that the Republican majority has put us into record-breaking deficits.

If I can, just to start this off, Mr. Speaker, because I like to use visual aids and I know we are going to talk about security, but I think it is important because folks just feel we may come to the floor, the 30-Something Working Group comes to the floor, we go in the back room, we just dream up things to say, and this is not the case because, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there is so much bad news overwhelming the good news as it relates to future generations and this generation on how we are going to function as Americans and as a country.

No other time, I must add, before I bring this chart up, has the country been in the fiscal situation that it is in right now as it relates to foreign countries owning our debt.

Now I want to put this up, and I think it is important. You have seen this chart before. We have said that this chart may very well be in the National Archives one day because it will document that there were Members on the floor identifying to other Members on the majority side because they voted for this to happen. No other time in the history of the country have we borrowed \$1.05 trillion from foreign Nations in just 4 years. Matter of fact, we were not able to do it in 224 years, Mr. Speaker. We were not able to do it in 224 years; \$1.05 trillion just for President Bush and the Republican Congress, it says right here below this picture because we cannot leave the Congress out because he could not do it all by himself. You have 42 Presidents here going back to the First Continental Congress, 224 years, and there they were only able to borrow \$1.01 trillion.

Well, folks may say, well, Congressman, we are at war; Congress, 9/11. Guess what, these 42 other Presidents had the Great Depression, World War I, World War II, a number of other wars in between. They had all of these issues that were challenging America, but they never sold America off to foreign nations.

Let us talk about who those foreign nations are, and I think it is important again. This chart here has nothing to do with the weather. It is a silhouette, Mr. Speaker, as you can see of the United States of America. Who are we selling our debt off to? Who are we indebted to now? Because before this President and this Republican majority took over, we were talking about surpluses.

I am speaking here as a Democrat from the party that, guess what, we balanced the budget. We told folks that we would balance the budget and that we would cut down on spending, and guess what, we did it. But, you know, once again you have the other side, the Republican majority, saying: Trust us, we are fiscally responsible. Some folks may say the folks on the Democratic side, they like to spend money. Well, who is spending now?

China, Red China, many people in your district in Ohio are training people to go to China to do their jobs. Meanwhile, they are trying to make ends meet, and they are a part of the millions of Americans without health care, and Red China, we owe them \$249.8 billion. They bought our debt to that point, and we owe them.

Japan, the little small island of Japan. They own \$680.8 billion of our debt. Those are the big numbers.

UK, they own \$223.2 billion of our debt.

This is not by the Democrats now I must add, and I challenge any Republican that wants to come down here right here, right now. This is not the WWF cage match. I want them to come here right now and explain to us, how is this positive for Americans in the future and right now?

Korea, \$66.5 billion that they own of the American apple pie.

Canada, \$53.8 billion of the American apple pie.

Germany, some of our veterans, \$65.7 trillion.

Taiwan, the small island of Taiwan, \$71.3 billion.

And OPEC nations, now Mr. Speaker, this is very interesting because OPEC nations, we are talking about Saudi Arabia, we are talking about Iraq, we are talking about Iran, who we have real issues with, OPEC Nations, they are a part of the American apple pie; \$67.8 billion of our debt we owe them.

Now, anyone, Mr. Speaker, who has been in a financial situation before and has made youthful indiscretions on spending knows when a creditor calls you and they call in the tab for this payment, they disrespect you from the beginning. They do not call up and say, Mr. RYAN, I am calling from whoever the lender may be, when do you think that you can return payment? No, they call you TIM, because they disrespect you from the beginning.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to find ourselves in a situation where these countries are going to start disrespecting the United States of America, not because of something

they did. It is because we have had a Republican Congress that has been the rubber stamp Congress for the President of the United States and not doing what they should be doing in Article I, section 1 of the Constitution, and that is a fact. They have been rubber stamping everything that the President has wanted.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is President Bush's Congress.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is President Bush's Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is his Congress. They toe his line.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And the bottom line is, it is like having, Mr. Speaker, a board of directors of a bunch of people like bobble heads going up and down like this: What do you want, Mr. President? You want to make tax cuts permanent for millionaires and billionaires? We are with you. You want to give subsidies to oil companies that are making record profits while the American people are paying through the nose for oil and for gas prices? We are with you all the way. All the way, Mr. President, you can count on this Republican Congress because we are going to do it.

Hey, guess what, we are going to put it on the credit card. And folks used to say future generations. This is dealing with right now, and so just because you see a majority stands up there and they have this big chart behind them saying fiscal responsibility, we want to cut the budget in half, the deficit in half; that is not true.

So that is the reason why we are here on this floor today. That is the reason why we are sharing with the American people, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would be concerned if I was a Republican Member of Congress because I can tell you right now, as a Democrat who represents Republicans, Democrats, Independents, I represent Americans. They are all coming to me. They are not coming up to me and saying, hey, I am a Republican and I have got to stick with Republicans because I am Republican. No, they are saying I am an American and I am concerned about what is happening in Washington, D.C.; I am concerned about the fact that I am going to have to pay more for my grandchild's education because we have not done what we are supposed to do in the fiscal way to make sure that we are there; we do not cut student opportunities so they can train themselves for the next generation. I am concerned, Congressman, that the Congress is not investing in innovation so that we can have engineers, we can have scientists, so that we do not have to raise the visa rate to be able to bring folks in from another country to take U.S. jobs because we have CEOs that are begging us for the opportunity to have an educated and ready-to-go workforce, and we cannot provide it because these kids cannot get into schools, but meanwhile, we are standing up for the billionaires in this country, and we are standing up for bad policy in this country.



No one is questioning the whole issue as it relates to Iraq. You heard one of our Members just got back, said this is what we need on the ground in Iraq. We go to Iraq. We fought for our troops to get them what they need. The bottom line is we have to govern, and the reason why you see all of these scandals and all of the wasted money, Mr. Speaker, is that the Congress is over here doing this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Bobble heads.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Bobble heads on the other side of the aisle saying, we are with you all the way.

So when they say we stand up to the President every now and then, that is not what the Constitution says, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution says that we are the House that represents the people of the United States of America. If they are in a wheelchair, walking upright, if they are white, they are black, Hispanic, whatever the case may be, we are charged to represent them, and when we are making history in all the wrong areas, borrowing from foreign nations in 4 years more than in the 224 years of 42 Presidents, and folks are not alarmed? We are far beyond politics right now, Mr. Speaker. We are in a situation to where either we have some folks on this floor that are willing to lead on behalf of the American people, no longer sell our debt off to foreign nations that we have issues with, or we are just going to continue to go down this fiscal track, slippery slope, until we get to a situation to where we are not going to be the superpower that we have been in the past of the work that these the other Presidents and other Congresses have done.

I will be doggone if I am a Member of a Congress where we are not trying to bring about the paradigm shift to get us back on the fiscal track and make sure that we do the things the way the American people elected us to do it when we come up here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are exactly right. Article I, section 1, of the United States Constitution creates this House of Representatives. It does not say we are going to have a king. It does not say we are going to have a President. That all comes later. Article I, section 1, of the Constitution creates this body, and when things get so turned around that this body is rubber stamping everything, this is President Bush's Congress. They have done every single thing that he has asked and everything that is supposed to be up is down statistically, and everything that is supposed to be down is up.

Now, since President Bush has been in and President Bush's Congress, they have raised the debt limit by \$3 trillion. Basically what happens is the CEO, the President, the Treasury Secretary, they come to Congress; they come to the board of directors and say, hey, we need to go out and borrow more money for the business. So the Congress time and time and time again says, sure, keep going, we will not even ask any questions as to where you are spending it.

They raised the debt in June of 2002 by \$450 billion; May of 2003 by \$984 billion; November of 2004, \$800 billion; and just 2 weeks ago, we did it again by several hundreds of billions of dollars. Almost \$9 trillion is the limit the United States can go and borrow.

As the gentleman from Florida said, we are borrowing it from the Chinese, the Japanese, OPEC countries. Can you imagine, we are going to the oil producing countries to borrow money? Are they not getting enough of our money right now? I think they get plenty of our money, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what did the Democrats try to do to stop the insanity? We have a little provision here that was implemented in the early 1990s, and it basically said if you want to spend money, you have got to go find it somewhere. You have either got to raise revenue or you have got to cut spending from another program in order to bring it into balance. It is called pay-as-you-go, just kind of like you do at home.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If a family had this kind of situation where they had debt and they were trying to catch up on that debt, the first thing when you get out of that or you get a second mortgage or you get some sort of loan to consolidate your debt, the first thing that lending officer says is, to do what? Cut your credit cards up.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Because from this point on, you can only buy what you can afford, not just continue to put it on the credit card because you are going to continue to go into the hole.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is a great point, and I thank the gentleman.

So, in this Congress, the Democrats have tried to reimplement this pay-as-you-go system because Bush's Congress, Bush's House, Bush's Senate, President Bush, they got rid of the PAYGO requirements. They said we did not need them anymore, and the Democrats, time and time, you know, we hear a lot about, well, what is the Democrats' plan? This is the Democratic plan: We want to implement PAYGO rules back into the United States Congress to rein in this spending. JOHN SPRATT from South Carolina, our ranking Democratic member on the Budget Committee, tried to put a substitute amendment in on the 2006 budget resolution, and that amendment failed. Zero Republicans voted to reimplement the PAYGO rules.

□ 1600

We tried again with another Spratt substitute amendment, H. Con. Res. 393. I am not making this up. This happened. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker. The Members can go and look and check it out. It failed 194-232. Zero Republicans voted to reimplement the PAYGO rules.

Mr. THOMPSON from California tried; Mr. Stenholm, a former Member from Texas, he tried. Mr. MOORE from Kansas, he tried. We have been trying to implement fiscal restraint on Bush's

Congress, and they refuse to accept it time and time again.

Now, the funny part about it, and not really funny ha-ha, just funny peculiar, is that this is the same outfit that campaigned in 1994, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to pass a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. They wanted to enshrine balanced budgets into the U.S. Constitution and make a constitutional amendment. Now, 12 years later, they are the most fiscally irresponsible group that has run the show in the United States Congress.

Time and time again, when Democrats have tried to rein in spending, we keep butting our heads up against the Republican majority, President Bush's bobblehead Congress that just continues to say "yes" to every single thing that they do.

I remember, too, my good friend from Florida, time and time again we heard about how government needs to be run like a business. And you know what, put me in. Sign me up. I agree. I think it should be run like a business. But when you apply this scenario to a business model, we are the board of directors, the United States Congress, and the majority in particular. The President is the CEO. So if the CEO keeps going back to the board to say, hey, we want to go borrow more money, the board should at least ask some questions, like, Where are you spending it?

And when you hear where they are spending it, in Iraq a \$1.5 billion a week, and then Halliburton, who is getting the contracts in Iraq, is inflating prices and has been fined already for inflating prices, basically bilking the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, is what that is called in laymen's terms; yet there is no oversight. Where is the \$9 billion dollars in Iraq. Where is it? You got it. No, I don't. You don't have it? He's got it. Wait a minute, I don't have it. Nobody knows where it is, \$9 billion.

This is not an operation that is being run like a business, especially in Iraq. Then we look at what happened when Katrina hit. That operation, FEMA, was certainly not run like a business, because you don't put a horse lawyer in charge of an emergency management operation. That is the bottom line. You put people in who will respect the operation and respect what needs to be done.

So if all this is happening, we've got to make some changes. And if it is General Motors, the American people do not have a vote as to who is on the board or who is the CEO of the company. But, fortunately, my friend, in the United States of America, the American people have the opportunity to pick a new board, and in November of 2006 the American people are going to have an opportunity to pick a new board.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, when you start talking about our stakeholders here, and who is a stockholder in the United States of America or a stakeholder that has stock, you

know, I am a Member of Congress and I guess I put on a suit and a tie this morning and a shirt, and I am wearing a decent pair of shoes here today, but that doesn't make me a stockholder in America, just the way I dress. This voter registration card here does. That is the bottom line.

Anyone that is carrying one of these, Mr. Speaker, are the folks that will be able to speak to us in a way versus another person who is not registered to vote. And the real issue comes down to this: Are we going to be accountable to the American people? That is one question. Are we going to be accountable to those that are not old enough to vote yet and carry one of these voter registration cards? That is another question. Are we going to be accountable to those Americans that do have a voter registration card and know what it means to have a responsible government?

People want governance, Mr. RYAN. They could care less about the Republicans did this and the Democrats did that. They want governance, they want security, they want to make sure their children are educated and they want to be sure we are responsible, being the overseers of the Government of the United States of America. And the bottom line is this: we have some folks that have gotten confused, Mr. Speaker, on the majority side.

There are some votes that have taken place on this floor, this education bill that just passed today that did very little to address the issues of innovation in education, even though the majority side says we are for innovation; even though we are for education, just a little tiny increase here and there, and this is the best bill since bills have been passed.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to just step back for a minute and say the reason why we are here. We are not appointed here in this House of Representatives. In the other body across the Hall, in the Senate, if a Senator was to say, hey, you know, I can't do this any more, I am gone. That is it. Hey, it was great serving for 20-something years, or even 5 years in some cases, but I am not going to do this any more. I have to go take care of my grandkids, my mother is ill, or whatever case, and they go on. In that particular case, a Governor can appoint a U.S. Senator.

But if a Member of the House, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, says, you know, family issues, personal issues, I can no longer come back to Washington every week to represent my district, I am gone, there has to be a special election set. And that is what holds us to a higher power as it relates to representing the people of the United States of America.

It is important that Members realize that folks early one Tuesday morning in some given community woke up one day and stood in line to vote for some representation. And I can tell you right now, the bills that are passing on this

floor that are benefiting folks that are very powerful in this capital city, that I feel are not really benefiting the folks back home, I am concerned about. I know my card happens to say Democrat, but there are some cards that say Independent, and there are some voting cards that say Republican, and there are some voting cards that say Green Party and other parties. And guess what, they feel the way we feel.

I share with some Members sometimes that we have to act as though it was our first night being elected, all the things we wanted to do before we hit Washington, D.C., until someone started telling us how we should vote and how we shouldn't vote. We should have those feelings of representing the group of people that have sent us up here. And by the fact they have sent us here, Mr. Speaker, many times we have to look on behalf of the greater country. We have been federalized once we have been sent here to serve in this body.

So, Mr. RYAN, when we talk about stakeholders and stockholders, the stakeholders and stockholders in the United States of America are the people we serve. And folks are getting confused about that, or we wouldn't see this out-of-control borrowing and spending.

Folks are coming before the people of the United States of America and saying, you know, the President is asked, what about Iraq? Well, we are going to be there as long as we have to be there. That is not an answer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is the next President's issue.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, that is the next President's issue.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about the other night, Mr. RYAN and I were talking, and the next thing you know, it is like Mr. RYAN or my constituents walking up to me in Miami and saying, hey, Congressman, you really need to do something about economic development. Well, that is for the next Member of Congress. It is not for me.

So the real issue is this: Do we want to represent the people that have fought that are veterans, and the American people that are paying taxes for us to be able to salute one flag here today? Or do we want to represent someone that is publicly on the stock market that has an issue that wants to use the U.S. taxpayer dollar to carry on their business when they are making record profits, when they are doing very little as it relates to investment?

So we have to make sure that the rubber hits the road and that everyone understands. Because we know there is going to be a big marketing campaign going on later on this year about who is doing the best job up here in Congress. And what I am seeing of the polling numbers and what people are saying and how they are concerned, the party has nothing to do with it. It has everything to do with governance.

And, Mr. RYAN, if they want accountability in Iraq, and if they want ac-

countability as it relates to paying as we go, and if they want accountability as it relates to us following up and saying what we are going to do, and we have all these scandals going on under this situation, what will happen? And what would happen if we had real oversight? If we had oversight, would Halliburton be able to get a blank check?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Here is the choice, my friend. The American people will have a decision to make. We can either go and keep following President Bush down this unknown path, that I don't even know sometimes if the President knows where we are going as a country, or we can change course and we can go in a different direction than President Bush's direction. Because that direction, as you have seen, has led to more borrowing from foreign interests than the previous 42 Presidents.

We are not making this up. That is from the United States Department of the Treasury. And when you look at the interest payments that we have to pay just on the interest, and here is a great example, Mr. Speaker: for the 2007 budget, we will spend about \$230 billion just paying the interest on the money that we owe all these other countries.

So if China loans us money, they loan us the money and then we send them the interest. So China takes the interest and invests it back into their state-owned companies and wipes out the manufacturing base in the United States. That doesn't seem too smart. That is President Bush's direction. The Democrats want to take the country in another direction.

So \$230 billion out of the 2007 budget is going to go just for interest. Wasted money. Flush it right down the toilet, 'cause it is done. Then what are we going to spend on education? Fifty billion. We have \$230 billion on the interest and \$50 billion on education. You know, 10 or 15 on homeland security, and a pittance, just a little more than that, on veterans.

You know, President Kennedy said: "To govern is to choose," and this is the choice that this President makes. The Bush Congress continues to reaffirm with their rubber stamp time and time and time again. So all we are saying is what we want to do is we want to change direction.

I personally would like to stop following the President, because I have seen his track record, and I don't want to follow him. It is just like any leader. You are with them, you want to be with them, but over time they build a record, and this Republican Congress refuses to break free from what the President is doing here. And this is President Bush's Congress, my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I just want to also share the fact that we both serve on the Armed Services Committee, and we feel very passionate about what our men and women are doing. And we know that in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, you watch the Secretary of

Defense and you watch the press conference with the President and you would think that it is another beautiful day in Iraq, and it is not.

First question: Is there a civil war in Iraq? That answer usually comes back "no." There is a civil war going on right now. As sure as today is Thursday, there is a civil war going on in Iraq right now. Will it get worse? It probably will get worse. Is the coalition getting bigger or smaller? Well, you know, we are talking to people, and the indicators of the indicators are saying. And they are not making any sense whatsoever.

And the reason they get away with this, Mr. Speaker, is we are not nailing them down as a Congress on the tough questions so they can answer in a truthful way and guide them in the right direction. It is not the Congress's responsibility for the day-to-day operations of war. The President would say it is not his responsibility either, that it is the commanders on the ground.

Well, we found from past commanders and some present that have slipped and said a few things every now and then that we did not have all that we needed to go into Iraq; that we did not have the body armor and equipment and a mission and a plan; we did not have a real coalition when we went into Iraq. We had a number of main countries, but when you look at it, you had the U.S., you had contractors, and then the Brits. And that was a huge deficit as it relates to numbers.

The Brits have said they are leaving this year, and a number of the other countries that were sending 50 to 100 troops there, or technical advisers that were part of our so-called coalition are leaving. Because they are willing to take the training wheels off the Iraqi Government. They are willing not to get into a situation, Mr. Speaker, of a continued borrowing from other countries. You know why they are doing it? Because they know they cannot weaken their country.

The U.K., I am going to snatch them off this map here, \$223.2 billion of our debt. I mean, they have it so good they can buy our debt and still operate their country and continue to do what they are doing.

□ 1615

But they have better sense to know they have to take care of home first.

The President can boldly say, because he has the bobble-head Republican majority here that says whatever you say, Mr. President, we are with you.

For a minute there, I was concerned that maybe we could move in a bipartisan way. But, of course, when it came down to the whole Dubai Ports World issue, we had folks that said we stopped that from happening. But the environment was set up for it to happen, that the under secretaries in each department could make a unilateral decision that we will sell our ports off to a foreign nation. Somebody ob-

jected, and all of a sudden it became a situation where we had to do something about this after the whole country was in an uproar over the issue.

The Democrats, we were the first ones on the floor saying, what do we need 45 days for? What is there to think about, that we are going to outsource our ports to a foreign nation that there is a question mark concerning where the financing for the 9/11 attack came from. We are going to give them six of our ports on the east coast? What is to think about? 45 days for what? What does the President of the United States say? "We gave them a handshake. We have to move on with this. You can have your 45 days, I am still going to do what I want to do."

The Republican Congress was pushed with their back against the wall. But does the Republican Congress have to be pushed to the wall before they stand up and say, excuse me, Mr. President, we don't agree with you, and we are not going to do it.

The same thing happened, Mr. RYAN, when we came to this floor night after night, in some instances 2 hours a day on this floor, talking about the President's Social Security plan. He was going to privatize Social Security. Many of the Members on the majority side were with him. Ho-hum, private accounts, big press conference.

It took the American people to rise up in over 1,000 town hall meetings on this side of the aisle to bring to the attention of the American people that they were going to lose under private accounts, and then the President finally said okay. He flew all over the country and burned all kinds of jet fuel at taxpayers' expense and kind of did the Potomac two-step kind of thing.

Why can't we, as a bipartisan body, because people want leadership, and we are here sharing with the American people that we are ready to lead. We have plans to lead. We have led before in the past, be it war, be it making sure, and I want you to talk about Bosnia a little bit, be it planning to move into an area. I think it is important because yesterday we not only unveiled but said for a second time in many cases our security plan, our real security plan that people can get. They can read it online. They can get it on HouseDemocrats.gov. They can get a copy of this plan.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, you have to be tough, there is no doubt about it, but you have to be smart. What we are doing now is not smart. We talked earlier about the debt and deficit and everything else we have now. In 1993, a Democratic House, Democratic Senate and a Democratic President balanced the budget in the United States. It led to the creation of 20 million new jobs. The Democrats know how to govern.

We had an incident in the late 1990s with Bosnia. General Clarke, a Democrat; Madeleine Albright, a Democrat; President Clinton, a Democrat; we went into Bosnia with a coalition of

countries around the world to help us stop basically what we said was happening in Iraq. We went in there, and we did not lose one American soldier. The Democrats know how to administer governments, and the Republicans, quite frankly, do not because the numbers do not bear it out. The budget is ballooning. They have raised the debt ceiling by \$3 trillion. They are borrowing money from Japan, China and the OPEC countries, and whoever else will loan them money. The deficit next year is projected to be about \$500 billion. Tuition costs have doubled in the past 4 or 5 years. The gap between the wealthiest people in our society and the poorest people in our society has grown to a point we have not seen since pre-World War II, and Iraq is a mess. \$1.5 billion a week. We are losing soldiers every day, and there is absolutely no end in sight. We did not go in with enough troops, and whether you supported the war or not, you want to make sure that you succeed, for God's sake.

Mr. Speaker, we have not seen the rebuilding effort in Iraq that we need to see in order to get out of there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RYAN and I were both in Iraq. We were in Iraq together. We were in these meetings with the commanders and the troops. You ask a question, sometimes folks lose eye contact with you because they are trying to do what the commander in chief said that we need to do. And there are a lot of stump speeches going on, and the President is flying and folks are standing behind him and clapping and all. And we are all supportive of the commander in chief, but when you are riding down the railroad tracks and you are saying, is that the light at the end of the tunnel or is that the train? Is that a train or is that the sun? When you start getting indicators, when you hear a horn and the rails start shaking on the train track, I think you start saying, I think that is a train.

Tough talk: The President throws out statements, talking about folks, we are going to get them and track them down and all this kind of stuff, it makes things even worse. So when we talk to these commanders, and some of them lose eye contact because they know we do not have what we need. And as long as this Republican majority is here bobble heading with the President saying, Mr. President, we are with you. And they have special breakfasts over at the White House. And, of course, Mr. RYAN, we are not invited because we may say something to the President he does not want to hear. We all know that the President does not take good to those who disagree with him, and I guess that rule applies to some of our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle because, obviously, we do not have the kind of uprising we need in the majority to be able to say, Mr. President, we are really going to have to start talking about this Iraq thing. We have to do something about it.

The Iraqi government, you go over there and you have some of the Members of their government, be it elected or appointed, they are sitting up there like they have 10 years to do whatever they have to do, they have 20 years to do whatever they have to do. And guess what, it is at the U.S. taxpayers' expense.

Meanwhile, Mr. RYAN, we have schools that do not have what they need. Meanwhile, we are here on this floor talking about cutting lunches for poor children just because they so happened to be born into a poor family. I have mayors coming to me saying, Congressman, these unfunded mandates for homeland security, I am having to spend all of this money. I have to take money out of parks and rec and decrease the quality of life in my city. The Federal Government just cut the COPS program, but meanwhile, we are building schools and roads and water treatment plants and the President said we were not going to be into nation-building over in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we want to be able to mold the clay and to be able to let the American people know if you are walking down a tunnel, which they know, it is just commonsense, if you are walking down a tunnel and you are walking on some train tracks and you are stepping on those wood slates and you are saying, is that the sunlight or a train, and then you hear a horn and the tracks are shaking, I do not think that is the sun, I know it is a train.

What this majority has to do, and if the American people want us to be able to bring this President into accountability and bring the Department of Defense back into accountability and oversight, you are going to have to have a Congress, in this case a Democratic Congress, that asks the tough questions.

When you sit down for a job interview, you have to have a good resume. You cannot say, in my last job, I agreed with everything that the other guy who was sitting next to me said because I was told to say yes. No. People elected us to lead. People elected us to have plans. People elected us to have plans in all areas to make sure we have accountability for our government. People do not care if it is a "D" or "R" behind the name; they want leadership. We talk about real security. Real security is making sure that we protect America before something happens.

I do not want a 9/11 or an 8/11 or a 7/11, I do not want those dates to come up and say, oh well, now an event has happened and let's legislate to make sure that we move from 5 percent container checks at ports to 100 percent. Why do we need an event for that to happen?

The reason it is not happening, to be brutally honest, is we have the bobblehead Republican majority Congress that is saying "yes" to the President at every turn. Not all Republicans because I do not want to generalize, but enough to allow the President to con-

tinue doing what he is doing. And the only way we switch and have the change that you are talking about, Mr. RYAN, is if we have a Congress that is dedicated and bonded, ready to work in a bipartisan way, unlike what we have today, and bringing in the very few Republicans on the other side of the aisle that think the way we do, and say we are willing to represent. We do not care what your party affiliation is, we are willing to represent on behalf of the American people.

We are willing to tell the special interests that we notice you have issues, but we have something at hand. We have other issues such as innovation, such as homeland security, such as making sure that our troops have a clear plan in Iraq. The tough questions need to be asked, and we need to act on them. Some of them are being asked in some places, but they are not being acted upon.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. From a security perspective, we need to be tough; we need to be smart. We need to have our act together, and we have a comprehensive plan. You know, these bumper-sticker solutions to complex world problems do not work. They just do not work. They have gotten us into the situation we are in now.

If you look at the plan that the Democrats have, we talk about 100 percent of the ports. Right now, we are only inspecting 5 percent of the ports here. The Democrats have tried. Let us get those charts out about all of the amendments we have offered to try to increase funding for port security.

We only check 5 percent of the cargo coming into the United States ports. That means 95 percent is not checked at all because of the failed leadership on behalf of President Bush's Congress.

What have the Democrats tried to do? Some people ask: What are the Democrats doing? Here is what we are doing.

In June of 2004, Mr. OBEY tried to put on an amendment right here in Congress to increase port and container security by \$400 million; Republicans refused to even allow a vote. That was for \$400 million, and we need \$6 billion worth to actually do the job. That is what the Coast Guard says we need. We only asked for \$400 million, and could not even get a vote on it.

October 7 of 2004, another amendment by Mr. OBEY, Mr. SABO and Senator BYRD to increase funding by \$150 million. That was shot down.

We kept trying, we kept going. On September 29, 2005, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SABO, increase funding for port and container security by \$300 million. The House conferees defeated this amendment along party lines. Democrats for, Republicans against.

Again, March of 2006, Republicans blocked an effort by the Democrats to bring the King-Thompson port deal bill to the floor.

□ 1630

Again, Republicans voted against the bill. Time and time and time again, the

Democratic minority tried to get President Bush's Congress to support these deals, to support increases in funding so we can get it from 5 percent to 100 percent. We should check all of the cargo that comes into the country. So that is one issue. We need to check the ports. Okay? But there is not one little bumper sticker we could say we are going to have, we are going to put it on all our cars, then the problem is going to be solved. That is just one component.

We believe, in the Democratic Party, that if we do not have a long-term alternative energy proposal where we are going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, we will continue to be in these squabbles and these entanglements in the Middle East, time and time and time again. So the Democrats want to fund the ports. We have made efforts to do that. We want an alternative energy program. We need to get the oil man out of the White House in order to do that. And not only are we trying to take on the oil companies, the Republican majority in the energy bill gave the, check this out, gave the oil companies \$12 billion in corporate welfare. So not only are your gas prices going up; your public tax dollars that you send to Washington, D.C., the Republican majority is also giving that to the oil companies on top of what you are already giving them.

The first day we take over, next January, we will implement the 9/11 Commission's report, make sure we put that thing front and center and we do what the bipartisan commission has told this country that we need to do.

The COPS program that you mentioned, our first responders, that program is gone. It is gone. President Clinton had a goal of putting 100,000 cops on the street. And the Republican Congress has almost nearly eliminated that program, if it is not all gone already.

So what we are saying is, real security is an opportunity for all of us to have a comprehensive plan, implement the 9/11 Commission's report, make sure that we secure the ports and fund the funding level that the Coast Guard recommends, not KENDRICK MEEK and TIM RYAN, what the Coast Guard recommends. Let's develop an alternative energy policy in this country so that we are not reliant on oil from the Middle East that gets us entangled in all of this stuff. And let's make sure we fund our police and fire and our first responders, the first line of defense here.

So be tough, but be smart and make proper investments that are going to yield value and protect the country, not where did the \$9 billion go that we are spending in Iraq that no one knows where it is.

Be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, you know, Mr. RYAN, I believe that America is protected best and freedom is protected in advance. We look at homeland security.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Prevention.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Prevention. When you talk about prevention, you are talking about before. When you are talking about reactionary, we are talking about after.

So dealing with this container thing, I don't want the Members to take it lightly, Mr. Speaker. You may say, well, you know, I am in the middle of America. I live in Sioux City, Iowa, and we don't have ports so I don't need to worry; that is not my issue. Well, it is your issue because those containers that are coming in from overseas and from countries that are in question, some may say suspect as it relates to their commitment to the United States of America, they get on those little trucks and trains that I was talking about a little earlier, and they go right down into your community. And if there is a dirty bomb or some sort of substance that will hurt your community and your family, now it is your problem. And I think it is important that we point that out, because I don't want folks to get confused and say, well, I am not from a coastal area; Members who say, you know, well that is not my issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just like you get your food, just like you get the toys that shipped to the local store that you are going to buy, same thing. Those all come in through the ports.

Now, here is what is interesting, Mr. Speaker. And I think this is something that really makes your ears perk up when you hear about this. On March 28, just a day or so ago, Senators said that a report, this is from Bloomberg News, Senators said a report that investigators smuggled enough radioactive material to build two dirty bombs into the United States called into question the Bush administration's efforts to secure the borders.

Now, check this out. A sting operation that was described in one of three Government Accountability Office reports, now this is the GAO, this is not a partisan deal, said, they released a report. The report accused the Bush administration of being slow to deploy equipment that would detect radioactive materials, and they say corrupt foreign border officials and poor maintenance of detection devices have left the U.S. vulnerable to terror plots.

Enough material for two dirty bombs to go off in the United States was snuck in by, you know, through a sting operation that we were trying to figure out what is going on. We are not doing enough.

Now, third-party validator, which the 30-somethings like to promote. We don't want this to be all our opinion here. This is from a retired Coast Guard commander who is now a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. He says: "Both the opportunity for terrorists to target legitimate global supply chains remain plentiful, and the motivation for doing so is only growing. We are living on borrowed time."

We are not here to scare anybody, but the reality is, when you only check

5 percent of the cargo coming into the country, and your own folks are sneaking in enough nuclear material to set off two dirty bombs, and we are giving tax cuts to billionaires and not funding port security, when we are giving \$12 billion in corporate welfare to the oil companies, when we are giving billions in corporate welfare to the health care industry, and we are not funding our national security priorities, when we are spending a billion and a half in Iraq a week, and \$9 billion of it no one can find, and we have these kinds of situations, we have an obligation. When we come here the first part of every second year and we swear our allegiance to the United States and the Constitution and everything else, we have an obligation to oversee what is going on. So we have an obligation to come down here and be critical of things like this and provide solutions, which we have time and time again.

Now, President Bush's Congress has not taken any of our recommendations, and they are up for a job review in November; and I hope that the American people, Mr. Speaker, take a good look at what has happened over the past 4 or 5 years and hope that our plan on real security, which you can find on our Web page, [housedemocrats.gov](http://housedemocrats.gov), you can get the whole deal and you can see our comprehensive plan to try to do this.

You can also check out our plan on innovation, how to get the country moving economically again. Periodically, we will have unveilings of different ideas that we have. But we have tried on port security. We have tried on PAYGO. We have tried on school funding and we continue to get shot down by President Bush's Congress. So we have got the plan; we just need the opportunity to implement it. For Members who are in their offices and would like to send us e-mails or anyone else, [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something). All the charts that were here that we used will all be on the Web site so you can go back and reference them all.

Yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN. I just want to let you know that it was a pleasure coming down to the floor with you again. We got out a lot of good information.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before we go, I know you have a Florida team in the Final Four this weekend, and I want to wish you the best of luck.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, we need it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I hope you guys pull it off. Since there is no Ohio team, with a good conscience I can root for Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you. With that we want to thank the Democratic leader. We want to also encourage everyone to go to our Web site, [housedemocrats.gov](http://housedemocrats.gov). We want the majority to go on our Web site, [housedemocrats.gov](http://housedemocrats.gov).

These are our plans. As it stands right now, in the state of homeland se-

curity is the majority's plan. It is already there, already being carried out. We have a plan to make things better, more secure here in the United States of America, not only here in the House but also in the Senate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor addressing the House once again. I yield back the balance of my time.

---

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF HON. WILLIAM JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from Joyce G. Davis, Congressional Aide of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOYCE G. DAVIS,  
Congressional Aide.

---

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Loretta Mahony, Congressional Aide of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

LORETTA MAHONY,  
Congressional Aide.

---

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT MANAGER OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Stephanie Butler, District Manager of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE BUTLER,  
District Manager.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from Angelle Kwemo, Legislative Assistant of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ANGELLE KWEMO,  
Legislative Assistant.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Julius Feltus, Congressional Aide of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JULIUS FELTUS,  
Congressional Aide.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT MANAGER OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Stephanie Butler, District Manager of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 22, 2006.

The Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE BUTLER,  
District Manager.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Ericka Edwards, Congressional Aide of the Hon. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ERICKA EDWARDS,  
Congressional Aide.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF MAJOR GENERAL MICHAEL TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the career of Major General Michael Taylor. All citizens of the United States owe General Taylor a debt of gratitude for devoting his life to freedom and all the ideals that make this country so great. Not only did he serve his country valiantly for 37 years, but he also attended Texas A&M University, an institution of higher learning famed for its rich tradition, its honor; and it also happens to be my alma matter as well.

General Taylor began his military career in 1970, upon graduation from

Texas A&M. Commissioned as an armor officer, he served as a platoon leader in Vietnam with the 2nd Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment. Serving in various roles throughout his career, including deputy commander of the 71st Troop Command, General Taylor assumed command of the 36th Infantry Division, Texas Army National Guard, Camp Mabry, Austin, Texas in May of 2004.

Of the many major awards and decorations he has received over the course of his accomplished career, time limits me to name just a few. Some of the most notable are a Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Bronze Star Medal of Valor with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart, not for some scratch on him either. He has a Meritorious Service Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Commendation Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster and the Army Achievement Medal.

General Michael Taylor is a man of honor. He is a man with a sense of duty. He is a man with a love for God and his country. He served this country and he served his fellow man with wisdom, with discretion, with courage, with valor, and with clarity. His career of service to our Nation should be admired by every citizen who enjoys living free, and I am proud to honor him on the House floor today as a great American. He is a powerful patriot, and he is a personal friend of mine. He is an example for young people today who desire to be an intellectual servant and a defender of freedom.

May God bless General Mike Taylor because he has certainly blessed America with his service.

OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the conference and leadership for allowing me to come before the House during this hour today and to present a number of different issues with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

□ 1645

We are going to bring another edition of the Official Truth Squad today. And folks ask, what is the Official Truth Squad? And I guess the simplest way to explain it is that it is a group of individuals in the House of Representatives who are interested in making sure that the American people have the truth presented to them so that they can make appropriate decisions. And it grew out of the group of freshmen Members of Congress who were elected for the first time to Congress in 2004, and after a number of months here, we would meet on a regular basis, met about once a week, and when we would talk to each other, we would get the

same kind of sense about what was happening on the floor of the House. We were, frankly, disgusted with all of the personal attacks, the lack of cooperation, the leveling of charges, and, frankly, so many times, comments that were made that simply were not true. And so we said, what on Earth can we do? So we created what we call the Official Truth Squad. And we try to come here as often as possible, almost every day that we are in session, and talk about issues that are of importance to the American people and present the facts.

We have got a quote that we are so fond of and it comes from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Senator Moynihan said, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts." And here in Washington, we hear something repeated over and over and over again, so often that you think it is a fact, that you think it is the truth, but, in fact, it is not. And we have just been treated to an hour from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle with many, many issues that were remarkably distorted. Some of them outright untrue. And so our concern is that the American people, in order to make correct decisions about what direction this country ought to go, they need the facts. They need the truth.

I have told folks oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, I am a physician. Before I came to Congress, I was a medical doctor. And when I would see a patient, I could not get to the right diagnosis unless I was given the true information, either in a lab test or talking with the patient or whatever it was. And the same is true in public policy. Unless you get the truth, unless you get real honest information, you just cannot get to the right solution because you do not have all of the information that you need. So everyone is entitled to their own opinion, and there are a lot of opinions here in Washington, Mr. Speaker, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

And just by way of clarification of a number of things that folks have heard today and oftentimes, but most recently within the last hour, I was sitting here in the House, and I had to write down one of the comments that was made because it was just so outrageous, and it was, "Everything that is supposed to be up is down and everything that is supposed to be down is up." And I guess I am supposed to take the gentleman at his word, and if that is the case, then I would like to point to a few things that are either up or down and are moving in the right direction, frankly, Mr. Speaker. And one of them is the number of jobs that have been created in this Nation over the last 3 or 4 years.

A chart says it so much better than I can, but this is a chart that shows the number of new jobs, these are new jobs in America, since January of 2002 until January of this year. And what you see for the first 2 years is a significant de-

crease in jobs and then on about the end of 2003 or the beginning of 2004, it began to tick up, and now we have, month after month after month, over 30 months of new job creation in the hundreds of thousands, almost 5 million new jobs created in the last 2 to 3 years. So that is something that is up that I guess the gentleman wants to go down; is that right, Mr. Speaker? This chart does not even include the month of February, which was 243,000 new jobs across this Nation.

Here is another chart that shows the direction of job growth. And again, the axis down here is January of 2002 through January of 2006, and you see what happens to job growth is that on or about the first part of 2003, it begins to tick up, and it is ticking up month after month after month after month and the unemployment rate ticking down. The unemployment rate last month, Mr. Speaker, 4.8 percent across this Nation. That is lower than the average for the 1970s and the 1980s and the 1990s. I guess that is something that the gentleman wants to go up instead of down; is that right, Mr. Speaker? These are good numbers. This is good news, economic news, across this Nation. And saying that it is something different, confusing people, distorting things, telling things that are, frankly, not true does a complete disservice to everybody in our Nation because if you are given misinformation, you cannot make correct decisions. So what the Official Truth Squad is interested in is real information, honest information, the real numbers, and then we are confident that people will make the right decision.

Here is another number that I guess the gentleman wants to see go in a different direction. This is Federal revenues. This is tax revenue. And up until 2003, it was ticking down. And then what happened in 2003 is that there was a tax cut. There was a tax decrease, and what happened was that Federal revenue increased after that and continues to increase. In fact, we are now at a rate of Federal revenue increase over where it was at the beginning of 2000. And it is kind of counterintuitive, but what happens when you decrease taxes is that you give people more of their money back, and they are able to spend more or save more or invest more, and it spurs the economy. So, Mr. Speaker, those are numbers that are moving in the right direction, not the wrong direction.

A couple other items that are very specific that were mentioned within the last hour, and the record just has to be corrected because, again, truthfulness is imperative if we are to make correct decisions here. This is the issue of port security funding, and what you heard recently was, frankly, a remarkable distortion of the truth. Port security funding in 2001, it was about \$30 million. Port security funding last year, over \$3 billion. Port security funding request for this year, nearly \$4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, you can argue about whether or not there ought to be that amount of money or more or less, but what you ought not do is distort the truth to people and tell them that that is not what is occurring, that there are not resources going into port security. It is just wrong. It is not fair to the American people. It is not fair to the discourse here. And, frankly, it creates a greater cynicism for politics than there ought to be. We need to be working together here.

The challenge of port security is not a Republican challenge. It is not a Democrat challenge. It is an American challenge. And an American challenge requires that Americans work together. We solve problems best when we work together. So I encourage my friends on the other side who oftentimes fondly distort things to work with us.

You hear them talk about their national security agenda. Well, I think it is important that we look at the truth. It is important to look at the record. What they have said is that one of their recommendations is to follow the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. But on a roll call vote here in the United States House of Representatives, they voted "no" on establishing the Department of Homeland Security, rollcall 367, July, 2002.

On a rollcall vote in July 2004, they voted "no" on \$21 billion in funding to strengthen border protections.

Now, that is the truth, Mr. Speaker. That is the truth. And it is important that people all across this Nation know that.

One more item as it relates to national security and then we will move on to a different topic that I think is important for the American people to know the truth about as well. And this is what they have said in their national security plan, the folks on the other side, and they talk about the need to increase human intelligence capabilities, eliminate terrorist breeding grounds, secure loose nuclear materials, stop nuclear weapons from development in Iran and North Korea. It all sounds wonderful. But what do they do? Rollcall vote 393, Democrats voted repeatedly to slash funding for intelligence activities.

One of the ones that astounds me so, is that recently, June of 2004, rollcall vote 293 on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, there was a resolution that said we support the work of the intelligence community. We support the men and women who are working so hard to make certain that you and I are safe, Mr. Speaker. And what happened? They vote "no." They cannot even stand up here in the House of Representatives and say, we support the men and women who are trying to keep us safe.

So I think it is imperative, it is imperative that we talk about truthfulness here on the floor of the House. And, again, if we do not talk about the

truth, if we did not present all the information accurately and appropriately, then the American people really cannot make an appropriate decision.

Now, today we are going to talk about 527s, and I have been joined by a number of folks who are members of our Republican conference, and I am pleased to have them join us today. I want to put up a poster about 527s.

And you say, Mr. Speaker, what is a 527? Well, a 527 is something that folks across this Nation may not have heard about but they probably heard from them. And it is called a 527 organization because it is a political organization whose taxation is defined in the section 527 of the Federal tax code. And we are here to talk today about 527s because we believe fundamentally that they were formed because of a loophole in the law and that they are fundamentally unfair and that they do not result in any transparency or accountability as it comes to elections.

I want to just highlight a couple of things and then look forward to comments from my colleagues.

Five hundred twenty-seven groups really result in no transparency and no accountability. And it is not unfair to Republicans or Democrats; it is unfair to the American people. Information that is not filed for a 527 or posted with Federal Elections Commission, so there is no way to get accountability. You do not know who is donating to these groups. There is a lack of proper disclosure requirements for filing and donors and disbursements. Where do they spend their money? There is no way to tell. Filled out forms are often incomplete and disclosure is imperfect, again making it so that it is unfair to the American people because they will not know, they cannot know because the information is not available, who is funding certain ads or activities.

They fall under the guidelines of the IRS. And as such, as you and I know, Mr. Speaker, the IRS is a huge, giant entity that, frankly, cannot figure out who is coming or going, and they certainly cannot with these organizations. And funding is dominated by a few wealthy donors, and I know that we will talk specifically about that. Unlimited giving, remarkable unlimited giving, is alive and well in the political environment. We believe that that ought to change.

And I am so pleased to be joined by some of my colleagues, initially Congressman PATRICK MCHENRY, who is an official member of the Official Truth Squad, a member of the freshmen class, from North Carolina. He has just great experience with political activity and also great experience with the importance of truthfulness and fairness in the public arena.

And I am pleased to yield to my friend from North Carolina.

□ 1700

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you, Congressman PRICE, and thank you for

your leadership in the Official Truth Squad. I think it is important that we come to the House floor and articulate our views and our agenda for the American people as Republicans, as conservatives, and as Members of Congress. Today I think it is important that we bring up a pressing issue dealing with 527 groups. My colleague from Georgia has done a very good job of outlining what 527 groups are, what they do, how they operate.

The one thing he points out in his chart there is that funding is dominated by a few wealthy donors, unlimited giving is alive and well. Let's just go back a few years. Our colleagues on the left, the Democrat Party, said that big money is a corrupting influence in politics. And so you had men like George Soros, one of the richest men in the world, a multibillionaire, George Soros, who I like to call the Daddy Warbucks of the Democrat Party, he spent \$18 million to root out big money in politics. Think about that. That is liberal lunacy at its worst, or I guess I should say at its best.

He wanted to root out the corrupting influence of very large donors. That is what he was quoted as saying, to root out issue advocacy phone calls, TV ads, radio ads. This last election cycle, he spent \$27 million, wrote a check for \$27 million to different 527 groups to do exactly what he wanted to ban through campaign finance reform. Liberal lunacy, hypocrisy. It is a culture of hypocrisy that we are fighting on the left.

Let's look at the facts and figures. \$370 million flowed through 527 groups. \$370 million. That is more than President Bush and Senator KERRY spent on the presidential election. This flowed through unregulated, undisclosed means. So voters didn't have the opportunity to know who these 527 groups are, who their donors are, what their true agenda is. And so it is important that we bring out and bring to light the need for 527 reform so that we can have accountability and transparency, two things that my colleague from Georgia has been talking about extensively.

We are going to point out the culture of hypocrisy on the left. Really at the heart of it is their reliance on a few billionaires to spend money through unregulated means to go out and influence elections. It is very deceptive to the voters. I think it is very unbecoming of who we are as a democracy. But I also want to say, Congressman PRICE, that I think our philosophy is similar. We believe that freedom works and that free and full disclosure is important to the nature of campaign financing. That is what we are trying to push with 527 reform.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. You mentioned one person, George Soros. I just happen to have prepared a poster here, because you talk about big money in politics, and the stated goal by some was to get big money out of politics. In fact, that is exactly what has not occurred. The problem with what we have right now, as you well know, is that

there is no way for folks to get this information easily or to know what this money is being spent on. George Soros spent \$27 million, as you have said. And then there are others here as well that I would love to have you highlight. I know that you have got information about that.

Mr. MCHENRY. Absolutely. I appreciate you putting up something visible for people to see. George Soros. What is his agenda? He is one of the greatest leftists this side of Havana and he is trying to influence elections for his left-wing agenda. I think it is important for the American people to be engaged in elections. But you should not allow billionaires to go in and buy elections. You shouldn't allow billionaires to go in, through undisclosed means, and influence elections. You see Peter Lewis. You see Herbert and Marian Sandler. You see Stephen Bing, a huge Hollywood producer. You have Hollywood money flowing through undisclosed means to influence elections.

My agenda, Congressman PRICE, just like yours, is full disclosure. I think that is important. My version of campaign finance reform is maybe akin to what yours would be, Congressman PRICE, and that is to allow full, open, public transparency of campaigns and allow them to be financed so that the American people can see who is financing them. We shouldn't limit that financing. Until we have that in America, through honesty in Federal elections law, we must level the playing field until we get to that point.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate those comments, because they are right on where we need to get to. The problem is that politics is the art of the possible so what we have got working here in this Chamber is the possibility of appropriate reform right now. The accountability and disclosure that you mentioned, I think it is important to mention these numbers, Mr. Speaker, because they are staggering. The American people need to know that. George Soros, we have talked about, \$27 million. Peter Lewis, \$23.9 million. This is personal money coming into campaigns that the American people don't know anything about. There is no way for them to get that information. Herbert and Marian Sandler, \$14 million. Stephen Bing you mentioned, but you didn't mention the number. The number is \$13.9 million. That is money, Mr. Speaker, that is being used to influence elections and nobody knows about it.

When you and I, Congressman MCHENRY, have our elections, what do we do? We put on everything that we have got, Paid for by Price for Congress, or Paid for by McHenry for Congress. We have to disclose that. And that is appropriate. What happens when they spend nearly \$80 million? Nobody knows.

I would like to yield now to a good friend and colleague who is not a freshman, who has been around here for a little while, but he is a good friend and



he has excellent insight into this and so many other issues and is truly interested, Mr. Speaker, in making certain that the American people have the information that they need in order to make appropriate decisions. Chief Deputy Whip ERIC CANTOR from the great State of Virginia, I welcome you and look forward to your comments.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman and I commend him on really a tremendous job in heading up the Official Truth Squad of House Republicans, because it is about transparency. You have done a great job at laying out the record here in the House of who votes for what and sort of comparing that to the rhetoric that often swirls around this place, certainly in the press and in other corners. I would also like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership on this and many other issues. But I would like to, as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, talk just a minute about the issue of transparency in elections. See, I come from the Commonwealth of Virginia. In Virginia, we have an election law that allows for open and often disclosure. We have a campaign finance regime that allows for pretty much anyone to step up and exercise his or her first amendment right without any restriction so far as there is full and quick disclosure. That is really what we are all about, I think, here in this country, is we are about ventilating what goes on in this body, what goes on in elections. And so when this body passed the McCain-Feingold legislation, when it passed what we otherwise now call BCRA, somehow the Federal Election Commission in its promulgation of regulations created a loophole that was unintended, because again I think the primary goal of any campaign finance reform should be transparency. We should trust the voters and trust the citizens of this country to be able to make decisions for themselves as long as they have full disclosure of the information. Well, McCain-Feingold produced this loophole and the loophole was the 527 entities that were created, or really that flourished, after the passage of the McCain-Feingold legislation. As both gentlemen have pointed out, this loophole allows the super-rich to impact elections and it allows them to impact elections with very little to no accountability to the voters.

As was said earlier, when any Federal candidate runs for office, they are required to disclose their contributions, their expenditures to the FEC, all of it done now electronically and online for their constituents and for the entire country to see. That is the difference here with 527s. They simply are not disclosing who their donors are in a timely fashion and are not disclosing what type of expenditures they are making. In fact, the Center For Public Integrity reported that section 527 political organizations raised approximately \$535 million during the last Federal election cycle in 2004. That was up from

the prior cycle of \$268 million that was raised then. Reports that were released by public interest groups and various media sources during 2004 indicated that these 527 groups were not reporting all their contributions and expenditures to the IRS. In fact, the IRS did a study. In that study, it was estimated that 527 political organizations received nearly \$27 million in contributions prior to filing the necessary disclosure forms, and consequently may be subject to over \$17 million in unpaid taxes and penalties. So it almost seems as if 527s may be averting the law to get away with hidden contributions, hidden activities, shady activities.

We all know and we have read the reports about the type of activities that these organizations have engaged in. For instance, one of these 527s hired dozens of felons as voter canvassers in Missouri, Ohio and Florida, including people convicted of crimes such as burglary, forgery, drug dealing, assault and sex offenses. Again, if there were not this loophole that instead would require 527s to abide by the same kind of disclosure laws that any Federal office or any Federal campaign committee was required to comply with, we would have known about that. In fact, these organizations, my contention would be, would not have hired felons and would have been much more careful in their activities.

But the list goes on about the type of activities that these entities are engaged in across the country. That is what we are here today to talk about and that the Truth Squad has come to deliberate upon because frankly the American people expect better. The American people do expect that those who engage in political activity do so in the sunshine, do so with the ability for voters to access information and for the political process frankly not be commandeered by these groups that operate in the dark.

I appreciate the manner in which the gentlemen from Georgia and North Carolina approach this subject and look forward to continuing to debate and discuss these important issues that face Americans frankly this election cycle.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate you really clarifying that issue so very well. I think it is important that we talk today about what kinds of things these 527s do, because people say, "I don't know what a 527 is. How am I supposed to know? They would never interact with me." That is what people think. But I am stunned at the number of folks that I know who have gotten phone calls from 527s. They are what are called push calls, so that they are trying to push an individual in a particular direction to believe something that may often not be true about an individual candidate or an individual person.

Mr. MCHENRY. Congressman PRICE, I know you mentioned the telephone calls. Some of us get annoyed by these answer machine messages. Some people

get annoyed by these recorded messages. Even when telemarketers are at the other end of the line. I for one agree with my constituents on that. But it is important at the end of that telephone call to actually know where it is coming from and who paid for it. Under section 527 of the IRS code, these groups don't even disclose that. They don't have to. They don't have to say who is paying for these phone calls. They have to say who they are from. As a Member of Congress, I have an obligation to communicate with my constituents. So when I make phone calls to them, I disclose that it is coming from the Congressman PATRICK MCHENRY office and if they have a problem they can call me back at this number if they want to be taken off the list or they don't want to be contacted. You can't do that with 527s.

I don't know, Congressman PRICE, if you recall reading about, or Congressman CANTOR, I don't know if you recall reading about a 527 group in one State who hired felons, known felons, folks with criminal records, to go out and knock on doors to campaign. It is absolutely frightening when you see these shady groups hiring shady people to be out in our communities. It is very frightening and the power that you see with \$80 million coming from just four people to influence elections. At the very least we want to know what their agenda is, what they are arguing for. What we should be engaged in is more disclosure.

□ 1715

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is exactly right. I think the three of us and probably most of our colleagues would adhere to a philosophy that allows for free and open participation in the political process, but again, with the stipulation that that participation brings an obligation for full disclosure; and that is in fact what we are about here in 527 reform.

I anticipate and look forward to the debate on this House floor next week on the issue of 527 reform. We have got to allow the average American the same ability to get involved in the political process that, frankly, the super-rich have. As we see in the gentleman from Georgia's charts, over \$78 million, nearly \$79 million was contributed and put into the political process by four super-wealthy donors. Now, I know that most, if not all, of our constituents do not have the ability to participate in that manner, to participate in these 527s.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned what is a 527. And Congressman MCHENRY, you indicated, well, they are the ones that are paying for these calls that may be interrupting your dinner at home, that may be coming and knocking on your door inquiring about your allegiance, inquiring about your political affiliation. 527 groups are groups that have involved themselves in the political process. They have become omnipresent in many places in

this country because they can get involved in a political campaign really under the radar screen, unbeknownst to a candidate, unbeknownst to perhaps both candidates in a race. They do so because they are not properly disclosing who their donors are.

Frankly, we do not have the proper enforcement mechanisms in place. Mechanisms that should be in place belong at the FEC just like they are for any other election campaign.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Accountability really is what it is all about. It is so important for people to appreciate that when we make a phone call or when we put an ad on the television or when we send something out, we have got to say who it is coming from. We have got to say it is coming from our campaign. When people get their information from other sources, when they get it from the newspaper, they know who is giving them information. You can see who wrote the article. You know where the editorial is coming from by looking at the editorial boards.

When you watch the evening news, you know where you are getting your information from. When even PACs, political action committees, which have often times gotten a bad name, but even PACs have to disclose what they are doing, that they are paying for this so Americans across the Nation can understand and appreciate who is paying for it, who is pushing that discussion point or that argument; and then they are able to respond. But what happens with 527s is that nobody knows, nobody knows.

I have got an actual phone call that went out and this was a 527 that was put together to attack the Medicare part D program. Now, I do not want to talk about the merits of the program, but I want to talk about the importance of Americans knowing who is contacting them. This phone call went something like this:

Hello, I am calling from Working America. You and your family must be having trouble with the Medicare prescription drug plan. Ask Congressman So and So. Congressman So and So received so much in contributions from big drug companies and HMOs. Congressman So and So voted for the drug program and has drug companies and the HMOs laughing all the way to the bank and the rest of us scratching our heads. You should call Congressman So and So's number and tell him and her to stop working for drug companies.

Now, whether you believe that message or not, I do not happen to believe that, whether you believe that or not, you ought to know who is paying for it. That is the importance of the issue that we are talking about today.

Mr. MCHENRY. Congressman PRICE, do they leave a telephone number?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. There is no way to know who is paying for it, and there is no way to contact them. You are absolutely right.

Mr. MCHENRY. What group do they say they are with?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. These groups all have wonderful names. This one is Working America. It is a great name, but can you find them? There is no way to find them.

Mr. MCHENRY. This goes right to my point. Somebody calls you and says they are with Working America or they say they are with Mom and Apple Pie, and yet this other person is very hateful. That is their message. It is always a negative message. There is nothing inspiring about it. It does not talk to the greater good. It talks to really the base elements of our society and of human beings.

Look, what I am for is allowing groups to participate who are honest and straightforward. I know, I know, Mr. Speaker, I know that is a laughable thing in politics. Honest, forthright, openness. Oh, goodness. I guess just as a new Member of Congress I still want to embrace those things, somebody who is not so focused on Washington. I am focused on my constituents. I want to make sure they get the information they need, that they have the ability to discern for themselves what is right and what is wrong and where we should go as a country.

Congressman PRICE, I appreciate you using a specific example because that allows the American people to hear, to hear what is happening all across America with this big interest liberal left wing money flowing into politics through unregulated, undisclosed means outside of our Federal election laws. That is wrong. And so what we need to get back to is openness and full disclosure and to make all groups abide by the same laws, that we do not have a two-tier system.

I do not think it is right in any form in our society to have two groups, lower-class citizens, upper-class citizens, big money billionaires who play by different rules than you or I as average Americans. And so it is important that we have a unified system for Federal election laws that say you must disclose, you must be honest. And that is why as Congressman CANTOR, our chief deputy whip, said, who is a great leader on this issue, we will bring a bill to the floor next week and it will bring all these rogue 527 groups like the Daddy Warbucks of the Democratic Party, George Soros, who is funding left and right, left and right, we are going to bring this bill to the floor and say that these groups must abide by our Federal election laws. We cannot have rogue groups in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate you so much pointing out one of the stock and trades of the 527s, which is what I call "the politics of division." And it is so often used because it pits one group against another. And it is cynical and it is not an honest debate at all. It is calling somebody up and saying, Isn't Joe Schmoe a bum and don't you think you ought to do something about it? You have no idea who is calling, no idea who is paying for it.

Accountability and transparency, that is what we are after. And people

all across this Nation are being affected by 527s, and they may not even know it. They are active in over 30 States, countless congressional districts in the Nation, and they are affecting people's opinions even though the folks do not know that they are there and they are paying for this message.

We have been joined by Congresswoman BLACKBURN of Tennessee who is a wonderful leader, an honorary member of the Official Truth Squad. We welcome you today, and I look forward to your comments.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you so much. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia and his work on the issues and for continuing to work on the Truth Squad to get the message out, and the gentleman from Virginia, our chief deputy whip, Mr. CANTOR, who has been leading on this and working with us to be certain that we educate our constituents on exactly what a 527 is.

I love the poster that you have there. It is a PAC by another name. One of the problems with this, as we were just hearing from the gentleman from North Carolina and you reiterated, people do not know where the money is coming from. People do not know who is behind this group. And time and again in town hall meetings people will come before us and say, I got this call or I got this mailer. Who is this group? And then they find out that it is a group that nobody knows who is giving them the money. Nobody knows really what they are about. They are kind of a shadow organization.

I think it is time and it is appropriate that we put the emphasis on three things, which is what our bill will do next week: disclosure so that we know where the money is coming from; transparency so that our constituents when they get a piece of mail, they know who it is by. When they get a mailer from our campaigns, it says that. When they see an ad from our campaigns, it tells them. And we know that they are aware of who they are receiving that from. And that type of transparency is needed in this system.

The other thing is about fairness, and it is about fairness for the system because addressing these issues, disclosure, transparency, fairness, will enable our constituents to know that our focus is on being certain that they know that they can trust the electoral process, that they can trust that there is some truth in the material that they are getting with knowing where it is coming from, and that they know that we are working to be certain to restore the trust and integrity that they expect from this body and from the electoral system.

This is something that we have needed to address. We have watched the process and the 527s kind of get out of control with the 2004 elections. And I appreciate what you said about it being the politics of division. All too often these groups focus on the politics of personal destruction. No one is well

served. No one is well served when we travel that path.

Our political process is to be about ideas and bringing forth ideas, in bringing forth issues that are focused on how we preserve freedom. How do we preserve hope and opportunity for future generations? How do we make certain that this Nation stays a free, a productive society? And being certain that we have an open and trustworthy process that is accountable is a way that we will do that.

So I thank the gentleman from Georgia for bringing the issue to the floor today. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his interest in the issue and for being a leader on the issue as we address the problem that the advent of 527s have caused in the political process.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman so much for her participation and her leadership and for joining us on this issue today because the items that you mention are so important: disclosure, transparency, fairness.

As I mentioned before, this isn't fairness for Republicans or fairness for Democrats. This is fairness for Americans. It is fairness for the system. We talked about 527s being a PAC by any other name so they ought to follow the same rules. That is what ought to occur in the House next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia to talk about the solution, where do we go from here and how do we solve this problem.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee who has joined us, and I appreciate her dedication to this issue and so many others that reflect her desire to achieve transparency in so much of what we do here in this body and on behalf of the constituents that we represent.

The gentleman is right, next week will be the opportunity for all of us to set partisanship aside, to speak up for the American people, and to essentially allow all Americans the access to the political process that right now only the super-wealthy have through their use of 527s.

So we will look forward to hopefully having a bipartisan vote next week in closing the loophole, in upholding the principles of McCain-Feingold, which were to get soft money out of politics.

We have often heard that that is what McCain-Feingold was about. This is what we were trying to do was to get rid of this so-called "dirty soft money."

□ 1730

Well, it would seem to me that anyone who voted for McCain-Feingold several years ago, in order to be consistent, should vote for the measure that will be on the floor next week because, otherwise, I would think an individual would open themselves up to allegations of hypocrisy, because, in fact, it was the aftermath of McCain-Fein-

gold, the regulation process at the FEC, that produced the flourishing of the 527s; and as the gentleman, gentlewoman and also the congressman from North Carolina has shown, this is nothing but a ruse on the American people.

There is an awfully powerful voice out there in many, many areas of the country involved in electioneering, a voice that no one knows who really is speaking, and that really is not what this country was about. That is not what the voters expect of us.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for laying out what the plan is, a positive plan, a plan to level the playing field and to make the system fair.

I wonder if Mr. MCHENRY has some comments about where we go from here. What is the positive solution from here?

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding. I will tell you what we are trying to do is reform reform. Unintended consequences of laws are something that we as Americans deal with all the time, and the Federal election code has numerous unintended consequences as Congressman CANTOR mentioned, and what we are trying to do is make fairness reign within the Federal Election Code.

There was a glaring omission with 527s, and what we are saying is, do not exempt these groups from Federal election laws. It is very simple, very basic, 527 fairness. We want to allow 527s to participate just like PACs participate, but they should disclose like PACs and like campaigns and abide by the same laws, rules and regulations.

I am so happy that we are going to come forward with legislation that does that, that ensures fairness and a level playing field for all Americans and all the people that want to participate in elections and make their views and their voices heard.

Because as I said before, Big Daddy Warbucks of the Democrat party, George Soros, he certainly does not abide by the rules and regulations that all average Americans have to abide by when it comes to funding elections. So let us make sure that the Daddy Warbucks George Soros, the Big Daddy Warbucks of the Democrat party, of the leftist agenda, has to abide by the same rules and regulations that all Americans do. It is a matter of fairness and good government and reform.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments, and I think it is so important to focus on the issue of fixing and reforming the system because that is what our constituents send us here to do, to fix and to reform the system. This system is broken, allowing more individuals, some individuals to have a greater influence than they otherwise might be able to have, and it is not fair. It is not a level playing field.

I just have a few more moments left, but I wonder if the gentlewoman from Tennessee might have some closing comments.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and one of the things, as we talk about fairness, again, going back to the politics of division and the politics of personal destruction, I have got before me a list of some of the shady acts that were committed by 527s when it comes to people that were hired to be voter canvassers and the way that they filled out faulty registrations and absentee ballots. That is the type of activity that my constituents repeatedly tell me they feel like should not be a part of the electoral process, that individuals should be held accountable for that.

One of the things that we have found is that many of these activities were carried out by 527 groups, and that is something that is causing our process to not function as it was set up. It is not fair to our voters. It destroys the "one man, one vote" principle, and I think that it is important that we address the activity.

I am so pleased that our focus is on disclosure, transparency and fairness, and I look forward to working with the Members of this body next week to be certain that our focus stays on trusting integrity in our electoral process.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much and appreciate your participation today and leadership on this issue, along with my good friends from North Carolina and Virginia.

The issue of 527 groups is really about the issue of fairness, as has been mentioned, and the truth of the situation that we currently have right now is that there is a loophole in the current law. There is no transparency, and there is no accountability, which means that Americans can get information from people that they do not know. They do not know who is sending it to them. They do not know what their agenda is, and there is no way to find out. That is not a system that any of us would devise.

To cut to the bottom line, which is the bottom line, funding is dominated by a few wealthy donors, and we have a lot of talk about soft money. What is soft money? Soft money is unlimited money, and in this case you have got a number of individuals giving tens of millions of dollars to affect the political process with no transparency, no accountability and no fairness.

So what we stand here today to talk about and to present to the American people is the truth of the situation, a proposal for a solution that is fair to all Americans. The current is a system, as I mentioned, that is not unfair to Republicans or unfair to Democrats. It is unfair to Americans.

So what we are here to talk about and to present to the American people is a system and a solution that will fix and reform the system in a way that is fair.

I urge all of my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, Republican, Democrat, to come together next week and to work

for a positive solution to a real challenge that we have in America, that would bring about a positive solution for all Americans and a better system of electoral process that we have in our Nation and allow each individual American a better opportunity to decide.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again and want to thank the leadership for allowing us to participate. I thank my colleagues from Tennessee and North Carolina and Virginia for participating today.

#### HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this time tonight to talk to the House about the subject of health care, something that I have been involved with for the last 30 years of my adult life, taking in that time that I spent in residency and private practice.

I think the single most important issue that we need to keep foremost in our minds as we talk about issues surrounding health care in this body over the next year and, indeed, over the foreseeable future is the overall affordability of health care. If we do not keep health care within the affordable grasp of the average American, we not only keep people away from care that they need, but we also put the overall prosperity of our country in peril, and in fact, the overall system that has been created, the health care system that has been created in the United States over the last 227 years will itself be in peril.

Right now, the Federal Government pays about half of the health care bills in this country. It is a big chunk. About 16 or 17 percent of the gross domestic product of this country is spent on health care, and of that, the Federal Government picks up about half the cost through Medicare, Medicaid, VA, Federal Prison System, Indian Health Service. All the various federally qualified health centers, all of the various groups gathered together all make up an expenditure that is just shy of 50 percent.

Well within that money that is spent by the United States Congress, we need to be sure that that money is spent wisely. We need to be sure we get value for our dollars. So I want to spend some time this evening and talk about where we are in health care, where we are in fact going, always keeping in mind that affordability has to be first and foremost in our mind.

We have got to discuss, we have got to come up with some solutions for the uninsured. Federally qualified health centers, the President has mentioned them in every State of the Union address that I have heard since I arrived in this body 3 years ago. Federally

qualified health centers have been mentioned by the President, how he wants to see a federally qualified health center literally in every poor county in this country.

There is no question that liability reform is going to be part of the picture of the overall reform of the health care system that deals with affordability. We have to find some relief for our providers. We historically underpaid or cross-subsidized our providers, doctors and hospitals alike, by underfunding government systems that pay for health care, and the result is we now have people dropping out of the system at a time when we, in fact, need more people coming into the system.

The information technology that is available to health care systems in some ways is old, is past its prime. In some areas, it was never, in fact, developed at all. So we are going to have to pay some attention. There is going to be some expense borne with recreating and creating information technology that our health care system, in fact, requires.

Then, finally, as we have seen so many times over the past 3 years, preparedness is going to be part of not just the overall security of the country but the overall security of our health care system.

When I talk about affordability of health care, I think back to a time when, just a few years ago, I was, of course, in private practice in medicine, but I went back to school and went back to graduate school at the University of Texas at Dallas and studied for a Masters Degree in medical management at their school of management there. Their graduate school of management is a very good school, and one of our professors one day, Dr. John Burns, came and talked to our class and said, Within medicine you will always want to focus on affordability, access and quality.

Now the dilemma facing us is we have only been able to deliver on two out of those three. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to identify the one that I am prepared to leave out so I am just going to talk about affordability.

I do think that the American medical system will always provide us quality, and I believe if we can improve affordability, we are, in fact, going to improve access.

With the amount of money that the Federal Government spends on health care, you have to ask yourself, would it be better if the government just picked up the whole charge, if the government just picked up the whole tab? In fact, that was discussed in this very House some 10 or 12 years ago. I did not think it was a good idea then. I do not think it is a good idea now, but that is going to be part of the discussion.

Certainly, you look to our neighbor to the north, and the Canadian health care system is oftentimes held out to us as something to which the Americans ought to aspire. In the interest of full disclosure, my dad was a doctor in

Canada and fled to this country because he did not like the Canadian health care system, and as a consequence, I was born while he was doing his residency in this country.

But he never went back because the system there was too onerous, the waiting lists were too long, and even the Canadian Supreme Court, about a year and a half ago, ruled that access to a waiting list is not the same as access to care. I would submit to you that the resident in Toronto, Canada, who suffers a heart attack may be just as likely to get their angioplasty or coronary artery bypass graft done at Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit as Toronto, Canada, because the length of time spent on the waiting list is just far too long.

Can we, in fact, keep the private sector involved in health care? It is a question that we are going to have to ask, and we are going to have to be able to answer it. I believe that it can. I believe that it can, and I believe Congress can and should have a part in promoting policies that do help keep the private sector in the health care marketplace.

Look at, if you would, the history of medical savings accounts. Medical savings accounts were basically born 10 years ago in the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that came through the House and the Senate. That is the same bill that gave us HIPAA unfortunately, but it also did give us what is called a medical savings account, this old Archer MSA. I very happily bought one when they became available in 1977, made one available for everyone in my practice of medicine. Some people took it, most did not because not much was known about medical savings accounts at the time, but think of what a medical savings account does.

Instead of the power of medical decision-making being in the hands of some distant medical director or somebody somewhere or even in the hands of the government bureaucrat, the medical decision-making power was in my hands, and that was the most important part about having a medical savings account.

To be sure, I was issued a high deductible policy, and I was able to put money away to cover that deductible year over year in what was called then a medical IRA, a tax-free contribution to a medical savings account year after year. The interest in that was not taxed, and even though I gave up my medical savings account when I came to Congress in 2003, that money remains in that medical savings account, continuing to draw interest, and will be available to my wife and I when I do retire, however many more years I have at this job.

But the medical savings account is an important tool because it does give the power back to the consumer, and it makes a consumer an involved participant in health care decisions.

A lot of concern on some people's part is, well, people delay getting medical care if they are going to have to

spend their own money. They will spend someone else's money, but they do not want to spend their own.

□ 1745

Well, in fact, the National Center for Policy Analysis, a think tank that is located in Dallas, Texas, not too far from my home, had a study done around the time the medical savings accounts first came out in the 1990s looking at other countries that had allowed medical savings accounts to compete head to head with private indemnity insurance. And, in fact, what was found in a comparison of medication usage in one of those countries was that drugs such as Ritalin that might be regarded as a life-style drug, the usage of Ritalin was in fact decreased. But the usage of a drug such as Fossumax, that is a drug that is given to individuals who are thought to be at high risk for osteoporosis, to prevent calcium loss from the bone and prevent osteoporotic fractures in the future, a drug like Fossumax to prevent osteoporosis, that usage increased. So life-style drugs perhaps had some diminution, but drugs that are really there to prevent problems in the future, the usage of those drugs was not curtailed at all. In fact, it was somewhat increased.

I look back to the experience that I had as an individual back in the mid-1990s, in 1994, trying to get health insurance for a family member who didn't have it and the difficulties, the intractable difficulties involved with finding an insurance policy, a single insurance policy for a single individual. It just was not available, not at any price. I was prepared to pay top dollar. I knew I would have to pay top dollar for such a policy. But no such policy was available.

Well, contrast that with now, where perhaps a young person just getting out of college, no longer on their parents' health insurance plan, wants to start their own business rather than working for a company. One of the big obstacles to that is, well, no health insurance. But today, that person can go on the Internet, go to their favorite search engine and type in health savings account, hit search, and they will be returned a vast number of choices of high-deductible health insurance plans that are available to them.

In fact, the most recent time I did this, there are some insurance companies to be sure that I didn't recognize the name, and I would always be certain to check out the company before entering into a policy with them, but a well-known insurance company name, a high-deductible PPO-type policy, \$50 a month for a male in Texas, age range 20 to 30. Well, this is a pretty powerful tool that people have at their disposal. And prior to our passage of the Medicare Modernization Act in November of 2003, this tool was in fact not available. But it is now and many more people have insurance because of the availability of these high-deductible plans

that can then be rolled into a health savings account.

I think from the first year, January 2005, the first year the figures were available, a million people had sought that type of insurance. By January of 2006, that was up to 3 million people. Over half of those individuals were over the age of 40. So it wasn't just the young that were looking at those types of policies; it was people in the prime of life as well, and perhaps most importantly, 40 percent of that number had previously not had health insurance. That is nearly a million people that were taken off the rolls of the uninsured and put into a health savings account.

Now, I recognize that as we make a move to enhance so-called consumer-directed plans, and that is what a health savings account is, a consumer-directed type of health care, as we make the move to consumer-directed health care, we are going to have to give people the ability to evaluate not just their insurance policy but their health care providers and their hospitals. They are going to have to have the ability to evaluate health care on the basis of price, cost, and quality. It is unreasonable to ask someone to make those types of decisions while that information remains obscure.

That is a concept, the concept of transparency, that I believe that this body should investigate. We have had one hearing in our Energy and Commerce Committee. I trust we will have more, and I trust we will see some type of transparency-related legislation before the end of the year, either as a stand-alone bill or coupled with some other process. But that is going to be one of the keys to really furthering the cause for consumer-directed health care.

Now, transparency doesn't exist just because it is inconvenient to remove it. Transparency, or opacity, in the health care pricing system exists because there is some value to it. There is some protective value to it. So it is not without some pain that transparency is going to be provided.

Again, I go back to the issues of cross-subsidization of hospital costs and doctor costs, Medicare and Medicaid. We don't pay the full freight as far as provider fees, so hospitals and doctors do need to cross-subsidize with the more traditional indemnity plans. Removing transparency or removing opacity from the system is going to expose that, and in some cases it won't be especially attractive or pretty what we find. But to get to the ultimate goal of having transparency within the system, where health care consumers can make proper decisions for themselves and their families, I do believe that we are going to have to provide that. And I may speak a bit more about transparency a little later as time permits.

One of the other concepts that has been introduced as legislation for the past several years, though we have never really taken it up and done so in

a serious way, is the concept of a pre-fundable tax credit, sort of an EITC, if you would, for people of low-income levels for the purchase of an insurance policy: a pre-fundable tax credit that occurs at the beginning of the year rather than a refund at the end of the year; money exclusively earmarked for the purchase of health insurance. Several proposals have been put forth in the past. I know my neighbor down in Texas, Ms. GRANGER, has had a bill about tax credits for the uninsured for several years, allowing \$1,000 for individuals as a tax credit, or \$3,000 for a family.

Again, you might look at that and say, in today's market that is not going to buy much insurance. But if you couple that with a high-deductible policy that costs \$50 a month for an individual, you can, in fact, price policies that would be easily within someone's reach by providing such a tax credit. And if the individual were able to bring a little bit of the money to the table themselves, they would find the availability of a health savings account with an account that would grow over time and eventually would have significant capital within their reach that they could use for medical expenditures should they happen later in life.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all of this is great discussion. We do have to consider the job, the very big job ahead of us in this Congress, and probably many Congresses to come, on how to deal with the problem of the uninsured. The Census Bureau will give us figures from time to time on that. Whether that number is 42 million more or less, we can argue the actual number. This is not something that has happened overnight. I remember when President Clinton was running for office in 1992 on a platform of health care reform, he talked about the number of uninsured in the country being at 37 million during his run for office.

No question the number has increased. No question that the recent recession this country went through was in fact responsible for some of that. The good news is that jobs are on the rebound, and more people are receiving insurance as a consequence of their employment, so the number hasn't gone up in the past year or two as fast as it might otherwise have been projected. And also, as I alluded to earlier, some people are buying health savings accounts that previously were uninsured. But the number continues to grow.

The true number people will put anywhere between 9 to 10 million to in excess of 45 million, so I will have to acknowledge that there is a good deal of opacity here as well as the number of uninsured. But that doesn't prevent us from working on a solution to the problem.

Now, the President has talked about a number of solutions during his State of the Union addresses. He has of course talked about consumer-directed health care with health savings accounts, which we have already covered.

He has talked about association health plans. And I was very relieved to see Senator ENZI and his committee finally making some movement on an association health plan bill over in the Senate earlier this month. We have passed an association health plan bill here in this House every year that I have been here, so that is at least over the past 3 years.

Association health plans and achieving that goal is not going to suddenly deflate the number of uninsured in this country, but it is certainly going to help arrest the growth curve as the number of uninsureds increase, because employer costs increase for providing that insurance.

What an association health plan does is allow small businesses, the backbone of business in this country, association health plans allow small businesses of a similar business nature, it allows them the ability to band together and attain the purchasing power of much larger companies, even going across State lines if necessary to get the power of that large group to negotiate with an insurance company. So that means that a group of Realtors, for example; a group of employees of your local chamber of commerce, for example; a group of doctors' offices, or a group of dentists' offices might band together to be able to grab that purchasing power and get a better deal on insurance, a deal such as a much larger corporation might be able to command.

Federally qualified health centers are a reasonable way of providing health care to people who otherwise would not have that health care available and would not have health insurance available. Federally qualified health centers are present in a number of areas in the country. Unfortunately, my congressional district does not contain a federally qualified health center. States that border the Mississippi River and those east have a number of such facilities available. Western States on the coast have a number of such facilities available. But we do have some fairly big gaps in the presence of federally qualified health centers throughout the middle part of the United States.

One of the things that I think is so powerful about a federally qualified health center is that it gives a person a medical home. It gives them a place where they can go to receive their care. There is some measure of continuity of care, of seeing the same person on an ongoing basis, and overall reduces the cost of care for the uninsured in that community because that person is no longer dependent upon an emergency room for their hospital care. They in fact have a health center nearer their home. And because it is nearer their home, it is not just a question of access; sometimes it is a question of utilization. Utilization isn't always what it should be, but by placing these centers close to a person's home, it does increase not only the access but utilization as well.

One of the things that I think this body needs to consider is why are there

so many people uninsured. Well, of course, one of the reasons is the cost of health insurance has gone up so much over the past 10 years' time. And one of the reasons that health insurance has gone up over the past 10 years' time, surely there is advancing complexity of what we are able to do, so health care just simply costs more. To some degree it is that cross-subsidization with Medicare and Medicaid and picking up the tab for the uninsureds in the community hospitals.

But another reason that the cost of care increases, or the cost of insurance increases, which is different from the cost of care, is that in some places States mandate that certain procedures or certain diseases require special coverage or additional coverage. So placing a number of mandates on a State insurance policy can certainly drive the price of that insurance policy ever higher and make it more unavailable to more people in the population who cannot afford that degree of health coverage.

We have talked in our committee about some of the solutions for that. In fact, association health plans will provide some relief for that problem. But the issue, Mr. Speaker, is no one wants to take away from people what they really need. And if a procedure or if a type of coverage is truly basic to human need, no, of course it shouldn't be withdrawn from an insurance policy. We have the ability in front of us to identify those procedures, those things that should be required in an insurance policy. We have already agreed on that list, and that list are the procedures, the diseases that are covered through a federally qualified health center.

□ 1800

If we were to work off of that list, if we were to decide what are the can't-haves, what are the can't-live-withouts on that list and develop a template for an insurance policy that could be sold from one State to the other to allow someone at a lower income level to be able to afford an insurance policy, it is absolutely ludicrous to think that a family of four with a yearly insurance tab of \$9,000 where the principal wage earner earns a over little twice that, that they are going to be able to be in the market for health insurance. It is just not going to happen.

But if we can make a product affordable and within their reach, my belief is that most families want to have insurance coverage if a child gets sick or if a principal wage earner is involved in an accident and needs a prolonged hospitalization.

I have been involved in numerous situations in the hospital where an injured person does not have insurance. It is an uncomfortable feeling for the family. Forget how the hospital feels about it or any of the doctors feels about it, but someone who is in a hospital knowing they are running up a big bill and knowing they have no means at their disposal to cover that

bill, it is terribly uncomfortable and adds to the discomfort of any accident or disease process that brought them to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most people want to have that type of coverage for their family. And in fact, we are denying it. We are denying it by allowing insurance policies to be sold that no one could afford.

My belief is that some of the larger insurance companies would look at that number of 42 million uninsured as potential market share if they simply had a product that was priced in a range where people could afford it. I think this body ought to look at the procedures outlined in the federally qualified health center legislation and make available to people a basic policy of benefits. Again, we have already identified what those would be, make a basic policy of benefits available to people, a policy without all of the bells and whistles that ends up costing patients and constituents so much in the way of out-of-pocket money.

The country is looking to us to provide this type of leadership. They are tired of the tennis match between our side and their side and who has the better ideas. We have already agreed on what that basic package of benefits should be. Why not have a federally qualified health center without walls that is a basic insurance policy that a husband and wife can buy for their family and have that peace of mind and knowing if that child gets sick, has an asthma attack, develops diabetes, they are going to be covered.

There could not be any discussion of health care reform in this body that did not cover liability reform.

We need a national solution. We have several States that have done a good job at correcting the problem at home. My State of Texas certainly is one of those, but that protection that is now provided by the State of Texas has only been there since 2003. It is under attack during every legislative session.

We need to step up and do this job. In fact, we are always looking for places in our budget where there might be some savings, where we might get a savings of a billion dollars here or a billion dollars there. And as famous Senator Dirksen said, pretty soon you are talking about real money.

We passed a bill called H.R. 5 in 2003. H.R. 5 was the Medical Liability Reform Act. At that time, 3 years ago, the Congressional Budget Office scored that bill not with a cost but with a savings of \$15 billion over 5 years. That is \$3 billion a year. In fact, the amount is probably higher today. If we were to take that same bill back to the CBO and ask them to score it again, I suspect it would be a higher figure. I do not think the number of dollars spent on medical liability and defensive medicine have come down in the last 3 years.

We are wasting money. We are wasting the country's money by not pushing for national medical liability reform. In my mind, those are precious

health care dollars, and it is unconscionable that we continue to waste that money.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a very new Member of Congress just a few short years ago, in my first August recess, we had a field hearing in northern Alaska up where the ANWR oil fields are proposed to be. On the way home, we stopped in Nome, Alaska. And Nome is still a fairly small town so you can imagine, a military plane with several Congresspersons on board landing at their airport caused quite a stir. In fact, their whole Chamber of Commerce turned out and had a nice lunch for us. When it turned out that one of the people from the Chamber of Commerce was also a physician, every member of their medical staff, all 19 of their medical staff showed up for that lunch and were eager to ask me questions.

The man sitting next to me at lunch said, I hope you are going to be able to do something about medical liability this year. Do you think you will?

I said, I do not know. It is a tough problem.

He said, We really need some help in Nome, Alaska. We cannot afford an anesthesiologist at our hospital because we cannot afford the liability policy.

Well, that certainly limits your ability to deliver services. I said, What type of medicine do you practice?

He said, I am an OB-GYN doctor, just like you.

I said, wait a minute, an OB-GYN doctor without an anesthesiologist at your hospital. Forget about pain relief during labor, what do you do if someone needs a C-section? He said, We get them on an airplane and send them to Anchorage. Well, that is an hour and a half away by air. I think there are probably a lot of days with probably pretty bad weather in Nome, Alaska, where air travel is not possible. So I do not know how we are furthering the cause of patient safety by not providing medical liability reform. I do not see how we can tell ourselves that this is unimportant when we have a hospital in Nome, Alaska, that has to put a pregnant woman in labor on a plane and send her to Anchorage, Alaska, to have her C-section under anesthesia and not feel every portion of the operation.

Mr. Speaker, another time I had an opportunity to have dinner with a woman who is head of one of the residency programs at one of the larger hospitals in New York. I trained at Parkland, and I know it is the best residency program in the country, but they have some good residency programs in New York as well.

I asked her how the liability issue is affecting her residency program. She related that they are taking people into their residency program that 5 years ago they wouldn't even have interviewed. The applicant pool has fallen off so much because of fears of young medical students getting out of school with a lot of debt because it

took a lot of work to get through medical school and they had to get student loans. Now they are getting out of medical school and looking at what they want to do with their lives and practice, and they say I cannot afford to go into OB-GYN. There is no way I can do 4 years of training in OB-GYN and then go out and buy the kind of liability policy that I will have to have to set up in private practice, and also deal with all of these educational loans.

So the best and brightest are no longer going to this hospital in New York for the residency program in OB-GYN. These are our children's doctors. These are the doctors that are going to be delivering our children and great grandchildren. How can we say we are furthering patient safety and patient rights by continuing to allow this to happen? And coupled with that, the money that is spent in the practice of defensive medicine because of the liability situation in this country, it is unconscionable that we do not change this. I hope we can. I honestly think the way we are actually going to have to go about doing that may be during the budgetary process, perhaps during reconciliation. But this issue is too important to wait for the 110th or the 111th or the 112th Congress.

In Texas, we passed a Statewide medical liability reform bill in 2002. It required a change in the State constitution to allow the bill to actually take effect. The bill was passed at the end of May or the first of June during the beginning of the 2003 legislative session, and then a constitutional amendment was called for an election that happened on September 12 or September 13 of that year. That constitutional amendment passed, not by much, but it did pass. What a difference it has made in Texas.

When I was first campaigning for office, we were in a situation where we had gone from 17 liability carriers down to two. That meant that there were a lot of doctors in the State of Texas who could no longer get medical liability insurance or they were paying top dollar for that insurance. In fact, I ran into a young woman one night during the campaign at an event for Senator CORNYN. This young woman said, I hope you can get something done about liability. I can't get insurance. It is not that I have had any lawsuits, but my company went out of state and I can't get anyone to cover me.

So here was a woman in her mid-forties, trained at State institutions. Taxpayers had subsidized her education, and she is now a stay-at-home mom and not practicing her specialty of radiology because of the medical liability issue.

The good news is that after Texas passed that law and passed that constitutional amendment, we went up from two liability carriers back up to 14 today. The liability reform that we passed in Texas was kind of unique. It was a cap on noneconomic damages,

the same as the one that we talked about here in the House. We bifurcated that cap so that part was borne by the doctors and part was borne by the hospitals. It was in some ways different from the bill that we passed in the House but not substantially different. It is perhaps a template that we might follow here in the House of Representatives to see if we can't get something done on this issue because I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the country is ready for us to take action on this.

People said, well, and certainly we heard this on the debate in H.R. 5 in 2003, the insurance companies are not going to reduce their rates. If you get this cap on noneconomic damages, it will not bring rates down. Well Texas Medical Liability Trust, my last insurer of record when I was in practice in 2002, my insurer has lowered rates by a total of 20 percent and provided dividends to their plan holders so that there has been between 20 and 25 percent savings to providers in Texas. Clearly, the people who said that the insurance companies would not provide relief to doctors were mistaken in that assumption.

One of the other things that we talk about a lot in this body is the concept of pay for performance, reform of health information technology and how these two things taken together will return so much money to the medical system that our expenditures on medical care can in fact be met. I do not know that is something that I completely buy into at this point, but I do know this. We have been paying physicians under a formula called the sustainable growth rate since 1997 or 1998. This formula, the so-called sustainable growth rate, and bear in mind hospitals are reimbursed under a different formula which is the medical market basket formula. The sustainable growth rate has gone down every year for the last 5 years.

During the month of December when we were working so hard on the Deficit Reduction Act, one of the reasons we were working hard on that was because the Deficit Reduction Act did contain language that would prevent that negative 4.4 percent update that physicians were to take January 1 if we did not pass the act. Passage of the act did not bring doctors any more money, it just held them at zero. And of course we all know, here in Washington, D.C., if you do not increase something year over year, you are in fact cutting it. Well, basically, we cut doctor's pay in January. Even holding them at a zero level negative update, we were cutting their pay. But even worse, we passed the Deficit Reduction Act but then because of a technical glitch it didn't get passed, it didn't get signed and doctors did get hit with a negative 4.4 percent update.

January 4 in my district office in Texas, my fax machine was about to run out of ink because of the number of doctors sending me letters stating that they wanted me to see the letter that they were sending out to their patients: "I will no longer be able to see

Medicare patients in my practice. The cost of seeing the patients is far greater than the amount of reimbursement. We just got our pay cut by Congress, and I cannot afford to continue to see you.”

□ 1815

And this is really a tragedy. In fact, when I did my first series of town halls, my first year I was in office, I did 65 town halls around in my district. And I heard people talk to me about the difficulty with purchase of prescription drugs. This came up time and again.

But what I heard without question in every town hall that I did, someone would come up to me afterwards and say, how come when you turn 65 you have got to change your doctor? And the reason, of course, is because the doctor they were seeing before now is no longer taking Medicare. Now this was 3 years ago. It is getting worse year over year. What is happening is we are driving doctors out of the business of seeing Medicare patients. Doctors who in all likelihood are at the peak of their careers, doctors who have the best diagnostic ability, doctors who have the best technical skill, whose operations take the least amount of time, whose infection rates are best, we are driving these doctors out of the practice of taking care of our most vulnerable citizens, our senior citizens, individuals who will typically have multi-symptom disease and chronic ailments for which they need the best care.

But we are taking the best doctors out of the system. I submit that by doing so, if we then try to loop back and say, well, we are going to pay for performance, we may be paying for performance not with the first tier of doctors in this country, but with the second or third group. And it is going to cost more to pay for that performance.

I submit the time to take care of this is now. We don't necessarily need to tie reform of the sustainable growth rate formula, which is not working, to some pay-for-performance formula, which quite honestly is not ready for prime time yet. But we do need to give providers some measure of relief and some degree of stability in the pricing of the procedures that they perform for us. It is difficult to make decisions about, well, how, am I going to expand my office, am I going to hire another partner, am I going to hire another nurse, am I going to offer this new procedure, when we here in Congress every year are threatening them with a 4.5 percent pay cut year over year until we reach a total of 26 percent, which, to me is unconscionable. We are driving the best doctors out of business; and then we expect to say, but we only want to pay for quality out of the doctors that are left.

You know, the same could be true for the investment in information technology. If we drive our best doctors out of practice, then paying for information technology, but we don't have the best providers there anymore, so we

are going to end up paying more for the technology, or paying more for the training for that technology. We, in fact, are harming ourselves by postponing this decision for another year or another two years.

I submit this is the year to get this done. Reform that formula, place it on the Medicare economic index, which has been recommended by MedCap, which is the group that we tasked with dealing with this program and providing us a solution to the problem. Just like the hospitals who get a positive update year over year, we need to provide the same for physicians. Then we can get on the business about investigating the pay-for-performance issues and the information technology issues.

I will just have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, my own experience with information technology, with an electronic prescribing unit that a company placed in my office for beta testing. They wanted our group of five physicians to try this out and see how it worked for them, to see if they could make it work better. But the problem was that it added 1 to 2 minutes to every patient encounter. Well, when you are having to see 45 patients during the course of an average day in order to pay the light bills, pay the help, pay the rent and take a little bit home at the end of the day, if you have got to see 45 patients in order to do all of that and you add 1 or 2 minutes to each patient's encounter, you are adding 1 or 2 hours to that practitioner's day.

And who pays for that additional 1 or 2 hours? Well, in the situation that we found ourselves in, that question just simply went unanswered. And what happened was the technology, for the most part, went unused. I will admit that I did use it because I like technology and I like fooling around with things like that. But my other partners were absolutely uninterested in anything that would slow them down or make them less productive.

When we get to the point that we are willing to spend vast amounts of dollars for bringing this information technology to, say, a hospital or a doctor's office, we are going to have to be prepared to compensate individuals, doctors and nurses, nurse practitioners. We are going to have to be prepared to compensate them for the time involved in learning that process.

Mr. Speaker, I was in a hearing in our Committee on Energy and Commerce just the other day where we talked about this. I will have to tell you, two of my worst days as a practicing physician: one was the day that this body passed the Stark laws, and one was the day this body passed the HIPAA laws. It certainly did not make my practice life any easier, and, in fact, made life a lot harder and, as a consequence, made the overall cost of delivering that care go up.

I couldn't help but think that, as we were talking about crafting legislation to require doctors and hospitals to use

advanced information technology, that that may well go down as the third worst day in the practice of medicine. We have to be very careful about how we structure this. In fact, the Stark laws right now prevent a hospital from providing that equipment or that infrastructure to a private doctor's office because that would be an unjust inducement to put patients in that particular hospital.

We need to look at these 1980s health care laws and look at them in light of the 21st century. We are far past the point of punishing every doctor and every hospital for imagined transgressions by this body. We have to look at reforming those restrictions and those regulations so we can, in fact, allow doctors' offices and hospitals to come into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, any discussion of medical care would not be complete without talking a little bit about what is going on in the gulf coast in this country. Now, Hurricane Katrina, in Louisiana and Mississippi, Hurricane Rita in my State of Texas and our neighbor, Louisiana, did tremendous damage to all sectors of the infrastructure in those States. But especially hard hit was the health care infrastructure. And of course in the State of Louisiana, in the city of New Orleans, where, unfortunately, poverty was so prevalent, these storms did vast damage to the health care infrastructure that was at some days before the storms only tenuous at best.

And it continues to be a problem, despite all of the dollars. Just last week, we did that supplemental bill, and all of the dollars that we have appropriated from this Congress, but you go down on the ground in New Orleans, Louisiana, and it doesn't look like we have done a darn thing for the folks down there, particularly in the realm of health care. Same with Beaumont, Port Arthur area in my State of Texas.

I can remember watching those hurricanes, both of them, on the Weather Channel the nights that they were drawing their bead on the various towns in the gulf, and you just knew they were so big and so powerful that nothing good is going to come of this.

My two trips to New Orleans this past year certainly have showed me what devastation those storms were capable of inflicting upon those areas. The city of New Orleans itself, of course, a virtual ghost town. You go into the lower Ninth Ward and you just cannot imagine the destruction if you haven't seen it.

And furthermore, the task ahead, it has not even been decided yet whether rebuilding is something we should do in those areas. Certainly they continue to be flood-prone because of the number of feet they are below mean sea level. When you are standing in the street and you look up and you see a boat traveling by in the canal, that just gives you a graphic of how far down those communities are. And in a hurricane-prone area, to repopulate, it is a



question that we are going to have to ask.

But when you go into the health care facilities there in New Orleans, LSU Hospital, Charity Hospital, one of the venerable teaching institutions in this country, my professors at Parkland Hospital in the 1970s, many of them trained at Charity Hospital in the 1950s and 1960s. It is truly an icon as far as medical care in this country.

But when you walk through that facility, you realize that it quite likely will never be, ever again, what it was before. And it is a sad state. There is equipment that is relatively new equipment, but it has been ruined by water, ruined by mold, not likely to be salvageable under any circumstances.

One bit of good news that I do need to share with Congress is that across the street at Tulane Medical School, the hospital there, under private ownership, has come a long way since the storm hit and since the forced evacuation of that hospital. We toured the facilities there at Tulane, at the HCA hospital. New paint on the walls, new sheet rock where sheet rock had to be replaced. The emergency room, the day we were there was about a week before Mardi Gras. It was not open that day, but they were going to open for Mardi Gras; and I believe that is, in fact, what they were able to do. It was a stark contrast to what was going on across the street.

Now, the difference was that from a corporate level, that hospital, that private hospital had made the decision that no matter where the disaster happened anywhere in the country, they were going to be ready and they were going to respond. As a consequence, insurance money and new investment, new capital invested in that hospital brought it back much more quickly than any of the other facilities that I toured down there.

But even with that hospital coming back, the service available to the residents who have come back to New Orleans, the medical care available, has been decimated. Doctors in private practice, when I visited the first time in October, would tell me, I have got no mail for 2 months. My accounts receivable, I have no idea. No money is coming in across the counter because everyone I am seeing, and the schedule is full, no one has any money, no one has any insurance. No one even knows if the company that they are working for is still in business. Things were so disrupted by that storm that day.

Doctors are leaving the area. The hospitals that remained open may not be able to stay open because of the vast debts that they are incurring. Again, they are busy, patients are coming in, but nobody has any visible means of paying them. It has been a slow, slow process getting our Federal agencies to provide the reimbursement for seeing those patients that should be there. And it just continues to be a sad tale.

There is no question that State involvement, as well, their response has

been weak to nonexistent in several of those areas.

Now, we saw a number of people that fled from the storm path in Katrina came to my area of north Texas. Some great stories there about how people opened their hearts and their homes to people who had been displaced by the hurricane. One of the great stories is, of course, from the Dallas County Medical Society. When they heard that 17,000 people who had previously been in the Super Dome were going to come to a similar facility in downtown Dallas, even though it was on a Labor Day weekend, the doctors in Dallas, through the Dallas County Medical Society, sent out a blast fax to all of their members, and out of a 3,600-member medical society, 800 showed up on the steps of Reunion Arena to help those people and make certain that they had medical care.

But we need to learn our lessons from this crisis. There are areas where our medical system performed valiantly. But there are areas within our medical system and particularly in our Federal agencies where the response was weaker than it should have been. And the reason to be concerned about that is we also hear discussion of an illness called the avian flu that, while fortunately not in this hemisphere yet, may be here before we get back from our August recess because of the distribution of the distributive path along the migratory flyways of birds.

A lot of doctors showed up when they were asked to come down to Reunion Arena to receive the people from the hurricane. But what is going to happen if, instead of a natural disaster like a hurricane, the disaster is a communicable disease like the bird flu?

□ 1830

Can we expect first responders to show up for that when they, in fact, themselves may be placed in peril by doing so?

Well, fortunately, the President and the Department of Health and Human Services and the NIH have worked very hard to come up with an Institute of Preparedness plan. We have provided some of the funding for that right at the end of December in the Department of Defense appropriation bill. There is still more money that we are likely having to put forth for that. And it is one of those things that it may turn out to be another Y2K. It may never materialize. But if it does materialize, it could be so severe and so harsh on our country that not being in a state of preparedness really makes no sense.

Mr. Speaker, the House has been very kind with its time tonight. It has given us an opportunity to talk about what I see are a number of issues ahead for us in health care.

I want to stress again that affordability of health care is a thing that we need to keep first and foremost in our minds. Every bill that we introduce, every vote that we take, every committee hearing that we hold, we need

to keep affordability of health care uppermost in our minds. We need to work on the problem with the uninsured. We need to make insurance products available so that people can afford them. We need to expand and perhaps embellish federally qualified health centers. There is no question that we are going to need some type of liability reform in this country, and there is no question that we need some type of provider relief and to keep the best doctors involved and to continue to be involved in the practice of medicine, particularly where it is concerning our seniors.

Information technology will be something that we talk about now and for several years to come, but we need to be extremely careful how we implement that.

And then, finally, every hour that we spend thinking about preparedness, every dollar that we spend on preparedness is going to be money well spent. We can ill afford to have a poor response to the next crisis when it happens to this country. Unfortunately, the events of the last 5 years, I think, have shown us that bad things do happen to good people.

Mr. Speaker, the House has been very generous with its time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 1 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:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 4, 5, and 6.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1259. An act to award a congressional gold medal on behalf of the Tuskegee Airmen, collectively, in recognition of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces.

H.R. 4911. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 3, 2006, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research — Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program — Spinal Cord Injury Model Systems Centers (SCIMS Centers) and Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRPs) — received March 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6795. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report on Carryover Balances," pursuant to Public Law 102-486; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6796. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities: Community Economic Development Program (CEDP) Projects Funded During Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6797. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a copy of the Department's vehicle fleet report on alternative fueled vehicles for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 106-419; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6798. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress-FY 2004, in accordance with the requirements in Section 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6799. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the text of ILO Recommendation No. 195 Concerning Human Resources Development: Education, Training and Lifelong Learning, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 92nd Session, at Geneva, June 17, 2004, pursuant to Art. 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Or-

ganization; to the Committee on International Relations.

6800. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 25(a)(6) of the Arms Export Control Act(AECA), describing and analyzing services performed during FY 2005 by full-time USG employees who are performing services for which reimbursement is provided under Section 21(a) or Section 43(b) of the AECA; to the Committee on International Relations.

6801. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the 30 September 2005 status of loans and guarantees issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

6802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the quarterly report of obligations and outlays of FY2004 and FY2005 funds under the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through September 30, 2005 pursuant to Division D, Pub. L. 108-199; to the Committee on International Relations.

6803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's criteria used to determine appropriate adjustments in post differentials and danger pay allowances, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5925(a) and 5928 Public Law 109-140, section 4(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

6804. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2005," pursuant to (90 Stat. 748); to the Committee on International Relations.

6805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Office Names, Corrected Cross-Referencing, Reference to Wassenaar Arrangement, and other Corrections/Administrative Changes — received March 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General for the 6-month period ending September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6807. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's annual report for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6808. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting in accordance with Section 647 of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Department's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6809. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental positions in the Department of Transportation, as required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6810. A letter from the Deputy Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual

report on the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6811. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill titled, the "Reclamation Water Management Improvement Act"; to the Committee on Resources.

6812. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan pursuant to the Indian Tribal Judgement Funds Act for the White Mountain Apache Tribe in Docket No. 99-148L, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1401; to the Committee on Resources.

6813. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act covering the six months ended June 30, 2005, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6814. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement (ITVERP) Report to Congress 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6815. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Twenty-First Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2004; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6816. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2007 Leasing Program report, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6817. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at the Jackson Hole Airport will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

6818. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Sioux Falls Regional Airport will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 5050. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize coverage for anesthesia and other costs related to dental care for children and certain other patients; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FARR, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 5051. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for fiscal years 2007

through 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 5052. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting fraudulent advertising of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 5053. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include additional sites associated with the preparation or return phase of the expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 5054. A bill to fund capital projects of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 5055. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide protection for fashion design; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions of real property for conservation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 5057. A bill to authorize the Marion Park Project and Committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia, and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 5058. A bill to provide support for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, the Judiciary, and Science, 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. BASS (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5059. A bill to designate the Wild River Wilderness in the White Mountain National Forest in the State of New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect

to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user friendly form; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 5061. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey Paint Bank National Fish Hatchery and Wytheville National Fish Hatchery to the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 5062. A bill to designate as wilderness certain National Forest System land in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. EDWARDS:

H.R. 5063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit tax return preparers from requesting taxpayer consent to disclose or use return information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 5064. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the MA Regional Plan Stabilization Fund and to extend health status adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 5065. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal in order to afford a convenient means by which members of the public may contribute towards the acquisition of works of art to honor female pioneers in Government service; to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. NADLER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5066. A bill to provide for a "gold standard" for the security of nuclear materials worldwide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5067. A bill to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5068. A bill to reauthorize the operations of the Export-Import Bank, and to reform certain operations of the Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 5069. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to hire additional full-time non-supervisory import specialists of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 5070. A bill to extend certain trade preference programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 5071. A bill to establish a pilot project for the remediation of abandoned and inactive hardrock mines in the Upper Animas River basin in southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 5072. A bill to reform the universal service provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SABO, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution honoring and congratulating the Minnesota National Guard, on its 150th anniversary, for its spirit of dedication and service to the State of Minnesota and the Nation and recognizing that the role of the National Guard, the Nation's citizen-soldier based militia, which was formed before the United States Army, has been and still is extremely important to the security and freedom of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself,

Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MICA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. SODREL, Mr. SALAZAR,

Mr. DENT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. POE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MACK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WAMP:

H. Con. Res. 374. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a National Dysphagia Awareness Month should be established; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 375. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to support the decision of the United States Court of Federal Claims to award public safety officer death benefits to the family of Christopher Nicholas Kangas, a 14-year old volunteer apprentice firefighter who died as a result of serious injuries sustained en route to assist in fighting a fire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H. Res. 746. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BUYER:

H. Res. 747. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that all members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and all members of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations have security clearances; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. FORBES):

H. Res. 748. A resolution recognizing the 225th anniversary of the American and French victory at Yorktown, Virginia, during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Res. 749. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments of Ignacy Jan Paderewski as a musician, composer, statesman, and philanthropist on the occasion of the 65th anniversary of his death; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Res. 750. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Alfred Ernest Alquist and expressing sorrow on his death; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 751. A resolution recognizing the cultural and educational contributions of American Ballet Theatre throughout its 65 years of service as "America's National Ballet Company"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 752. A resolution requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the receipt and consideration by the Executive Office of the President of any information concerning the variation between the version of S. 1932, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, that the House of Representatives passed on February 1, 2006, and the version of the bill that the President signed on February 8, 2006; to the Committee on Government Reform.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 354: Mr. EVANS and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 356: Mr. DELAY.  
 H.R. 376: Mr. RENZI and Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 594: Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 663: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SABO, Mr. BOYD, Ms. LEE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 697: Mr. OSBORNE.  
 H.R. 699: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.  
 H.R. 713: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 752: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. DICKS.  
 H.R. 808: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 817: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 884: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 903: Ms. BEAN.  
 H.R. 966: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1124: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. OBERSTAR.  
 H.R. 1175: Mr. HAYWORTH.  
 H.R. 1227: Mr. PORTER and Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 1246: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 1264: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 1288: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1338: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 1425: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1545: Mr. PICKERING.  
 H.R. 1578: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.  
 H.R. 1603: Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 1849: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 1902: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1951: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
 H.R. 2014: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 2238: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2363: Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 2456: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 2588: Mr. CANTOR.  
 H.R. 2841: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. BONO.  
 H.R. 2943: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3049: Mr. EMANUEL.  
 H.R. 3142: Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 3145: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 3164: Mr. REHBERG.  
 H.R. 3476: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 3559: Mr. BACA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.  
 H.R. 3658: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 3692: Mr. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 3795: Mrs. ANDREWS and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3858: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 3861: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CARDIN.  
 H.R. 3883: Ms. HERSETH and Mr. MCKEON.  
 H.R. 3933: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 3962: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 4005: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 4025: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 4098: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.  
 H.R. 4127: Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H.R. 4211: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H.R. 4217: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 4226: Mr. CASE.  
 H.R. 4387: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 4408: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 4413: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4414: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4415: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4423: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 4447: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 4452: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. CARSON.  
 H.R. 4511: Mr. WELLER.  
 H.R. 4542: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 4546: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.  
 H.R. 4547: Mr. POE.  
 H.R. 4562: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 4574: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 4666: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 4672: Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H.R. 4673: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 4681: Mr. WAMP, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
 H.R. 4704: Ms. HERSETH.  
 H.R. 4727: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 4749: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FORD, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 4755: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.  
 H.R. 4761: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. PORTER.  
 H.R. 4788: Mr. ORTIZ.  
 H.R. 4790: Mr. CONAWAY.  
 H.R. 4799: Mr. RAMSTAD.  
 H.R. 4816: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 4820: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 4830: Mr. GORDON.  
 H.R. 4854: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 4897: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LEACH.  
 H.R. 4898: Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs.

JONES of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4899: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 4902: Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 4903: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4913: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4918: Mr. PAUL and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4920: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 4949: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 4956: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 4966: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 4975: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCAU of Texas, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 4980: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 4985: Mr. POE and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 4998: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 5014: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5032: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5037: Ms. HART, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.J. Res. 71: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. BASS.

H.J. Res. 73: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 277: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Con. Res. 323: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Con. Res. 339: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. FLAKE.

H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. ALLEN.

H. Con. Res. 355: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. WALSH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 365: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCNUITY, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WU, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MELANCON.

H. Res. 20: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 82: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 149: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 327: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Res. 521: Ms. HOOLEY.

H. Res. 600: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 626: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WATT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 627: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 628: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 635: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 636: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 637: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 692: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 706: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Res. 717: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 722: Mr. PICKERING.

H. Res. 723: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 737: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CLEAV-ER, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4755: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4 by Ms. SLAUGHTER on House Resolution 460: Nita M. Lowey.

Petition 5 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 537: Nita M. Lowey.

Petition 6 by Mr. ABERCROMBIE on House Resolution 543: Mike Thompson, Zoe Logren, Edward J. Markey, Nita M. Lowey, and James A. Leach.

Petition 8 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 570: Nita M. Lowey.

Petition 11 by Mr. BARROW on House Resolution 614: Nancy Pelosi and Adam Smith.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 2006

No. 38

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord, we wait for You and in Your Word do we place our hope. Help us never to run ahead of You. Quiet our doubts and calm our fears as You remind us that many things are better left to You.

Challenge our lawmakers today to put their trust and hope in You. Encourage them with the fact that You know their works and their motives. Help them to know that You will guide them with Your providence if they will only seek Your will in all things.

Open all of our eyes to Your presence among us in the kind deeds and generous acts that we encounter along life's journey. Let Your grace transform us and Your mercy keep us on the path of faithfulness.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Demo-

cratic leader or his designee and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we begin with a 60-minute period for morning business, with that time equally divided. Following morning business, we will return to the debate on S. 2454, the border security bill. The consent agreement from yesterday provides that the time until 12 noon be equally divided for debate only.

At noon, Chairman SPECTER will be here to offer an amendment. There will then be a period for general debate until 5 p.m. this afternoon.

Today Senators should have the opportunity to offer amendments, and I hope we can debate and vote on some of those amendments. Today is only Thursday, and we will be working today and tomorrow on this bill, and I think we can make good progress over the course of this week. I encourage Members to get their amendments ready and contact the managers when they are prepared to get into a lineup to offer their amendments.

We expect votes today on the border security bill, and I will be working with the Democratic leader and the two bill managers to set up a vote as early as possible this afternoon.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, has the Chair announced morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has announced morning business.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first 20 minutes would be yielded to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR.

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

Mr. REID. I see the Senator from Louisiana. It is my understanding she and Senator KERRY need 10 minutes.

How much time does the Senator from Louisiana need?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Ten minutes.

Mr. REID. OK. So 20 minutes to Senator SALAZAR and 10 minutes to Senator LANDRIEU.

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

The Senator from Colorado.

### IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak in support of the immigration reform bill which has been produced out of our Judiciary Committee. I wish to first congratulate Senator SPECTER and Senator LEAHY for their leadership in that effort in the Judiciary Committee. I also wish to congratulate all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, who have come together in support of this historic measure that is now before the Senate.

I believe this measure truly represents the kind of bipartisan spirit that leads to the best policy creation for our country. I am also proud of the eight sponsors of the McCain-Kennedy bill, including Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM, Senator BROWNBACK, Senator MARTINEZ, Senator KENNEDY, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator OBAMA, who came together and have led part of the effort to make sure we address comprehensive immigration reform this year.

I believe these bipartisan success stories establish the kind of civility we need to have in the Senate to be able to address the major issues that affect our

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2547

country. In reality, what the Judiciary Committee proposal does is it addresses the real problem we currently are facing in our country. We are facing a reality of broken borders and lawlessness at our borders as well as the interior with regard to immigration issues. What the Judiciary Committee bill does is it takes that reality of broken borders and lawlessness and creates a system that addresses our national security by strengthening our borders.

It also takes that system and reality of broken borders and lawlessness and says we can do a better job in securing our interior by enforcing our immigration laws. It also takes that system of broken borders and lawlessness and it creates a workable system of immigration that addresses both the economic and human realities of immigration in our Nation.

Finally, it takes that system of broken borders and lawlessness and tackles head on the horrible injustice that occurs with human trafficking that we see in our immigration problems of today.

As the Senate works to perfect and strengthen this legislation, it is my hope we will build upon the committee's work. I believe if we continue in a bipartisan manner, our final work product will be a comprehensive immigration reform law that protects our borders and addresses the human and economic realities within our homeland.

I believe comprehensive immigration reform legislation must be tough, must be fair, and must be practical. It must be tough, and it must be fair, and it must be practical. I believe the Judiciary Committee proposal is, in fact, tough, fair, and practical.

I know I am not alone in supporting this type of approach. Just last week, President Bush met with Americans from the business, faith, agriculture, and civil rights communities across our country. In the group in that meeting there were two people from Colorado who attended: Cindy Clark from The Broadmoor in Colorado Springs and Archbishop Charles Chaput, the archbishop of Denver. I commend both Ms. Clark and the archbishop for voicing the concerns of Coloradans with the President that we need to have a comprehensive immigration reform package. I have also spoken with President Bush and members of his Cabinet on a number of different occasions in the last year about the need for comprehensive immigration reform.

I share President Bush's belief, as he says—and I quote—

Ours is a nation of law and ours is a nation of immigrants, we believe that we can have rational, important immigration policy that's based upon law and reflects our deep desire to be a compassionate and decent nation.

Immigration is, indeed, a vital component of our Nation's history. Our country has always been seen as a land of opportunity for immigrants who are willing to work hard for a chance at

achieving the American dream for themselves and for their families.

Without the important contributions immigrants have made to our country, the United States would not exist as we know it today.

In my home State of Colorado, the first nonnatives to explore our lands were the Spanish. They arrived nearly 500 years ago and left their mark on the American Southwest and Colorado. Their presence is reflected today in the names of my State and its cities, its rivers, its mountains, and even in the food we eat.

More recently, immigrants came to Colorado to farm and ranch, to mine our State's abundant natural resources, to build the railroads and forge steel. They came, and continue to come, out of desperation, and also out of hope—the hope of America.

In a recent newspaper column, a former councilman, Bill Burnett, of the little Colorado town of Minturn—an old mining town—summed up the sentiments of many people in my State. He said:

Without immigrants, we never would've built this place.

The sentiment is echoed by many across this great country of ours.

It can also be heard through the words of the great poem "The Mew Colossus," inscribed at the foot of the Statue of Liberty. That poem says:

Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

Our country has always been a beacon of hope.

My own family migrated to Colorado in the 1850s, almost 20 years before Colorado became a State. We came from northern New Mexico, from a city named Santa Fe, which we had helped found over 250 years earlier. That was before Plymouth Rock and James Town. We pioneered the settlement of Colorado's San Luis Valley, where we have farmed the same land for almost 150 years.

In truth, every one of us in Congress and, indeed, virtually every person in America has a story to tell of their immigrant roots. That is because we are a nation of immigrants, a historical fact that has made us the wonder, the hope, and the envy of the world for centuries.

But there is no question today that our immigration laws are not working. We have broken borders in America today, and we must fix the problem for the sake of the national security of America.

The level of illegal immigration on our borders is unacceptable and has to change. Our borders are undermanned and overwhelmed. We must do far better in getting control of our borders.

In the past decade alone, we have seen the number of undocumented immigrants in our country rise from 4 million to some 12 million in 2006.

Enforcement of our immigration laws has certainly not kept pace with the flow of both legal and illegal immigration, and the laws that deal with those who cross the border are enforced only rarely so that in reality many believe enforcement of the laws simply does not exist.

In this post 9/11 era, it is critical we get control of our borders—both the northern border with Canada as well as the southern border with Mexico—so we can protect our country from outside threats that would do harm to Americans and punish those who exploit the hopes of foreign workers who come here through human trafficking.

We must solve our Nation's illegal immigration problems as a matter of national security.

To that end, the first priority of immigration reform must be to provide for adequate and sensible border security and a renewed Federal commitment to enforcing our Nation's immigration laws. The Judiciary Committee bill contains many provisions that will strengthen enforcement both at the border and within our country. It contains more than 30 provisions that will ensure the security of our borders.

Among the numerous provisions it includes, it doubles the number of Border Patrol agents. It adds 12,000 new agents over the next 5 years. It doubles interior enforcement. It does so by adding 1,000 investigators per year over the next 5 years. It provides additional border fences at specific vulnerable sections across the border. It increases resources to expand the ability of Federal agents to retrieve aliens detained by local police. And there are numerous other enforcement provisions contained within the bill.

Some in our country would have preferred that we wall off our country along our southern border. To the proponents of building that wall, I ask them: What would Ronald Reagan have said about that wall? We should not repeat the example of the Berlin Wall, one of the most shameful symbols of antifreedom and oppression ever designed by man, designed solely to keep people from hope and opportunity and freedom. It was President Reagan who told the Soviet leader: Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. We must not build those walls around our country.

Some also want to make criminals out of local parish priests who counsel their immigrant parishioners and soup-kitchen workers who provide a warm meal to the hungry. That, too, is wrong, to criminalize these people who take on humanitarian endeavors. I am pleased that the Judiciary Committee bill does not call for the construction of a massive wall along the border and does not criminalize the millions of Americans who come into contact with undocumented workers.

These security and enforcement efforts alone cannot be our sole means to confront this challenge. In the past,

Congress has focused almost exclusively on only this component of border security. We have tripled the number of Border Patrol agents who sometimes spend eight times as many hours patrolling the border. Yet during the same time, our borders have continued to be out of control.

The reality is, regardless of how much money we dedicate to border and interior enforcement, there are economic forces that spur immigration. Our country's current workforce is continuing to age, and our newer workers have become more educated and less interested in taking the important jobs our economy keeps creating. The Judiciary Committee bill addresses this issue.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I know he has a limited period of time. Obviously, in describing his own background and that of his family—some 160 years in Colorado, 250 years in Santa Fe—he knows the issues. He brings a special dimension to the debate. What I am hearing from the Senator is that what is really necessary is a comprehensive approach, that the Senator is a strong believer that we have to do something about our borders to make sure they are going to be the best in terms of technology so we can have realistic laws, but that we also have to understand how we are going to include those undocumented here in the United States in a way which is going to be consistent with our traditions and will also be responsible.

Many have called that adjustment status amnesty. I reject that. I ask the Senator if he doesn't agree with me that amnesty means forgiveness. It means pardon. That is not what the underlying legislation is. The underlying legislation says you have to go to the back of the line. You have to wait until everyone who is in line gets the opportunity to come here. You have to work hard, play by the rules, pay your taxes, and pay a fine. Then you can earn your way to the possibility of citizenship, if that is what you desire. If you don't desire that, you don't have to. Does the Senator agree with me that is a reasonable way we ought to think about that, at least when we are trying to recognize that some 11 million undocumented people are here, who work hard and play by the rules? Eighty thousand of them are permanent residents who are serving in the Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. Should they not be able to earn the possibility of citizenship?

Mr. SALAZAR. I agree with my colleague and friend from Massachusetts. As a person who has worked with law enforcement for a good part of my life as attorney general of my State, I know what amnesty is. I believe those who characterize this bill as amnesty are absolutely wrong. In the proposal of the Judiciary Committee, we have said that you go to the back of the line. What we have said is that you pay

a very substantial fine. That, in my view, with the other provisions in the bill, takes it completely out of the context of any kind of amnesty program we have ever seen.

I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts that at the end of the day, what we are dealing with is the reality of creating a stronger border but then addressing the reality within our Nation in a way that is workable. For those who would simply want to ignore the reality of the 11 to 12 million undocumented workers who are in the shadows of America today, we are simply not going to create a workable system of immigration reform in our country.

That is why I join my colleague from Massachusetts in pushing as hard as I can to get the Judiciary bill passed.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. He has explained the underlying bill accurately and correctly. The Senator understands that any of those individuals attempting to adjust their status over an 11-year period, if they get in trouble with the law, they are subject to deportation. They have to play by the rules, pay their taxes, work in the community, and be good citizens, learning English.

I am always impressed by the fact that under the Pew poll, it says that 98 percent of undocumented males are working today in the United States. These are workers making our economy stronger and providing for their families. If they in any way violate the law, they are subject to all of the legal interpretations and their opportunity for citizenship is eliminated. This is a tough provision, I believe.

Mr. SALAZAR. I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts. Amnesty is simply a red herring from those who don't want to get real immigration reform. When you talk about somebody having to wait in line for 11 years, having to go to the back of the line, having to remain crime free for 11 years, having to have a job in America, having to have an absolutely clean record, and then, at the end of the day, having to pay a substantial monetary fine, that is not amnesty.

We will be on this bill for a number of days. I expect to be speaking again about the importance of immigration reform as part of our national security. I wanted today, in this period of morning business and as we enter into the debate, to read from one of my favorite prayers from a person who understood the importance of immigration, especially in the context of agriculture. That is Cesar Chavez. He wrote this prayer, and it is something I think all of us in the Chamber should keep in mind as we move forward in the debate:

Show me the suffering of the most miserable so that I will know my people's plight. Free me to pray for others, for you are present in every person. Help me take responsibility for my own life so that I can be free at last. Grant me courage to serve others, for in service there is true life. Give me honesty

and patience so that I can work with other workers.

Bring forth song and celebration so that the spirit will be alive among us. Let the disparate flourish and grow so that we will never tire of the struggle. Let us remember those who have died for justice, for they have given us life. Help us love even those who hate us so that we can change the world.

As we engage in this very important debate on comprehensive immigration reform, I ask my colleagues to keep in mind that this is one of the most important issues we confront together as a group of Americans in the 109th Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Colorado and the senior Senator from Massachusetts regarding the important issue before the Senate, which is trying to reconcile the rules and regulations regarding immigration. I commend both of them for their outstanding leadership on that issue.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU and Mr. KERRY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2482 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I did not hear the unanimous consent request of Senator KERRY. Was it to have 3 minutes on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. It was to add 3 minutes to his side.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that we add an additional 3 minutes to the majority's time also.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President. I rise to express my extreme disappointment with the actions taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee earlier this week on immigration reform. I know that this is a tough issue, an emotional issue, and that my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee worked very hard to pass something out of committee. However, it seems to me that the rush to pass some form of immigration reform eclipsed prudent policy-making.

The immigration problem in our country is out of control and must be solved. Our top priority in this immigration reform debate is to provide for real and comprehensive border security. We must also address in a responsible manner the presence of an enormous illegal population currently in our country.

The issue before us is critical to the future of our country, in terms of national security, economic prosperity, and the fabric of our Nation. I hope we will proceed with a thoughtful and thorough debate in the Senate because the proposals we are going to be asked



to consider are enormous in scope and have far-reaching implications. We must ensure that not only the Senators but also the American people have ample opportunity to fully comprehend the consequences of any action we take.

It is absolutely vital that the Senate act to put the resources and mechanisms in place to allow the Department of Homeland Security to gain operational control of our borders and to have stronger and more meaningful enforcement of our immigration laws in the interior of the United States.

Rarely a day goes by when our borders are not breached in a new way. By now, we've all heard the story of the teams of investigators from the Government Accountability Office who, in December 2005, were able to carry enough radioactive material to make two dirty bombs past border checkpoints in Texas and Washington State by faking Government documents. We can address this problem, and we will, by providing improved training for agents and improved technology at the borders.

The magnitude of the flow of illegal immigrants into the United States is astounding. The Border Patrol arrested 1.2 million illegal immigrants in 2005, but couldn't stop hundreds of thousands more from unlawfully entering the country because they don't have the resources. We can address this problem and we will, by providing more Border Patrol agents, better infrastructure, additional checkpoints and use of the latest technology available.

In addition, we must address the real magnet for illegal immigration for so many: the promise of a job. Most illegal immigrants in the United States did not come to this country to cause us harm but rather came to earn a better life for themselves and their families. However, we must ensure that a legal process for hiring foreign workers is put in place and strictly adhered to. We can address this problem and we will by mandating employer sanctions for those who flaunt the rule of law and continue to hire illegal workers and by providing tamper-proof documentation to those who are authorized to work in the United States so that employers will have no confusion about the legality of the workers they hire.

In addition to border security, we will be addressing a guest worker program. However, I am hoping we can have the opportunity to refocus the Senate's attention on the "guest" part of the term guest worker program. It is vital in this debate to distinguish between true temporary guest worker programs and proposals that will lead a guest worker down a new path to citizenship. I don't think it's fair to call the legislation passed by the Judiciary Committee a guest worker bill. It is more appropriately named a citizen worker bill because it provides a clear new path to citizenship for aliens who are currently in the United States illegally.

I have a very simple question to ask all Members of the Senate as we debate this bill: Why is it necessary that we address the issue of U.S. citizenship when we are talking about immigration reform? There are reasons we need to deal with the people who are here illegally. There are reasons we need to deal with folks who want to come to this country for the right reasons. But why is it necessary in this legislation that we even consider the issue of U.S. citizenship?

I am particularly concerned about the agricultural guest worker program adopted by the Judiciary Committee because I believe it is contrary to the best interests of American agriculture. Not only that, but it will punish those farmers who have been abiding by the law in this country and utilizing the H-2A program, which has been a long-standing temporary guest worker program in the U.S. relative to agriculture.

Because my focus in this debate will center on border security and a temporary agricultural guest worker program, I would like to take a few minutes to outline some of the problems I see with the Judiciary Committee's agricultural guest worker program and indicate my intention to utilize the amendment process at the appropriate time to attempt to remedy what I regard as some shortcomings of the Judiciary Committee's agricultural reform.

Most troubling to me is that the agricultural reform provision provides amnesty to 1.5 million illegal workers in agriculture.

Some might call it earned adjustment of status or earned citizenship, but I call it amnesty because it provides a clear path to citizenship for illegal agricultural workers who meet a very low threshold. These illegal workers will not have to return to their home countries and will not have to wait their turn in line to gain legal permanent resident status in the United States.

The amnesty provision would allow illegal aliens who performed 863 hours, or 150 days, of agricultural work in the United States between January 1, 2003, and December 31, 2005, to qualify for a blue card.

In legislation Senator KYL and I introduced a year ago and had on the floor previously, we had a blue card provision. That is not the blue card I am talking about this morning. The blue card I am referring to is the one that was created by the Judiciary Committee mark.

The blue card program has a low threshold requirement to qualify. A workday is defined as "any day in which the individual is employed 1 or more hours in agriculture." So someone who worked 1 hour per day for 150 days over the past 2 years would qualify for a blue card. The blue card under the Judiciary Committee bill would allow those illegal workers to then work legally in agriculture or any other area of our economy, provided

they satisfy their agricultural employment requirements each year.

Once in possession of a blue card, an alien who is currently here illegally, would only have to work in agriculture for 100 workdays, or 575 hours per year, over a 5-year period to qualify for legal permanent resident status.

Alternatively, those blue card workers could work 150 workdays, or 863 hours per year, over a 3-year period to earn legal permanent resident status.

A workday is still defined as "any day in which the individual is employed 1 or more hours in agriculture." So the requirement to obtain legal permanent resident status is either 100 hours per year over a 5-year period or 150 hours per year over a 3-year period.

While the number of blue cards allowed to be issued is capped at 1.5 million, once a blue card holder becomes a legal permanent resident, his or her family members receive derivative legal status and work authorization.

That means that whether a blue card worker has 1 child or 10 children, once he or she becomes a legal permanent resident, the rest of the family will have been deemed to have been here legally in the United States, and the spouse will be allowed to work regardless of whether they have had a job in the United States in the past.

This is hardly matching willing workers with willing employers but, rather, putting a large population on a level playing field with American workers for job opportunities.

While some of my colleagues might disagree with me on the amnesty issue, we should be able to agree on the fact that these agricultural workers who earn amnesty through this provision will not remain in agriculture forever.

Most everyone agrees that agriculture is the hardest low-skilled work around in our country today. It is truly backbreaking. Generally, those who have had an opportunity to earn a living in some other manner have chosen to do so. Even those who choose to stay in agricultural work find they cannot occupy these labor-intensive jobs over a long period of time. There is a natural tendency to age out of agricultural work.

Therefore, if this provision adopted by the Judiciary Committee is enacted into law, I anticipate those current illegal workers who become legal permanent residents will leave agriculture in the short term and leave our farmers to continue to rely only upon H-2A for their workforce, if they are going to hire legal workers.

The reason I believe these workers will leave agriculture is because that is what has happened in the past. I have spoken with numerous farmers who were farming during the special agricultural worker program Congress authorized in 1986. That is commonly called the Special Agricultural Worker Program. That program provided amnesty for those agricultural workers who performed 90 days of farm work in 1985 through 1986.

Chalmers Carr, a peach grower in the State of South Carolina, helped 200 workers adjust in 1986 pursuant to the special agricultural worker education program. After 2 years, 75 percent of those workers had left his farm, and after 5 years, the last adjusted worker left agriculture.

Similarly, Bill Brim, a Georgia fruit and vegetable grower, assisted 130 workers adjust status pursuant to the Special Agricultural Worker Program. Not one single one of the 130 workers stayed on his farm for more than 6 months after they adjusted their status.

Recognizing that these agricultural workers who are able to adjust their status will not be in agriculture forever, the Senate should be able to agree that we need a viable H-2A program to address the labor needs of agriculture in the future. Unfortunately, the agricultural provision of the Judiciary Committee's bill simply does not meet the needs of our Nation's agribusiness.

It is ironic to me that those who admittedly do not use the H-2A program in their States purport to know the modifications necessary for improvement of the program. In reality, the language contained in the Judiciary Committee's proposal provides every advantage to those agricultural employers who have been utilizing an illegal workforce and cripples those employers who have utilized the legal H-2A program.

For instance, the Judiciary Committee's agricultural proposal treats all those currently illegal aliens who qualify for a blue card as U.S. workers for purposes of recruiting workers. This means an agricultural employer who has been utilizing the H-2A program for years and following the rule of law already on the books will be forced to hire an illegal alien with a blue card before that farmer can petition to bring in the same people who had been working and returning in a legal manner for him in the H-2A program for years.

Further, in the case of an agricultural employer who properly applies for and brings H-2A workers to work on his farm, that employer will be forced to replace that H-2A worker for whom he has paid transportation costs to the worksite with a blue card worker who arrives at the worksite at any point during the first 50 percent of the work period seeking an agricultural job to fill his or her yearly hourly requirement to maintain their blue card status.

Once again, we are going to be giving folks who are here illegally preferential treatment over those folks who are here legally. There is no common sense whatsoever to that proposal.

That yearly requirement, in many cases, may not encompass the employer's entire season or period of desired employment, leaving the employer, again, without an adequate, reliable workforce. This disadvantages those who have been playing by the rules.

The framework of the Judiciary Committee's proposal which provides that only 575 hours of agricultural labor per year are required to transition from blue card status to that of a legal permanent resident will likely have a destabilizing effect on the agricultural workforce.

Madam President, 575 hours per year equates to a little less than 72 days per year based on an 8-hour workday. I don't know about farms in California or Idaho, but in Georgia, our farmworkers generally work around 11 or 12 hours per day during peak season. Using a 12-hour workday, a blue card worker will work just under 48 days to meet the yearly minimum hour requirement.

If these blue card workers are allowed to work in industries other than agriculture and are only required to work 575 agricultural hours to qualify for legal permanent resident status, my guess is they will not work in agriculture one hour more than necessary. This is not going to provide our agricultural employers with the stable workforce they are being promised.

I close with a comment relative to a very current issue that is very important as we debate this bill on the floor today, and that is the fact that our President today is in Cancun, Mexico, meeting with the leadership of our two best trading partners and our two border partners in the United States, that being the leadership of Mexico and the leadership of Canada.

As he meets with those leaders, I hope he will strongly emphasize, particularly to the leadership in Mexico, to change their position on border security. It is almost unfathomable to me that the leader of a country would say to his citizens that he is encouraging a border country to grant amnesty to anyone who has left his country to go into a border country. But that is exactly what is happening on the part of President Fox.

I hope President Bush emphasizes to the leadership over this week that they must be a partner with us in helping secure their border and our border which we have in common. If they will work with us, we can secure the border, and if this body acts in an appropriate way over the next several days, we can come up with an accommodation to those workers who are here for the right reason and, at the same time, we can ensure that those people who have crossed into our country illegally return to their home country, again, in the right way.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to say a few words about immigration. May I inquire first how much time is left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 15 minutes remaining.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO LYNDEN AND MEREDITH MELMED

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I wish to say a few words about immigration reform, but before I do, I want to recognize a blessed occasion of the birth of Caroline Brown Melmed 2 days ago on March 28, 2006, at 3:58 in the afternoon.

Caroline's proud father, Lynden Melmed, has been an integral part of my Judiciary Committee staff. He is on detail from the Department of Homeland Security, and he is an expert in immigration law. One can imagine how important he has been in my ability to be effective and advance the debate on this important topic.

He and his wife Meredith undoubtedly will be fantastic parents. As the father of two daughters myself, I would tell him it is the greatest blessing one could imagine. I wish them the best in the years to come.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I wish to talk about immigration reform and border security. In particular, since this debate will be continuing for this week and the next, I want to emphasize the importance of border security, and, obviously, enforcement begins at the border.

But before I talk about border security and enhanced enforcement, I want to address the issue of the 12 million immigrants who are already here who have come to this country in violation of our immigration laws.

We know why people come to America. It is the same reason they have always come: because too often they have no hope and no opportunity where they live. So we understand at a very human level why it is that people want to come to the United States. Yet I think we all acknowledge America cannot open its borders to anyone and everyone who wants to come here or we would literally be drowned in a wave of humanity.

We have to regain control of our broken immigration system, and that means to deal with enforcement at our borders, to deal with enforcement in the interior of our country, and to deal with verification of the eligibility of prospective employees to actually work legally in the United States. We cannot repeat the mistake this Nation made with the 1986 amnesty bill.

I remind my colleagues that in 1986, that legislation required illegal aliens to pay a fee, to learn English, to improve themselves by working in this country for a set time.

I also remind my colleagues that everyone agrees on two points when it comes to the 1986 experience with the amnesty bill.

No. 1, they agree it was amnesty. And No. 2, they agree it was a complete and total failure. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a solution to this great

crisis that confronts our country, but I won't accept a repetition of the mistake of 1986 when this country granted amnesty in the hopes of that being the end of it and in the hopes that there would be a reciprocal obligation on the part of the Federal Government to actually sanction employers who violate our immigration laws. I am afraid the numbers speak for themselves, with 3 million illegal immigrants who benefited from the amnesty and now roughly 12 million who are here awaiting the next amnesty. Thus we can see what a magnet amnesty becomes and why it is so counterproductive.

I am proud to represent a border State, the great State of Texas, and I know from personal experience what problems the border States face. I know the strains that illegal immigration and our broken borders have placed on local taxpayers when it comes to education, when it comes to health care, and I know the anger and frustration that many people feel at the Federal Government's abject failure when it comes to enforcing our immigration laws.

I also know the nature of immigration across our borders is changing. There is more and more violence on the northern border of Mexico in cities such as Nuevo Laredo. I have listened to the concerns of my fellow Texans, including ranchers and those who are well accustomed to the movement of people across the border into the United States who want to work here and who then go back home with the savings and skills they have established. I have listened to the ranchers and the Good Samaritans who live and work along the border who were happy to lend a helping hand to the occasional traveling immigrant worker, to those seeking a better life. But I have to tell you, these people are now scared. They are terrified because drug smugglers and human traffickers are wreaking havoc along our Nation's borders.

Let's not delude ourselves. This debate isn't just about drugs, and it isn't just about violence, as horrible as those are. This debate is also—and I would say first and foremost—about our Nation's security. In a post-9/11 world, border security is national security. I say that again: In a post-9/11 world, border security is national security.

Make no mistake about it. Today we do confront a crisis that threatens our security. We all know that our immigration system is broken and has been for many years. And it is not getting any better on its own. So I applaud the majority leader and those who have worked so hard on both sides of the aisle to try to bring this debate to the Senate floor. This is the greatest deliberative body on the face of the planet, and I would hope that we could have a debate about this urgent need to fix our broken immigration system and to restore security to our border and do it in a way that is dignified and civil and

worthy of this great institution and of this great democracy.

Senator JON KYL of Arizona and I have teamed up to work on this issue from top to bottom. We have worked closely together over several years to address this challenge in a comprehensive way. We have held numerous hearings, and we have heard testimony from a diverse array of experts across the political spectrum. We have also inspected our Nation's failed immigration system and its relationship with the terrible events of September 11. And we have examined why it is important for America's neighbors to raise living standards for their own citizens to help relieve some of the pressure on our border.

Senator KYL and I have sought to lay a foundation for a comprehensive solution to fix our broken borders, a comprehensive solution that would avert another crisis 5, 10, or 20 years down the road.

When we sat down to draft legislation, we were alarmed that many of the bills already introduced at that time simply called for more studies and more reports. One so-called comprehensive bill failed to contain a single provision on interior enforcement. This is not a time for more studies or more reports. This is a time for action. We need to act, and we need to act prudently and in America's best interests.

So our goal was to craft an immigration bill that would be comprehensive. We understood that any truly comprehensive bill must address both border security and enforcing the law in our Nation's interior. Over a dozen of the strong and sensible enforcement provisions we crafted made their way into the bill that is now before the Senate in the form of the Judiciary Committee bill. I want to talk about these enforcement measures and why they are a necessary precondition to everything else that we do when it comes to reforming our broken immigration system.

I repeat: National security and border security begin at the border. Congress can no longer ignore the realities on the ground. We can no longer afford to under-fund and under-man our borders. What we see in my State of Texas is that the mandates that the Federal Government issues when it comes to health care, when it comes to education, when it comes to law enforcement are foisted off on State, and most often, local taxpayers. It is considered a local problem when self-evidently, it should be a national mandate. When it comes to any of those issues, we have a national responsibility, and the Congress and the Federal Government must step up.

Let's look at the reason many Texans and others who live and work along the border are scared, people who are very much accustomed to immigrants moving back and forth across the border. It is because they know the face of illegal immigration across our border has changed. We have a chart, chart

No. 1, that illustrates the changing nature of illegal immigration and the rise in the number of people coming from countries other than Mexico. You can see on this chart that the aliens who have been detained along the border are from special interest countries—countries with ties to international terror such as Syria, Iraq, Iran. Just 2 weeks ago, I talked to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security and he told me there were 39,000 Chinese who had been detained coming across our southern border and, unfortunately, once they were detained, China refused to accept any of them back.

So we have to use every diplomatic tool in our toolbox to make sure we not only detain people who come across our border illegally, but that we then, in an expeditious way, return them back to their country of origin.

Second, in the bill that Senator KYL and I proposed, we proposed a doubling in the number of Border Patrol agents. And while we have heard a lot of talk about additional Federal agents at the border, the Federal Government really hasn't stepped up yet. There is a lot of good and, I think, well-intentioned talk. But on 9/11, we saw that 9,788 Border Patrol agents were funded by the U.S. Government. Here we are today, and we have seen a small increase to a little over 11,000. But lest some people think that is a lot of Federal agents on the border, let me remind them we have a 2,000-mile border between the United States and Mexico—a 2,000-mile border—and now a little over 11,000 Federal agents, when the city of New York has somewhere on the order of 39,000 policemen. So if you compare a 2,000-mile border and 11,000 Border Patrol agents with the fact that the city of New York has 39,000 police officers, you can see why I suggest to my colleagues that we are both underfunded and undermanned when it comes to the sheer volume of people coming across the border.

Last year, about 1.2 million—that's 1.2 million—people were apprehended coming across the border. So how can we in good conscience say that we are doing everything within our power to enforce our borders and enforce our laws when we simply deny the Federal agents, who are doing a very good job, the number of people they need in order to be successful?

Then there is the issue of detention beds. Once you detain someone coming illegally across the border, they are entitled, ordinarily, to a deportation hearing, if they come from a country other than Mexico. People who come from Mexico are returned expeditiously—usually the same day. Of course, many of them try to come back and, after enough tries, they usually make it past the border. But we have had a flawed policy of catch and release. In other words, when we have apprehended people at the border who come in illegally from countries other than Mexico, we said: Please show up

in 30 days for your deportation hearing. Are we surprised that the vast majority of people don't show up but just merely melt into our landscape and become part of that 12 million people who come to our country in violation of our immigration laws? Well, it is because we only have 20,000 detention beds—20,000—with 1.2 million people coming across our borders just last year. That is the fundamental, root problem with the catch-and-release policy that the Department of Homeland Security has had for far too long.

Senator KYL and I would not only raise the number of detention beds to 50,000, but we would end the catch-and-release policy by improving and increasing and mandating the use of expedited removal across our borders.

This chart reflects that Border Patrol apprehensions of people from countries other than Mexico were 165,000 last year. Yet 114,000 of them were released under the catch-and-release program. As I say, most, if not all, of them melted into the landscape and became part of this shadow culture living in America today of people who have come to this country in violation of our immigration laws. We may assume we know why they have come here. We may assume that they are people in search of a better life and, indeed, many of them are. But the fact is, we can't assume in a post-9/11 world; we have to know who is coming into our country and why they are here because we know there are those who have evil intent toward America. We know there are common criminals. We know there are drug dealers and drug smugglers. We know there are arms dealers. We know there are international criminal syndicates who will do anything for a buck, whether it is smuggling drugs, guns, weapons of mass destruction, or smuggling terrorists across our borders.

In addition to the 10,000 more Border Patrol agents, I believe the solution to securing our borders is in the technology we have, our technological advantage. But we are not using technology along the border the way we should. We know the Department of Defense, our military, is the finest, most professional military the world has ever known, and in large part it is because of the technology they are able to use. We need to use ground sensors. We need to use unmanned aerial vehicles. We need to use technology to provide a secure border.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to conclude my remarks.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as I pointed out, border security is national security. I see the chairman of the Subcommittee for Homeland Security of the Appropriations Committee on the floor, and he has been a great champion of getting more money allocated

for this important effort. But we are a far cry from where we need to be. We can do this if we have the national will and commitment. But our national security depends on border security, and we have to make a credible effort—indeed, more than an effort—we need to be successful in providing security to our borders in order to keep the American people safe.

I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### SECURING AMERICA'S BORDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2454, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2454) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I understand that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Louisiana wish to speak. I also wish to speak, and I see the Democratic floor leader is here. I spoke with the Senator from Massachusetts, and he said he wasn't speaking at this time. I was wondering if we could maybe get a time agreement so that we can get an order, if that is all right with the Democratic floor manager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation now? I am just asking the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I would just suggest that since the Senator from Georgia is here and the Senator from Louisiana is here and I am here and I know the Senator from Vermont is here, since he is the floor leader, he would probably want to proceed. Do you have a statement you are proceeding with, I presume?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would tell my good friend from my neighboring State of New Hampshire, I do have a statement. It is not very long; it is probably 7 or 8 minutes. But I would like to say, just to frame the issue, the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator SPECTER, and I spoke on the floor yesterday on this. This is a major issue. I will want to speak. I do not intend to hold the floor very long.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator be good enough to yield? I will be glad to wait for 45 minutes or an hour. I will

seek recognition at that time. After the Senator from Vermont speaks, we have some other speakers, but I think we can wait.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont be recognized for as much time as he may desire and then the Senator from Georgia be recognized for 15 minutes, the Senator from Louisiana for 15 minutes, and then I be recognized for 15 minutes, and that will get us to approximately the 45 minutes the Senator was talking about.

Mr. KENNEDY. Then would the Senator from Illinois be recognized for 15 minutes and I will follow the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GREGG. That sounds reasonable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor. I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. As usual, he found us a roadmap and it worked well.

Madam President, let me just briefly suggest the absence of a quorum. I am going to take us out of the quorum in about 1 minute.

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. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we are going to have a major debate on immigration. That is a good thing, both for the country and for the Senate. I note, however, in the Judiciary Committee, we have had a major amount of debate and long markups. The distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator SPECTER, and I have tried to make sure we had full hearings.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, is on the floor. As I said last night, he has spent more time on this than any of the rest of us. He has been in the Senate longer. He has been a leader in the area of immigration.

When we began the debate, Chairman SPECTER and I followed the opening statement of the Republican leader with a discussion of how the Judiciary Committee, in a truly bipartisan manner, worked successfully to meet the deadline set by the Senate's Republican leadership. I understood that the majority leader had committed to turn to the committee bill if we were able to meet that deadline. I heard our chairman reiterate that same thing on the floor again yesterday. We did it, we completed that difficult task. We did it by working together, Republicans and Democrats, something that should be done more often around here.

Under the steady leadership of the chairman and Senator KENNEDY, and with the hard work and dedication of so many members of the committee, we worked through the long hours and numerous amendments and accomplished what had seemed to be the impossible. Our staffs worked throughout the St. Patrick's Day recess. As I said last night, I got e-mails from them at 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock at night and then again very early in the morning. I knew how hard they were working on this—the staffs of all the Senators involved. Then the Judiciary Committee sent a resounding message approving a bill by a bipartisan vote of 12 to 6.

What was interesting about that is none of the amendments on the critical issues passed on a party-line vote. They were by strong bipartisan votes. Let me tell you what our committee did.

We have a bill that is strong on enforcement. In some ways, it is stronger than the bill passed by the House. It is tough on employer enforcement. It is tough on traffickers—and it should be. It is stronger than the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee, who started from the same place as the committee bill but did not include some of the enforcement measures added by amendment during committee consideration nor any of the other improvements we made. For example, neither of those other bills included a provision, added by the committee at the urging of Senator FEINSTEIN, to make tunneling under our borders a Federal crime. The committee bill adds new criminal penalties for evading immigration officers, and it added manslaughter to the definition of aggravated felony.

Finally, on Monday morning of this week, the committee adopted a Feinstein amendment to add 12,000 new Border Patrol agents—2,400 each year for the next 5 years.

Our committee bill is enforcement-plus. It starts with strong enforcement provisions and border security, but it is also comprehensive in its balance. It confronts the problem of 12 million undocumented immigrants who live in the shadows. It values work. It respects human dignity and includes guest worker provisions supported by both business and labor. It includes a way to pay fines and earn citizenship that has the support of religious organizations and leading Hispanic organizations.

Yesterday, Senator KENNEDY and Senator DURBIN and Senator HARKIN made excellent, persuasive statements in favor of the committee bill. Senators DOMENICI and MARTINEZ also spoke of their personal journeys. These were very real and meaningful statements. They reminded us all that we are a country of immigrants. I thank them for speaking in terms favorable to the comprehensive approach we have adopted. Listening to them makes me think how proud my immigrant grandparents would be. They immigrated from Italy to Vermont. They would be

proud to hear this debate, and to see their grandson speaking on the floor of the Senate.

I look forward to working with Chairman SPECTER in a bipartisan way to pass the committee bill. The chairman and I have been able to move our committee from being a confrontational committee to one that works in a bipartisan fashion. I commend him for that. I commend all members of the committee for that.

What we have done is, by working that way, we have provided a realistic and reasonable system for immigration. The bill protects America's borders, it strengthens enforcement, and most important, it remains true to the best of American values.

The committee bill wisely dropped controversial provisions which would have exposed those who provide humanitarian relief or medical care or shelter or counseling or other basic services to undocumented aliens. Under the earlier bill, they would have faced possible prosecution under felony alien-smuggling provisions of the criminal law—a reminder that in a nation such as ours, with such a great heart and soul as a nation, we also have a moral and humanitarian responsibility to people. We should not make felons of those who carry out the responsibility of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and sheltering those who need shelter.

I thank so many in the relief and religious communities, the faith community, for speaking out on this matter. Even in my own faith, I was so pleased to see some of the leaders speak out so strongly.

The criminal provisions should be focused on the smugglers, not on the children of aliens or those who help them. Focus it on the smugglers, those who traffic in human misery and sometimes bring about the death of those they smuggle. Under the committee bill, that is what we did.

The committee also voted down a measure that would criminalize mere presence in an undocumented status in the United States. I was a prosecutor. I know how unworkable that would have been. Illegal status is currently a civil offense with very serious consequences. One of the most serious, of course, is it includes deportation. But if you then criminalize that status, it is punitive, it is wrong, it is totally unworkable and goes against the history of our Nation. It would have led to further harsh consequences. It would have trapped people in permanent underclass status. It would have put bars in front of the American dream.

These criminalization measures, which were included in the House-passed bill supported by congressional Republicans and which were reflected in the majority leader's bill, have understandably sparked nationwide protest. In the view of many, it is anti-immigrant and inconsistent with America's values and history. The committee bill, while tough in enforcement

and on the smugglers, is smarter and fairer.

I ask Senators to look at the peaceful demonstrations across this country. Listen to the people who are speaking out. A half-million people went out in a peaceful demonstration in Los Angeles. That is nearly the population of my State. That was just one demonstration among many.

Opponents of a fair, comprehensive approach are quick to claim that anything but the most punitive provision is amnesty. They are wrong. This is not an amnesty bill. An editorial in yesterday's New York Times entitled "It Isn't Amnesty" makes the point that painting the word "deer" on a cow and taking it into the woods does not make the cow a deer. As I said yesterday, in Vermont, especially during deer season, we Vermonters know the difference between a deer and a cow. Sometimes we wish the tourists did.

Our committee bill should not be falsely labeled. Our bill is more properly called what it is: a smart, tough bill.

We know we need a comprehensive solution to a national problem. We need a fair, realistic, and reasonable system that includes both tough enforcement and immigration reform provisions. All Senators, Republicans and Democrats, should be able to agree with these principles. The bill reported by the Judiciary Committee is that bill.

I am glad to hear that President Bush is again speaking about the need for a path to citizenship and the need for a comprehensive bill. I hope, as we now proceed through the sixth year in office, that the Bush-Cheney administration will finally send a legislative proposal to Congress on these matters. They have stated their support. Let them also bring forward what they believe is appropriate legislation. We did not want to wait any longer in our committee. We did the hard work, and produced a bipartisan bill.

We did the hard work, and we wrote a tough, smart, comprehensive bill. The Judiciary Committee's debate has produced a bill that I believe would make my immigrant grandparents proud, and my maternal great-grandparents proud. It is worthy of our support.

This is a body which should reflect the conscience of our great Nation. There are only 100 of us. We are enormously privileged to represent 295 million Americans. Let us speak to the conscience of all of us and the humanity of all of us. Let us pass this bill. It is not just from the managers' point of view, from a political point of view; it has the support of the labor unions, business groups, leading Hispanic organizations, and many from our religious communities. They are asking the Senate to do its part. Let's adopt the committee bill so we can bring hard-working people out of the shadows and end the permanent underclass status of so many who have contributed so much.

Let us protect our security and our borders, but support the American dream that attracted my grandparents and the American dream that attracted so many, and allow this bill to become a reality. We are a good, brave, and wonderful country. Let us demonstrate it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in 1903, Andrew Bengsten boarded a ship and left Sweden, the son of Isak Bengsten. He landed on Ellis Island and took the last name Isakson, which is the Scandinavian tradition, to take the father's first name and add "son" to it. In 1916, he had a son named Ed, and in 1926 he became a naturalized citizen.

He went to West Texas as a laborer, and later on to Atlanta, GA as a carpenter. In 1944, his son Ed and Ed's wife Julia had a son, who by the grace of God is me. No one in this body has any greater respect or admiration for this great country and our process of legal immigration than I.

As we approach the most important debate this Senate will encounter in this session, it is important that it be a debate of dignity and a debate of substance and a debate where we learned the lessons of the past and make sure that immigration in the future holds the same promise it held for my grandfather 103 years ago.

I have filed an amendment at the clerk's desk, which at the appropriate time in the debate I will offer, which to me is the key as to whether we proceed on whatever the final product this Senate may adopt may be. It is a point that has been missed by many and avoided by some but we must focus on and we must accomplish. It is an amendment that very simply says no provision of any act we pass which contains a guest worker program will go into effect until, first, the Secretary of Homeland Security has certified to the President and to this Congress that our borders are reasonably secure.

I want to tell you why that is important. It is important because 20 years ago, in 1986, a great President, Ronald Reagan, and this Congress adopted a program that gave legal status to 3 million illegal aliens in the United States. We did so in the hopes of clearing up the problem. Instead, what we created was an attractive reason for more to come illegally in hopes of gaining the same status. Today, 20 years later, we have estimates of 11 million to 13 million Americans who came exactly that way—over the border illegally in hopes of that same promise that happened in 1986.

Were we to pass in this body this year a bill granting status that does not require, first, security on the border, then we will create the same attractiveness we did 20 years ago. The result will be the same, and the legacy to another Congress and the problems in our social services system in our great country will be great. It is impor-

tant that whatever security requirements we place in this legislation—and there should be many—be funded and be in place before any other provision takes place.

Second, it is important to understand that enforcing the border is something we can do. Before I introduced border security legislation a few weeks ago, I traveled to the United States border with Mexico. I went to San Diego and Tijuana, met with our border agents who are having remarkable success now because of technology and, of course, because of improved numbers.

I went to Fort Huachuca in Arizona where the one and only unmanned aerial surveillance vehicle, the Predator, has a 150-mile stretch of the United States-Mexican border secure because we have eyes in the sky 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

For \$400 million, we can deploy a fleet of 26 of those unmanned Predator aircraft to have eyes in the sky 24/7 along the entire 2,000-mile border. That will have a tripling effect on our manpower because it allows us through technology to identify those who are coming and where they are, to position the agents we have to intercept them and turn them around. It will send the signal that no longer are we going to look the other way but instead we are going to focus on those who are trying to come here illegally and be smuggled, and shut the door so they will apply legally to come to this country the right way, as so many American guests have and some citizens have, to ultimately become naturalized.

This place we all call home and the rest of the world calls America is a very special place. Our problem isn't that people are trying to break out of this great country; they are all trying to break into this great country. We owe it to our country and our future and to the legacy of our children to assure that the path to this country is legal and operable, and that it isn't done illegally and involve smuggling.

While often many of us talk about the Southwest border, it should also be true on the border with Canada as well, and it should be true at our ports.

Whatever we do in this 2 weeks of debate, it must ultimately be predicated on, first, securing the border of the United States, whether it be on the north or on the South. We must have fortitude in this Senate to pass the appropriations necessary to fund the programs to secure those borders. Rhetoric is cheap. Enforcement on our borders can be expensive. But it must be essential.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is on the floor, has been an absolute leader to the appropriations and the budget process in focusing like a laser beam on seeing to it that we authorize and ultimately appropriate the funds to do exactly that in terms of manpower. I will join him in that as well as those who put the funds up for the unmanned aerial vehicle surveillance and the ground sensors

for tunneling and other technology we have.

It is a matter of us developing a resolve to secure the borders of the United States of America. We must not demonize anybody. First, we must secure the borders which the American people expect us to secure.

I come from a great State, the State of Georgia, a State that is a major agricultural producer in this country, a State where there are many migrant laborers. I am well aware of what the green industry, the agricultural industry and the construction industry workforce, is made up of. We owe it to those industries to see to it that we have a legal path to come to this country and to work and appreciate America, that no longer will there be smuggling of illegal aliens across our border, but instead we have as a country a legal path for people to come and an illegal door that is shut because we have stopped turning and looking the other way.

I look forward to this debate. I appreciate the promise of this country, because were it not for our legal immigration process I would not be here today. But I will fight as hard as I can to see to it that whatever passes this Senate requires first and foremost the securing of our borders before the extension to guest workers or any status be granted. If we do not, we will have recreated the problem we created in 1967. We will deal not with just 3 million illegals coming but millions and millions and millions more, all because we looked the other way at a time when we needed to focus like a laser beam.

The people of this country are looking to us to secure our borders for the homeland and for immigration. We must secure them first before we do anything else.

A comprehensive bill is possible, and I have no problem with addressing comprehensive reform. But those reforms that involve guest workers must only be implemented after the certification by the Secretary of Homeland Security that our borders are secure. For failure to do so is to pass on to another generation of Americans a compounded problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I too rise to strongly support the general thrust of the President's border security bill. As the essential first step in this great challenge, we must take strong, meaningful action—not just talk but action to prove that we can and will secure our borders and return to the rule of law with regard to our immigration system.

I too rise as a descendent of immigrants to this country, and I am very proud of that. Both sets of my grandparents—on my mom's side and on my dad's side—came from France. They came first into New York but very soon thereafter to Louisiana where there are

many other French immigrants, and they settled.

What is so unique about this debate is that here in the Senate, every Senator rises and begins with a similar sort of story. We are all the descendants of immigrants. That is what makes America so magical and so unique. For a young country, we are an immigrant country, and we celebrate that. But we also want to preserve that.

To me, that comes down to two fundamental traditions in this country—the two fundamental reasons I am supporting the Frist border security bill—and that focus as a first step in this great debate is one tradition, the tradition of immigration, but it is a proud, strong tradition of legal immigration throughout the history of our country, at least until recently.

The other great tradition which I will base my vote on is the very important tradition—in fact, one of the leading reasons so many people, including my grandparents, came to this country—of the rule of law which forms the basis of so much of what we do.

Let me talk briefly about those two traditions.

First, the rule of law: It is at the heart of our entire system. It is at the heart of what is attractive to millions upon millions of people from every country around the world to become Americans, including my family. Law is at the center of our democratic traditions. Without proper law enforcement, written laws mean nothing. Failure to enforce certain laws, including our immigration laws, gives people the impression that the Federal Government will fail to enforce other laws. That tradition of the rule of law and enforcement is an essential component to comprehensive immigration reform.

A recent poll conducted by the Washington Post and ABC News found that the huge majority of Americans agrees with what I am saying. Four in five Americans think the Government is not doing enough to prevent illegal immigration, with three in five saying they strongly hold that view.

The same poll found that 56 percent of Americans believe illegal immigrants have done more to hurt the country than to help it, while only 37 percent believe illegal immigrants help the country. But the key is the illegal nature of that activity—not our proud tradition of legal immigration.

Of course, this issue of the rule of law and the explosion of illegal immigration also has a very important national security component, particularly since September 11. Adequate border security and enforcement of our immigration laws was an issue on September 11. It goes directly to the terrorist attacks. It goes directly to our war on terror.

In its report, the 9/11 Commission itself found weaknesses in immigration enforcement could have facilitated those terrorist acts. The Commission stated:

... our investigation showed that two systematic weaknesses came together in our border system's inability to contribute to an effective defense against the September 11 attacks: A lack of well-developed counterterrorism measures as part of border security, and an immigration system not able to deliver on its basic commitments, much less support counterterrorism.

Other studies have shown that 15 of the 19 September 11 hijackers, including Mohammed Atta, should have been denied visas. At least three of them overstayed their visas. Clearly, lax enforcement was an important part, sadly, of that tragedy.

There are also other issues within the country related to illegal immigration—not our proud tradition of legal immigration but illegal immigration.

First, it is very important to say we are talking about millions upon millions of people, 11 to 13 million by most estimates, even more by some. It is important to say the great majority of those people are not dangerous criminals. However, some percentage of those folks do contribute enormously to our criminal issues in this country. A GAO report issued in April of 2005 says the number of criminal aliens incarcerated in the United States increased by 15 percent from 2001 to 2004. Those aliens constitute about 27 percent of all Federal prisoners. That is a cost to the Federal Government of about \$1.2 billion a year. That specific year was 2004. It is an enormous cost to our country. Again, a small percentage of those balloon the costs to society.

Violent gangs, composed mostly of criminal aliens such as the El Salvadoran-based MS-13, have been a very important and dangerous part of the criminal problem and violent crime in this country. Last March, ICE agents deported 37 criminal aliens rounded up in the Washington, DC area, two of whom had ties to MS-13. MS-13 has spread across the country. Over 2,000 members are in northern Virginia alone.

For all of these reasons, real enforcement must come first in our meeting this challenge. It must come first because we need to get control of our borders. We need to get control of the serious repercussions this illegal problem has in our country, including on the criminal side. To do this, we must prove to the American people we are not just going to talk about it as window dressing to what is tantamount to an amnesty program. We are going to do it. We are going to put the resources behind it. We are going to deploy those unmanned aerial vehicles. We are going to do what is next in terms of manpower enforcement and other resources at the border.

I am a fairly typical American when it comes to this issue. I have heard this enforcement talk in Washington for the last couple of years. I don't believe most of it. Quite frankly, we have never been true to it. We have never been serious about it. We have never turned the corner on this issue before.

I believe it is our solemn duty and responsibility in terms of addressing this

issue in a comprehensive way to first not only pass border security and significant enforcement measures, but to put them in practice, to fund them, to get agents on the border, to do whatever it takes to turn the corner on this issue and prove to the American people, prove to me and so many millions of others, we are serious about enforcement.

There is another reason I believe we must start with enforcement, as the Frist measure does. It is because any measure that is tantamount to amnesty sends exactly the wrong message as we try to get our hands around this problem. We are a nation that believes in upholding the rule of law. We must reestablish respect for our laws, including border security and interior security. But provisions which are tantamount to amnesty send exactly the opposite message. It sends the message that you can break the law and over time you will basically be rewarded for doing so.

These are not just theoretical or commonsense arguments. These are arguments that are borne out by history, as Senator ISAKSON, the previous speaker, pointed out.

The last amnesty type of program enacted by this Congress was in 1986. There have been many studies about the effects of that since then. Across the board they show that act of basically granting amnesty to a class of illegal aliens in this country dramatically worsened the problem. It did nothing to solve the problem. In 1992, for instance, 6 years after the last illegal alien agricultural worker amnesty passed in 1986, the Commission on Agricultural Workers issued a report to Congress that studied the effects of that 1986 agriculture worker amnesty. They made a number of findings and recommendations. First, the Commission found that the number of workers amnestied under the bill had been severely underestimated. I fear many of the estimates we are talking about here today are underestimated.

Second, the Commission found the agriculture worker amnesty only exacerbated existing problems.

Six years after AIRC was signed into law the problems within the system of agricultural labor continue to exist . . . In most areas, an increasing number of newly arriving, unauthorized workers compete for available jobs, reducing the number of work hours available to all harvest workers and contributing to lower annual earnings . . .

Third, the Commission stated that a guest worker amnesty program should not be the basis for future immigration policy. The Commission went on to say the only way to have a structured and stable market was to increase enforcement of our immigration laws, certainly including strong employer sanctions.

So we have experience to guide us. We have concrete history to learn by. Why do we believe doing the same thing as we did in 1986, only on a much greater scale, is going to yield different results?

The Frist bill is not perfect, but it is a good and an appropriate start. And start we must on the enforcement side of the equation to prove we can get real, get tough, get serious about enforcement as never before. Because, quite frankly, we have never, ever, in the history of this modern problem proven that we will be serious, that we will have the political will, that we will devote the manpower and other resources necessary to turn the corner on this issue.

I urge all of my colleagues to start here where there is consensus, where we can come together around common-sense, meaningful, and appropriate enforcement actions as the important first step in addressing this very important challenge.

The Senate is having a very important and responsible debate on this issue. It is crucial in this debate that we be respectful of each other and of everyone involved in this issue and not demonize any part of society. That applies equally to those who believe we must start with enforcement as it does to people illegally in this country.

No one in this Senate, I believe, is anti-immigration. Everyone is a product of a strong and proud history of immigration in this country. But until recently it was a strong and proud history of legal immigration. I truly believe what most threatens that strong and proud history and the support in this country for that foundation of our society is the fact that illegal immigration has subsumed that tradition.

If we want to continue to cherish that tradition, if we want to continue to have respect for all members of our society, no matter how they look or appear, we must get back to that important tradition of legal immigration. We must get back to the rule of law so we can defend that strong tradition and get hold of this very serious challenge our country faces.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New Hampshire.

**Mr. GREGG.** Mr. President, obviously the issue before the Senate is a critical issue—how we maintain the atmosphere of this Nation, which is basically the essence of our definition of a culture, which is that we are a society which invites people from around the world to participate in our society. It was the reason we went with the motto, *E pluribus unum*: from many, one. How we maintain that atmosphere, that way of life which has given us so much energy as a nation, that has given so many people the opportunity to pursue the American dream, is what this debate is all about.

Whatever we do, we do not want to, in my opinion, chill that great tradition which is the engine for our strength as a nation. People come here seeking a better life, and as a result they energize society to be even more productive, successful, and stronger.

We are, as has been mentioned by most of the speakers today, most all of

us immigrants. Certainly everyone in the Senate since the departure of the great Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell falls into that category.

The issue, in my opinion, breaks into two obvious parts. The first is how you secure the border. The second is how you deal with the fact there is a large number of people in this country who are here illegally today and that there is a large number of people who wish to come to this country for the purposes of earning a living, and that they will come into this country however they can—and if it is illegal, they will come here illegally—and how we would change that atmosphere.

On the first issue, which has been discussed and which is the purpose of the bill before the Senate, the bill filed by the Senate majority leader, this is very resolvable. We can secure our borders. That has been said by everyone. And we should. We must. We cannot as a culture survive if we do not have borders which are secure, if we do not know who is coming into the country, if we do not know who is coming here. If we have large numbers of people who are coming into this Nation illegally, it undermines us as a nation of laws.

There is no question but this can be resolved. It does not take a lot of new law to do that, to be very honest. We can pretty well control who is coming into this country. I want to get into the specifics of how we do that because I have the good fortune to chair the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the borders in the appropriations area. I will talk about what we need there. Before I do that, I also want to address this issue of amnesty and guest worker and how we deal with the folks who are here and who are here illegally.

Let's assume for the moment we are able to secure the southern border, which I think we can. It might take 2 or 3 years, but I am absolutely sure we can do that, so that the vast majority of the people coming across our southern borders will come across in some manner which is legal, for a purpose which is not to harm us. That is a little more difficult to do on the northern border. We do not have the human wave coming across the northern border. The northern border is probably more of a terrorist threat to us, actually, in many ways, but it does not have the human wave issue that we see on the southern border.

The question becomes, how do you deal with the folks who are already here illegally? There is this term, we cannot give them amnesty; amnesty is wrong. Well, as a practical matter, they already have amnesty. Our system is not able to deal with these individuals unless they become criminals, unless they commit an act which violates our law in an open way, commit a felony, do something that is clearly a transgression to our society. But if they are here working, as most of them are, trying to support themselves or their families or their families back

home, for all intents and purposes they already have amnesty because we are not doing anything about it and we do not have the capacity to do anything about it. That is a straw dog, to be very honest, this argument of amnesty.

The bigger question, more fundamental question, is how do you set up a system which allows these people to come out from behind the bushes where they have to hide, so they are not taken advantage of, so they can be even more productive in their role here in the United States, and do it in a way that does not basically affront our sensibilities as a nation of laws, and especially address the issue of citizenship.

There are a lot of ways to do that. There are a lot of ideas being put forward to do that. I happen to think the essence of the question is how you deal with the issue of citizenship. If you are here illegally, getting citizenship should be probably not attainable, but certainly there should be a way to allow you to still participate in our society so you do not have to hide.

That assumes, however, you have effectively set up a border enforcement mechanism which works because, as the point was made by the Senator from Louisiana, you cannot move to any sort of effort to try to redress or address the issue of people who are here illegally unless you have more control of the borders because you simply will create an incentive for more people to come in illegally.

But let's remember that if we were able to solve the problem of the people who are here illegally and who are working and who seek nothing more than to be working, if we were able to give them some sort of status that would allow them to participate as workers in this country in a public way, so they were able to participate in systems such as paying into the health care system, paying into retirement systems, I think we might actually be moving toward a more constructive result than what we have today, which is essentially a large number of people who we know are here and we just turn our eyes to the fact they are here illegally. They are going to continue to stay here and work here. We certainly are not going to remove them because we have no way to remove 10, 11 million people, however many people there are, except for those people who commit criminal acts.

So I think the debate is misfocused in some ways when the word "amnesty" becomes the hot button nomenclature versus the more substantive question: What you do with people who are already here and basically have the capacity to be here, and they already have amnesty, for all intents and purposes, because we are not going to do anything about them so long as they act legally in the context of their jobs because we do not have the capacity to remove 11 million people, and our society would not be able to absorb it.

But getting into the issue I wish to talk about today, which is the specifics



of the Border Patrol question and how you upgrade the Border Patrol, the bill before us authorizes an additional 1,400 Border Patrol agents over the next few years and authorizes more beds for detention. It authorizes more technology for the purposes of guarding the border. That is all well and good. I strongly support those authorization efforts.

But the bottom line is, the rubber does not meet the road with the authorization bill. The rubber meets the road with when we spend the money, which is with the appropriations bill. The problem we have, very simply, is we are not committing resources in this area to the level we need to accomplish what is already on the books in the way of obtaining security along the border.

Security along the border basically breaks down to three basic components: First, how many agents, how many feet on the ground do you have down there? Second, how many beds do you have, so when you find people who are coming across illegally, you can actually control where they are going, so you are not basically catching and releasing but you can actually hold these people and send them back? And third, what technologies are necessary in order to, first, monitor the border, and secondly, evaluate people who are coming into our country as to whether they are coming here to participate in our society in a positive way or whether they are coming here to do us harm?

In all four of those categories—three categories with a couple subcategories—we simply have not been able to put the resources in that are necessary to get where we want to go. This does not mean we have not tried. In fact, in the last 2 years, we have increased the number of Border Patrol agents by 1,500. That is almost 1,300 more than the administration asked for. We added over 2,000 beds to detention. We have significantly increased the funding for the surveillance and technology area, especially in the area of US-VISIT, which is the program which is essentially going to try to, through technology, be able to evaluate people as they come into the country legally and know whether they are people whom we want to have visit us or whether they are people who may be here to do us harm.

But that has not generated the results we need. I wish to go through a few statistics which are, unfortunately, rather stark but should be talked about because you are not going to get resolution around here unless you talk about them.

The first is the issue of border agents. We have been increasing the number of our border agents rather significantly over the last couple years, as I just mentioned, but we also know we need to increase them even further in order to hit what is the goal. With 20,000 agents on the border, we can accomplish what we need to do relative to boots on the ground. That means we have to increase—by 1,500, 2,000, 2,000 in

each of the next few years—the number of agents we put on the ground, the number of agents in the system.

The problem is very simple: One is a dollar issue, which should be able to be resolved but, secondly, it is an issue of being able to hire. It takes 30,000 applications, approximately, in order to hire 1,000 agents. It is very difficult to find the people we need—it is that simple—because of the language requirements and because of the educational requirements and because of the demands of the job. So it is not only an issue of money, it is an issue of hiring up. And that is a big problem for us.

A second problem we have is that the technology situation is dire, especially in the area of aircraft, where we are essentially functioning with a fleet of aircraft which has long outlived its purposes.

The average life of the P-3s we have in the air should be 20 years, but the average life of the P-3s that are actually flying is 40 years. I want to show you a picture of the problem we have with the P-3s, which basically is the backbone of our air surveillance. This is a crack in the bathtub fitting of a P-3. As a result, last year, we had 11,000 hours of P-3 flight, but this year alone we have had to reduce the P-3 flights by over 1,000 hours because we have had to retrofit these planes. Why? Because they are 40 years old or older, and they should have flown for 20 years.

We have the same problem in our helicopter fleet, where the average life is supposed to be 15 years for our helicopters. We are flying helicopters which have average lives of 30 years.

The same is true of our Beech King air fleet, where the average life is supposed to be 20 years, and they are well over 30 years.

These are problems of resources which need to be addressed. I will talk in a second as to how they should be addressed.

The third issue in the area of surveillance—we have heard about the Predator, which is the unarmed, in this case, air surveillance system along the border. This is a great breakthrough for us. We do not have to build a fence along the southern border. Building a fence would be the exact wrong message to send, in my opinion. There are certain sections where there are heavily populated communities where you are going to have to have some fencing, but the vast majority of the border does not require fencing, should not have fencing. It is the wrong image for us as a nation. And with technology, we can do a lot.

One of the keys to technology is the Predator. But we only have one Predator. We need 18 in order to effectively do the border. So, again, it is an issue of resources, putting resources in this area.

In the area of beds, we know the States are absorbing a huge amount of the costs of basically taking care of the illegal aliens who have been arrested. We know we do not yet have the beds

necessary to be able to even hold the non-Mexican arrests, which are the people we are most concerned about from a terrorist standpoint. We need to add a lot of new beds. We need to be creative about this—not just having physical buildings; we need to figure out ways to use swing beds. We need to figure out ways to use closed military facilities, maybe tents, tent capabilities. But we need to put more resources in this area, although this Congress has attempted to do it by adding over 2,000 beds in the last few years.

So we have serious resource issues. Well, how do we address this issue? There will be a supplemental coming through here in a few days—in a week—which is the supplemental to fight the war on terror. Now, it seems to me that probably one of the core elements of fighting the war on terror is making sure your borders are secure.

I would hope within the limit of that supplemental we would be able to fund the capital needs or at least make the first downpayment on the major capital needs I have just outlined in the border areas, specifically: the aircraft, replace those P-3 aircraft, buy more Predators, replace the helicopters, make sure the cars these agents drive can go out in the field day after day and still work well so we can move the agents out into the field, make the capital investments in the buildings necessary in order to take care of these people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GREGG. That is something we should do now. It is something we should do in the context of national defense, and it should be done as part of the supplemental.

The bigger problem we have is that when the Homeland Security bill hits this floor, we are going to have to figure out a way to pay for this. The administration has proposed we increase fees on air transportation. Well, air transportation fees do not necessarily line up with Border Patrol needs. In fact, the Border Patrol needs are not affected by air transportation fees. Air transportation fees fund things such as TSA. So it is unlikely that fee is going to occur. But if we do not do it, we are going to have a \$1.6 billion hole in the Homeland Security budget. We cannot afford that. We need those extra dollars. So we will have to come up with a way to do that. I am making my commitment to do that.

But the reason I wanted to speak today was to make it clear we can, with additional resources, accomplish the first step to border security and to good immigration policy, which is border security, which allows us to know who is coming into this country. It is a very doable thing. All it takes is resources. I believe we should have, as a Congress, the wherewithal and the willingness to commit those resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I commend Senators McCain and Kennedy, who are on the Senate floor. They have really pointed the way for a positive resolution of a problem we have faced for generations in America.

The immigration system in our country is seriously broken, and we know it. It is obvious, as we look at the number of undocumented people in America and as we consider, those of us in this line of work, all of the families who come to us with problems with the current system. There is so much unfairness, so much injustice. We can do better as a nation, a nation of immigrants.

Now the Senate will face a very clear and stark choice. Senator Frist brings to the floor an alternative. His is an alternative that focuses on enforcement.

Well, Senator Frist is not alone in believing we need to be better at enforcing the laws of our country. In fact, Senator Frist's bill and the bill I support—the one that came from the Senate Judiciary Committee, supported by Senator Specter, the chairman of the committee, inspired by Senators McCain and Kennedy in major part—is a bill which also focuses on enforcement.

Both bills double the size of the Border Patrol by adding 12,000 new agents. Both bills strengthen interior enforcement of immigration laws by adding 5,000 new immigration investigators. Both bills would take advantage of new technology to create a "virtual fence" at the border. Both bills would improve border controls by expanding entry-exit tracking. Both bills require the construction of new vehicle barriers and new permanent highway checkpoints near the border. The list goes on and on. The bills are the same when it comes to enforcement at our broken borders, as it should be.

But what the Frist bill does beyond that is what is clearly unacceptable, from my point of view, and was unacceptable in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Frist bill continues the provision that was started in the House of Representatives which criminalizes those who are here in undocumented status and those who help them. That is where this bill, the Frist bill, crosses the line. That is why it is unacceptable. This concept was rejected in the Senate Judiciary Committee and should be rejected on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Think about it for a moment. Are we serious that we are going to charge 12 million people with the crime that Senator Frist would create in his provision? Are we saying to people who are here in the United States under a myriad of different circumstances that they are going to be treated as criminals amongst us?

To what end? To arrest them, to apprehend them, to prosecute them, to incarcerate them? Of course, we can't do that. With 12 million people, it can't be done.

But by branding them as criminals at the outset, it is a guarantee they will

never come out of the shadows. They will stay lurking as part of our culture, part of our economy in illegal status indefinitely. Criminalizing them is not the answer.

Sadly, the bill goes even further. In the instance of undocumented people amongst us, it would subject them to a misdemeanor subject to 6 months in jail, but it goes much further for the Good Samaritans who assist them. That is the most outrageous element of the Frist bill. It is harsh. It is not American.

Consider this for a moment. If a priest counsels a mother that she should remain in the United States with her children who happen to have been born here and are American citizens, that priest can be found guilty of an aggravated felony for having counseled her to stay in the United States. In the city of Chicago, which I am proud to represent, we have a domestic violence shelter, *Mujeres Latinas en Accion*. It is in a section known as Little Village. It is primarily a Mexican section of our city. Some are citizens; some are not. This domestic violence shelter brings in battered mothers and their children to protect them from their abusive, drunken husbands while they call the police department. The social workers who are standing at the door protecting those mothers and children would be subject to being charged with a felony under the Frist provisions. A nurse who offers to a mother at a medical clinic the advice that she should bring her child back, without checking to make certain she is not undocumented, could be charged with a felony. Is that where we are headed? Is that the kind of America we want to live in? I don't think so.

The Senate Judiciary Committee rejected that. Why Senator Frist continues to offer it, I don't know. I don't think it is consistent with the goal we all share. The goal we share is in repairing the system, better enforcement at the borders, better enforcement when it comes to employment so we will know if employers are exploiting the undocumented. That is part of real enforcement that will lead to fairness and justice in the way we deal with immigration.

There's another problem with the majority leader's bill. It would do nothing to address the situation of 12 million undocumented immigrants who currently live in our country. We need tougher enforcement, but in the Judiciary Committee bill we acknowledge something that the majority leader's bill does not: A strategy that focuses on enforcement only is doomed to failure.

Beyond that, the McCain-Kennedy bill, which is an inspired piece of legislation, would offer a chance for immigrants who work hard and play by the rules to earn their way to citizenship over the course of many years. This is not an amnesty. Amnesty says we forgive you. The McCain-Kennedy bill does not say that. The McCain-Ken-

neddy bill says: If you are here undocumented for a variety of reasons, if you are here without legal status, there is a path you can follow. It is a long path, a demanding path, but at the end, you could end up in a legal position or have a chance. That is the best approach for us to use.

Let me tell you exactly what the McCain-Kennedy provisions would require in this path to legalization. It is not a free ride. It is not a get-out-of-jail-free card. Let me tell you what you would have to do during the course of an 11-year commitment on your part to finally reach citizenship: a clean criminal record, employment since before January 2004, remaining continuously employed during this period, paying approximately \$2,000 in fines and fees, passing a security background check, passing a medical examination, learning English, learning U.S. history and government, and paying all back taxes. If you have complied with all of those requirements, you will go to the back of the line behind all applicants currently waiting for green cards. That is not an amnesty; that is a demanding process which will test the undocumented as to whether they really want to be part of America on a legal and permanent basis.

All of us understand—those of us who are the sons and daughters of immigrants—that the people who come to these shores bring a special quality. David Brooks of the *New York Times* has an article which I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD.

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

#### IMMIGRANTS TO BE PROUD OF

(By David Brooks)

Everybody says the Republicans are split on immigration. The law-and-order types want to close the border. The free-market types want plentiful labor. But today I want to talk to the social conservatives, because it's you folks who are really going to swing this debate.

I'd like to get you to believe what Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas believes: that a balanced immigration bill is consistent with conservative values. I'd like to try to persuade the evangelical leaders in the tall grass to stop hiding on this issue.

My first argument is that the exclusionists are wrong when they say the current wave of immigration is tearing our social fabric. The facts show that the recent rise in immigration hasn't been accompanied by social breakdown, but by social repair. As immigration has surged, violent crime has fallen by 57 percent. Teen pregnancies and abortion rates have declined by a third. Teenagers are having fewer sexual partners and losing their virginity later. Teen suicide rates have dropped. The divorce rate for young people is on the way down.

Over the past decade we've seen the beginnings of a moral revival, and some of the most important work has been done by Catholic and evangelical immigrant churches, by faith-based organizations like the Rev. Luis Cortés's *Nueva Esperanza*, by Hispanic mothers and fathers monitoring their kids. The anti-immigration crowd says this country is under assault. But if that's so, we're under assault by people who love their children.

My second argument is that the immigrants themselves are like a booster shot of traditional morality injected into the body politic. Immigrants work hard. They build community groups. They have traditional ideas about family structure, and they work heroically to make them a reality.

This is evident in everything from divorce rates (which are low, given immigrants' socioeconomic status) to their fertility rates (which are high) and even the way they shop.

Hispanics and Hispanic immigrants have less money than average Americans, but they spend what they have on their families, usually in wholesome ways. According to Simmons Research, Hispanics are 57 percent more likely than average Americans to have purchased children's furniture in the past year. Mexican-Americans spend 93 percent more on children's music.

According to the government's Consumer Expenditure Survey, Hispanics spend more on gifts, on average, than other Americans. They're more likely to support their parents financially. They're more likely to have big family dinners at home.

This isn't alien behavior. It's admirable behavior, the antidote to the excessive individualism that social conservatives decry.

My third argument is that good values lead to success, and that immigrants' long-term contributions more than compensate for the short-term strains they cause. There's no use denying the strains immigration imposes on schools, hospitals and wage levels in some markets (but economists are sharply divided on this).

So over the long haul, today's immigrants succeed. By the second generation, most immigrant families are middle class and paying taxes that more than make up for the costs of the first generation. By the third generation, 90 percent speak English fluently and 50 percent marry non-Latinos.

My fourth argument is that government should be at least as virtuous as the immigrants themselves. Right now (as under Bill Frist's legislation), government pushes immigrants into a chaotic underground world. The Judiciary Committee's bill, which Senator Brownback supports, would tighten the borders; but it would also reward virtue. Immigrants who worked hard, paid fines, paid their taxes, stayed out of trouble and waited their turn would have a chance to become citizens. This isn't government enabling vice; it's government at its best, encouraging middle-class morality.

Social conservatives, let me ask you to consider one final thing. Women who have recently arrived from Mexico have bigger, healthier babies than more affluent non-Hispanic white natives. That's because strong family and social networks support these pregnant women, reminding them what to eat and do. But the longer they stay, and the more assimilated they become, the more bad habits they acquire and the more problems their subsequent babies have.

Please ask yourself this: As we contemplate America's moral fiber, do the real threats come from immigrants, or are some people merely blaming them for sins that are already here?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Brooks' message was addressed primarily to Republicans and conservatives, but he spells out for all who read it what these immigrant people bring to America. My mother came to these shores in 1911 at the age of 2. Her mother, my grandmother, brought her from Lithuania with her brother and sister. They made to it East St. Louis, IL, where my grandfather worked in a steel mill. My mom dropped out of school after the eighth

grade, which was not unusual in her time, got married, and a few years later became a naturalized citizen. Her son is now the 47th Senator from the State of Illinois. Those stories can be told over and over.

Think of the courage of the people who came here, starting with my family and others, the courage to leave behind your village, your church, your language, your relatives, your friends, to come to a country you have never seen before with a language you didn't speak to try to make a better life. So many of us are so blessed to be here from the start, but others fight night and day for the chance to come. They don't just bring another body to be counted; they bring a spirit. It is a spirit of hard work and determination, creativity, entrepreneurship. It is a spirit of family values that we should treasure. Mr. Brooks says as much in his article.

This is a positive force in the development of America, and it always has been. We should look at this as a positive opportunity for America to be a stronger nation, a nation that grows in the right direction with the right people and the right values.

The Frist bill is the wrong approach. Criminalizing those who are here, charging those who help them with felonies for simply providing humanitarian assistance is wrong. It is far better for us to take the more constructive and comprehensive approach of the Specter bill that was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the agreement of the Senator from Massachusetts, to use his time and an additional 5 minutes, if necessary.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. First, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for allowing me this time. Working with him on this issue has been an experience that I believe will result in benefit to the country. I appreciate the effort we have made together.

As we know, the Senate is beginning debate on a very important and complex subject that is among the most difficult and divisive we face. Our Nation's immigration system is broken. Without comprehensive immigration reform, our Nation's security will remain vulnerable. That is why we must act.

I begin by commending Chairman SPECTER and the members of the Judiciary Committee for the considerable effort they have taken to report a comprehensive immigration reform measure that could be considered during this debate. While I am not in agreement with each and every provision, it is a great starting point for the debate.

Those of us from border States witness every day the impact illegal immigration is having on our friends and

neighbors, our county and city services, our economy, and our environment. We deal with the degradation of our lands and the demands imposed on our hospitals and other public resources. Our current system doesn't protect us from people who want to harm us. It doesn't meet the needs of our economy. It leaves too many people vulnerable to exploitation and abuse.

Throughout this debate, we will be reminded that immigration is a national security issue, and it is. It is also a matter of life and death for many living along the border. We have hundreds of people flowing across our borders every day, an estimated 11 million to 12 million people living in the shadows in every State in our country. While we believe the majority are hard-working people contributing to our economy and society, we can also assume there are some people who want to do us harm hiding among the millions who have come here only in search of better lives for themselves and their families. We need new policies that will allow us to concentrate our resources on finding those who have come here for purposes more dangerous than finding a job.

Last year, when Senators KENNEDY, BROWNBACK, LIEBERMAN, GRAHAM, MARTINEZ, OBAMA, SALAZAR, and I worked together to develop a sensible, bipartisan and comprehensive immigration reform measure, first and foremost among our priorities was to ensure our bill included strong border security and enforcement provisions. We need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security has the resources it needs to secure our borders to the greatest extent possible. These include manpower, vehicles, and detention facilities for those apprehended. But we also need to take a 21st century approach to this 21st century problem. We need to create virtual barriers as well through the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, ground sensors, cameras, vehicle barriers, advanced communications systems, and the most up-to-date security technologies available to us.

The border security provisions under the leader's bill and the Judiciary Committee's bill provide sound proposals to promote strong enforcement and should be part of any final bill. However, I do not believe the Senate should or will pass an enforcement-only bill. Our experiences with our current immigration system have proven that outdated or unrealistic laws will never be fully enforceable regardless of every conceivable border security improvement we make. Despite an increase in Border Patrol agents from 3,600 to 10,000, despite quintupling the Border Patrol budget, despite the employment of new technologies and tactics, all to enforce current immigration laws, illegal immigration drastically increased during the 1990s. While strengthening border security is an essential component of national security, it must also be accompanied by immigration reforms.

We have seen time and again that as long as there are jobs available in this country for people who live in poverty and hopelessness in other countries, these people will risk their lives to cross our borders no matter how formidable the barriers, and most will be successful. Our reforms need to reflect the reality and help us separate economic immigrants from security risks. We need to establish a temporary worker program that permits workers from other countries to the extent they are needed to fill jobs that would otherwise go unfilled.

We need workers in this country. There are certain jobs Americans are simply not willing to do. For example, today in California and Arizona, food is rotting on the vine and lettuce is dying in the fields because farmers can't find workers to harvest their crops. At the same time, resorts in my own State of Arizona cannot open to capacity because there are not enough workers to clean the rooms. Restaurants are locking their doors because there is no one to serve the food or clear the dishes. We are facing a situation whereby the U.S. population does not provide the workers businesses desperately need, yet the demand for their services and products continues. The current immigration system does not adequately and lawfully address this problem. As long as this situation exists without a legal path for essential workers to enter the country, we will have desperate people illegally crossing our borders and living in the shadows of our towns, cities, and rural communities. That is not acceptable, particularly when we are fighting a war on terror.

The vast majority of individuals attempting to cross our borders do not intend to harm our country. They are coming to meet our demand for labor and earn money to feed their families. By the Border Patrol's own estimates, 99 percent of those apprehended coming across the border are doing so for work. However, the Border Patrol is overwhelmed by these individuals. They cannot possibly apprehend every crosser being smuggled in, no matter how many resources we provide. That is why any immigration legislation that passes Congress must establish a legal channel for workers to enter the United States after they have passed background checks and have secured employment. Then we can free up Federal officials to focus on those individuals intending to do harm through drug smuggling, human trafficking, and terrorism.

In addition to a temporary worker program for future immigrants, we have to address the fact that 11 to 12 million people are living in the United States illegally, most of them employed, many whose children were born here and are, therefore, American citizens. Our economy has come to depend on people whose existence in our country is furtive, whose whereabouts and activities in many cases are unknown.

I have listened to and understand the concerns of those who simply advocate sealing our borders and rounding up and deporting undocumented workers currently in residence here.

Easier said than done. I have yet to hear a single proponent of this point of view offer one realistic proposal for locating, apprehending, and returning to their countries of origin over 11 million people. How do we do that? The columnist George Will quite accurately observed that it would take 200,000 buses extending along a 1,700 mile long line to deport 11 million people. That's assuming we had the resources to locate and apprehend all 11 million, or even half that number, which we don't have and, we all know, won't ever have. And even if we could exponentially increase the money and manpower dedicated to finding and arresting undocumented workers in this country, and inventing some deportation scheme on a scale that exceeds all reality, we would, by removing these people from their jobs, damage the American economy.

Instead, what we have allowed to be in effect is a de facto amnesty, where, for all practical purposes, a permanent underclass of people live within our borders illegally, fearfully, subversively, vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Most of these people aren't going anywhere. No matter how much we improve border security. No matter the penalties we impose on their employers. No matter how seriously they are threatened with punishment. We won't find most of them. We won't find most of their employers. There are jobs here that Americans aren't accepting, that people in other countries who have no future there will eagerly accept. They will find their way to those jobs, and employers who can't fill them any other way will employ them.

And what of those we do apprehend? Do they have children who were born here? What shall we do with these Americans—and they are Americans by virtue of their birth here—when we deport their parents? Shall we build a lot of new orphanages? Find adoptive parents for them? Deny their citizenship and ship them back, too? No, Mr. President, we'll do none of these things. We'll simply continue our de facto amnesty program. Because we all know, we aren't going to find and deport so many millions and suffer the dislocation and agonizing moral dilemmas that such an impossible task would engender. So let's be honest about that, shall we?

The opponents of our attempt to address undocumented workers in this country decry as amnesty our proposal to bring them out from their shadows and into compliance with our laws amnesty. No, Mr. President, it is not. Amnesty is, as I observed, for all practical purposes what exists today. We can pretend otherwise, but that doesn't make it so. Amnesty is simply declaring people who entered the country illegally citizens of the United States,

and imposing no other requirements on them. That is not what we do, Mr. President.

Under the provisions of our legislation, undocumented workers will have incentives to declare their existence and comply with our laws. They may apply for a worker visa. They would be subjected to background checks. They must pay a substantial fine, pay their back taxes, learn English, and enroll in civic education, remain employed here for six years, and then, at the end of those six years, go to the back of the line to apply for legal permanent resident (LPR) status. I believe most undocumented workers will accept these requirements in order to escape the fear, uncertainty and vulnerability to exploitation they currently endure. And while those who have come here to do us harm won't come out of hiding to accept these conditions, we will at least be spared the Herculean task of finding and sorting through millions of people who came here simply to earn a living.

What are our opponent's alternatives? Raid and shutter businesses in every city and state in the country? Clog our courts with millions of immigration cases? Offer illegal immigrants the not too appealing opportunity to "report to deport?" We propose a better solution that is consistent with our country's tradition of being a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants.

Mr. President, we are aware of the burdens illegal immigrants impose on our cities and counties and States. Those burdens, which are a Federal responsibility, must be addressed. And we need also to face honestly the moral consequences of our current failed immigration system.

As I mentioned previously, immigration reform is a matter of life and death for some. At this moment, someone may be dying in the Arizona desert. According to border patrol statistics, 330 people died in fiscal year 2004, and that figure increased by 43 percent—to 472 deaths—in 2005. As temperatures in the deserts get higher and the desperation more tangible, we can only expect the death tolls to increase further this fiscal year.

In October of 2003, the Arizona Republic ran a story entitled "205 Migrants Die Hard, Lonely Deaths." I would like to read an excerpt from that story:

[In 2003] the bodies of 205 undocumented immigrants were found in Arizona. Official notations of their deaths are sketchy, contained in hundreds of pages of government reports.

Beyond the official facts, there are sometimes little details, glimpses, of the people who died.

Maria Hernandez Perez was No. 93. She was almost 2. She had thick brown hair and eyes the color of chocolate.

Kelia Velazquez-Gonzalez, 16, carried a Bible in her backpack. She was No. 109.

In some cases, stories of heroism or loyalty or love survive.

Like the Border Patrol agent who performed cardiopulmonary resuscitation on a dead man, hoping for a miracle. Or the group

of migrants who, with law officers and paramedics, helped carry their dead companion out of the desert. Or the husband who sat with his dead wife through the night.

Other stories are almost entirely lost in the desolate stretches that separate the United States and Mexico.

Within weeks, the heat makes mummies out of men. Animals carry off their bones and belongings. Many say their last words to an empty sky.

John Doe, No. 143, died with a rosary encircling his neck. His eyes were wide open.

I am hopeful that at the end of this debate in the weeks ahead, we can show the American people that we addressed a serious and urgent problem with sound judgment, honesty, common sense and compassion.

There are over 11 million people in this country illegally. They harvest our crops, tend our gardens, work in our restaurants, care for our children, clean our homes. They came as others before them came, to grasp the lowest rung of the American ladder of opportunity, to work the jobs others won't, and by virtue of their own industry and desire, to rise and build better lives for their families and a better America. That is our history, Mr. President. We are not a tribe. We are not an ethnic conclave. We are a Nation of immigrants, and that distinction has been essential to our greatness.

Yes, in this post 9/11 era, America must enforce its borders. There are people who wish to come here to do us harm, and we must vigilantly guard against them, spend whatever it takes, devote as much manpower to the task as necessary. But we must also find some way to separate those who have come here for the same reasons every immigrant has come here from those who are driven here by their hate for us and our ideals. We must concentrate our resources on the latter and persuade the former to come out from the shadows. We won't be able to persuade them if all we offer is a guarded escort back to the place of hopelessness and injustice that they had fled.

Why not say to those undocumented workers who are working the jobs that the rest of us refuse, come out from the shadows, earn your citizenship in this country? You broke the law to come here, so you must go to the back of the line, pay a fine, stay employed, learn our language, pay your taxes, obey our laws, and earn the right to be an American. Riayen Tejada immigrated to New York from the Dominican Republic. He came with two dreams, he said, to become an American citizen and to serve in the United States Marine Corps. He willingly accepted the obligations of American citizenship before he possessed all the rights of an American. Staff Sergeant Tejada, from Washington Heights by way of the Dominican Republic, the father of two young daughters, died in an ambush in Baghdad on May 14, 2004. He had never fulfilled his first dream to become a naturalized American citizen. But he loved this country so much that he gave his life to defend her. Right now,

at this very moment, there are fighting for us in Iraq and Afghanistan soldiers who are not yet American citizens but who have dreamed that dream, and have risked their lives to defend it. They should make us proud, not selfish, to be Americans.

They came to grasp the lowest rung of the ladder, and they intend to rise. Let them rise. Let them rise. Let us take care to protect our country from harm, but let us not mistake the strengths of our greatness for weaknesses. We are blessed, bountiful, beautiful America—the land of hope and opportunity—the land of the immigrant's dreams. Long may she remain so.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3192

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, yesterday Senator FRIST spoke about his bill and I spoke about the committee bill. We said that today, after there had been speeches, at approximately noon, I would propose an amendment that would be the committee bill.

I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3192.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as noted, this amendment will put before the Senate the bill which was passed out of the Judiciary Committee on Monday. There is one modification. There is a title which remains as to judicial review, and for procedural purposes, we have left the title in as to judicial review. But it is my intention to modify that, depending upon what the hearing discloses on Monday.

As is known, we worked under considerable time pressure. The leader wanted a bill reported out on Monday. People came back from recess early, and people were in town on Sunday night so we could start Monday morning, which we did at 10 o'clock, and worked through until 1 p.m., and then from 2 p.m. until past 6 p.m.

The section on judicial review was not subject to debate because the chairman's mark had a consolidation of the Federal circuit. We had considerable debate about that, so we have scheduled a hearing for Monday where

we will take up those issues. Then in the course of floor debate next week, we will modify that section, depending upon what we hear and what we decide to do.

Mr. President, I ask that Senator LEAHY, the distinguished ranking member, be listed as the original cosponsor.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the schedule, as agreed to, will call for continued debate. The majority leader, Senator FRIST, will have an amendment to offer involving the subject of deaths at the border. It is anticipated that there will be a 3 o'clock vote on the Frist amendment and that there will be an allocation and scheduling of time for debate until 5 o'clock.

Yesterday I urged Senators to file their amendments, to make them known to the ranking member, Senator LEAHY, and myself, so we could schedule debate. We have a prodigious task ahead of us. We are scheduled for a 2-week recess beginning at the close of business a week from tomorrow. It is going to be a daunting task to finish this bill on that schedule, but we have undertaken daunting tasks before and succeeded. That can be done only if we have cooperation from Members.

I ask Members who have amendments to consider at the outset time agreements so we can move ahead. I give notice to my colleagues that in order to complete this business, we are going to have to hold the voting time to 15 minutes, plus the 5-minute leeway, but we are not going to allow the votes to run 25 minutes, 30 minutes, 21 minutes. We are going to move ahead under the rules of the Senate.

As I say, it is a prodigious job to get finished by next Thursday night or on Friday. The temper of the Senate is to try to finish on a Thursday late before a recess, but to do that we are going to have to have a lot of cooperation to avoid a Friday session or, depending on the will of the leader, a session beyond Friday into the weekend, if necessary, to complete this bill.

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. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I understand the majority leader may be coming soon and, if he does, I will suspend my remarks so he may be recognized and hope that after he is recognized, I can continue with my remarks.

This week, the Senate begins an overdue reform of our immigration laws. The Chair has been in the middle of that and is making contributions to it. Because nearly 10,000 illegal aliens cross the United States border every day, more than 3 million a year, we

should start—start—with border security. But then, once we secure the border and can uphold our limits on immigration, we should get quickly back to the American tradition of creating a legal status for those whom we welcome to temporarily work and study in the United States and who, by doing so, enrich our diversity and spur our economy. But my purpose today is to make sure we don't stop there, that we don't overlook, as Paul Harvey might say, "the rest of the story," the rest of the immigration story; that is, helping prospective citizens who are legally here become Americans.

Joined by Senators CORNYN, ISAKSON, COCHRAN, SANTORUM, FRIST, and MCCONNELL, I have introduced S. 1815, the Strengthening American Citizenship Act that is indispensable to any comprehensive immigration bill. This legislation I plan to offer as an amendment at the appropriate time during this debate would help legal immigrants who are embarked on a path toward citizenship to learn our common language, to learn our history, and to learn our way of government by the following steps:

No. 1, providing them with \$500 grants for English courses; No. 2, allowing those who become fluent in English to apply for citizenship 1 year early; that is, after 4 years instead of 5; next, providing grants to organizations to offer courses in American history and civics; next, authorizing a new foundation to assist in these efforts; next, codifying the oath of allegiance, which new citizens swear when they are naturalized. It is an oath of allegiance that is very much like the oath of allegiance George Washington and his officers took at Valley Forge in 1778, about which I am going to have more to say.

In addition, our amendment would ask the Homeland Security Department, working with the National Archivist and others in our Government, to carry out a strategy to highlight the ceremonies, such as the one the President attended this week, in which immigrants become American citizens; finally, our amendment would establish an award to recognize the contribution of outstanding new American citizens.

Harvard political scientist Samuel Huntington has written that most of our politics is about conflicts among principles that unite us as a country. More than any other subject we might discuss, this immigration debate will involve the basic principles of what it means to become an American. That is why we begin the debate with border security, not because we are pro-immigrant or anti-immigrant. That is not what we are talking about. We begin the debate with border security because as Americans we believe in the principle of the rule of law.

It is hypocritical for us in the United States of America to preach to the world about the rule of law, yet thumb our nose at the 12 million people who live here illegally. It is hypocritical

and it is dangerous to our security not to control our own borders.

There is no apology to be made for us as Americans insisting on the principle of the rule of law, just as there should be no other hesitancy about other principles, such as welcoming those who temporarily work here and study here. So the principle of the rule of law is not the only principle that is at stake in this debate. We create a legal status for those from other countries whom we welcome to temporarily study and work here because of the principle, first, of equal opportunity, because we are a nation of immigrants; that is a part of our character, and because we founded our economy upon the principle of *laissez faire*. In other words, we are a free market economy.

So there are three more principles we need to throw into the mix along with the rule of law: equal opportunity, a nation of immigrants, *laissez faire*.

We may be outsourcing jobs, but for years we have won our wars and built our economy by "insourcing" brain power. Wernher von Braun and his colleagues from Germany helped us in the space race against the Soviets. Sixty percent of the American winners of Nobel Prizes in physics are immigrants or children of immigrants. Sixty percent of the postdoctoral students at our universities in America are foreign students. There are 572,000 foreign students studying at colleges and universities in the United States. While they are here, these students and researchers from other countries help create a higher standard of living for us Americans, and when they go home they export our values better than any foreign aid ever has.

In addition, many of the workers our economy needs to grow come from neighboring countries. I asked my staff to see if I could get an estimate of how many visas we have on the books today for workers coming to the United States from other countries. As best we can tell, we have about 500,000 visas of different forms that may be issued each year, of one kind or another, to unskilled and skilled people who come to our country. Add that to the 572,000 foreign students who study in our country and we have today a large number of people from other parts of the world who are here, enriching our country and improving our standard of living.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of visas for workers coming to the United States from other countries each year be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, these temporary students and workers have helped us create an economy that last year produced 30 percent of the world's wealth for us Americans alone, who constitute just 5 percent of the world's population. It makes no sense for us to have an immigration system

that makes it easy for unskilled workers to come here illegally and harder for the brightest people to come here legally. That is why it is my hope this comprehensive immigration bill we are considering will have in it the ideas that would make it easier, modestly easier, for a larger number of highly skilled people to come here and help us create better jobs.

For example, there are two recommendations that were made in the document called "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," by the National Academy of Sciences panel, headed by Norm Augustine. This was a set of 20 recommendations that was made to us in Congress by this distinguished panel last summer in answer to our question: What should we do to keep our advantage in science and technology so that our good-paying jobs don't go to India and China?

They told us 20 things to do. Two of the things to do had to do with making it easier for the most intelligent people in the world to work and study and do research here. One of the ideas would be to give a green card, a permanent residency card, to any student from overseas who earns a doctorate in mathematics, engineering, technology, or the physical sciences. Those persons could stay here and help improve our standard of living.

For example, at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee, the largest science laboratory in the United States of America, the director, the assistant director, and the head of our United States effort to recapture the lead in supercomputing in the world—those jobs are all filled by people from other countries who have green cards, who are here helping us improve our standard of living. So we are glad they are here, and we should make it easier for such people to come.

Craig Barrett, the head of Intel, estimates if we were to adopt this provision, that would mean perhaps 12,000 to 15,000 additional doctoral students in math, engineering, technology, or physical sciences, once they earn their degree, can stay in the United States.

The other provision was at one point in the Judiciary Committee mark. It may still be there. But it takes the cap off some categories of highly advanced people who have earned an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, and math. It is simply in our own interest to do that. It continues a long tradition and is one more example of why we already have a tradition of welcoming workers and students who temporarily work here.

So we have at least four principles at play that I have talked about: The rule of law, equal opportunity, *laissez faire*, and we have the characteristic of our country being a nation of immigrants. But there is another principle that I believe is the single most important principle we have in this debate and it is the one that is engraved above the chair of the Presiding Officer. It is the motto of this country: *E pluribus*

unum. Our work will not be complete until we help prospective citizens become Americans because our country's greatest accomplishment is based upon that principle. That is, we have united people from many different backgrounds into one nation based upon the belief in a few ideas, rather than upon race, ancestry, or background.

Of all the principles we will be debating in these next 2 weeks, none is more important than that one chosen as our national motto, the one carved in stone above the desk, *E pluribus unum*: one from many.

We are not here dividing sides up on who is pro-immigrant and who is anti-immigrant. We are here saying we have 5 important principles we all believe in that unite us as Americans, from rule of law to equal opportunity to *E pluribus unum*. We are trying to put those together in a sensible way. That is what our politics is about. That is most of what we do in the Senate and that is what the people expect us to do today. Each year we welcome about 1 million permanent new legal residents, many of whom go on to become citizens. I am now talking about people who are legally in the United States of America.

To become an American is a significant accomplishment. First, you must live in the United States as a legal permanent resident for 5 years. Next, you must learn to speak English, our common language. Next, you must learn about our history and Government. Since we are united by ideas rather than the color of our skin, one has to learn these ideas to become a citizen. Next, you must swear an oath and renounce the government of the country from which you came and then swear allegiance to the United States of America.

Those are pretty strong words—renounce the government of the country from which you came and swear allegiance to the country to which you are going. Where does that come from? This is where it comes from. This oath dates back to May 12, 1778, when General George Washington and the general officers at Valley Forge signed an oath very similar to the one taken by the 30 citizens the President swore in on Monday, the oath that more than 500,000 new American citizens took last year in hundreds of naturalization ceremonies all over America.

Here is a portion of the oath Washington and his general officers swore:

I, George Washington, Commander in Chief of the armies of the United States of America, do acknowledge the United States of America to be Free, Independent, and Sovereign states, and declare that the people thereof owe no allegiance or obedience to George the Third, King of Great-Britain; and I renounce, refuse and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him; and I do swear that I will to the utmost of my power, support, maintain and defend the said United States of America. . . .

Those were remarkable words then. Those were remarkable words on Monday, when those 30 new citizens stood up and said the same thing.

The language in the oath immigrants take today comes from that oath in 1778. It says in effect: I may be proud of where I come from, but I am prouder of where I am. In both the last session of Congress and in this session, Senator SCHUMER and I introduced legislation, S. 1087, to put the wording of the oath of allegiance derived from this into law, giving it the same dignity as the Star Spangled Banner and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Becoming an American is also a unique experience because it has nothing to do with ancestry. America is an idea, not a race. We are united by principles expressed in our founding documents, the very principles we are debating in this immigration legislation, not by our multiple ancestries.

Americans enjoy more rights than the citizens of any nation on the face of the Earth and our Founders recognized, as every citizen and prospective citizen must, that along with those rights come responsibilities. The new citizens, like those who came before, must appreciate this simple but fundamental truth: In a free society, freedom and responsibility go hand in hand.

Some have suggested our diversity is what makes our country great.

To be sure, diversity is one of our great strengths, but diversity is not our greatest strength. Jerusalem is diverse. The Balkans are diverse. Iraq is diverse. The greatest accomplishment of the United States of America is that we have molded that magnificent diversity into one nation, based upon a set of common principles, language, and traditions.

That is why the words above the desk of the Presiding Officer say one from many, not many from one. And that is why a comprehensive immigration bill is not complete unless we help prospective citizens who are legally here become Americans.

We could look to Great Britain and France to remind us of how fortunate we are to have had two centuries of practice helping new citizens become Americans. Last August, when he announced a number of measures regarding British citizenship, Prime Minister Tony Blair said:

People who want to be British citizens should share our values and our way of life.

These new rules were spurred by the terrorist attack in London in which four young men, three of whom were the British-born children of Pakistani immigrants, bombed the London subway system.

France is facing a similar period of self-examination on integrating immigrants and the children of immigrants following violent civil unrest this last November.

According to the French Ambassador:

These teenagers feel alienated and discriminated against both socially and economically. They don't want to assert their difference. They want to be considered 100 percent French.

It is hard to imagine becoming French or becoming British or becoming Japanese or Chinese or German, for that matter. On the other hand, to be a citizen of this country, one must become an American. We should be wise enough to take a lesson from the difficulties of our friends overseas and redouble our effort to help new citizens become Americans. This is, of course, one more reason to control our borders—so that we know who is coming from other countries and can help those who legally choose to stay here to become Americans.

We Americans have always understood that perhaps the most important limit on how many new citizens our country can successfully absorb depends upon how many can be assimilated as Americans. Robert Putnam has written in the book "Bowling Alone" how at the beginning of the 20th century, when America experienced an influx of foreigners about as great in terms of percentages as that of today, the Nation took seriously the issue of assimilation. It was during this time that civic organizations such as the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and the Rotary Clubs were launched. Many industries had programs that taught English and history to foreign workers. The most important agent of assimilation was the common school, what we call today the public school.

The late Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, said the public school was created largely "to teach immigrant children reading, writing, and arithmetic—and what it means to be an American."

Yet today U.S. history is not as important a part of the school curriculum as it once was. As a result, high school seniors score lower on U.S. history than on any other subject. I have worked with Senators KENNEDY, BYRD, REID, and a number of others to help put the teaching of American History and civics back in its rightful place in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

But while we are teaching our children more about what it means to be an American, we should also be stepping up efforts to help the 500,000 to 1 million permanent legal residents who are living legally among us and who will this year become American citizens.

During these next 2 weeks, we should enact legislation to secure our borders. That honors the principle of the rule of law. Then we should create a legal status for the workers and the students we welcome here to help increase our standard of living, as well as to support our values. That honors the principle that we are a nation of immigrants, that we believe in equal opportunity, and that we believe in a free market, *laissez faire*. But we should not complete work on a comprehensive immigration bill without remembering why we have placed that three-word motto above the Presiding Officer's chair,

without remembering that our unity did not come without a lot of effort, without noticing lessons from overseas that remind us that it is more important today than ever to help prospective citizens become Americans.

In the spring of 2002, 4 years ago, when Senator Fred Thompson decided not to run for reelection, my job then was on the Harvard faculty at the Kennedy School of Government. I was teaching a class I created there called the American Character and America's Government. Matt Sonnesyn, who is my senior policy adviser today, was my course assistant at the time.

In that course, we looked at the kinds of issues that Senators might deal with. I had no idea at the time that I might be a Senator. We tried to identify the principles that each of the problems raised. In other words, we recognized that since we are a nation united by principles, we wanted to be able to understand the principles and have a principled discussion when we got issues like school choice or support for faith-based institutions.

Perhaps the issue that created the most discussion in our class that semester was a question that was presented in this way: Should illegal immigrants in the State of Illinois have State driver's licenses?

The President of Mexico, Vicente Fox, had come to Chicago and asked the Illinois legislature to do that.

If one of my students had stood up and said: I have a pro-immigrant or an anti-immigrant solution to this problem, that student would probably have earned an F because I asked them to identify the principles that this issue raised. This was a typical university class of pretty smart students in an area where more of the students are to the left, I would say. There were several refugees from the recent Clinton administration, there were some international students, and there were students from all over our country of many races and backgrounds.

But the first issue this class raised when considering the question of driver's licenses for illegal immigrants in Illinois was the principle of the rule of law. Then we went right through the other principles that I have just discussed today. And a little bit to my surprise, this class came down very hard on the idea that, of all the principles considered, the principle of rule of law required no driver's licenses for people not legally here.

They came to that conclusion quickly. But they also came quickly to the conclusion that in a country that always values equal opportunity, laissez faire, and a nation of immigrants, that we should have clear rules for welcoming people who are temporarily working here and temporarily studying here, that there should be generous allotments for that, that it was in our interest. They also spent a lot of time talking about those three words above the Presiding Officer's chair, about how can we help all those who were here legally to learn what it is to be an American.

I was very impressed with the way our class 4 years ago at that university dealt with the issue of immigration. It had a similar problem to the one we are facing. They considered all the principles. It was not considered to be a pro-immigration or anti-immigration result. It was a discussion about principles in which we all agree, which collide, and it was up to the students in that class to come to a solution which was principled.

That is our job in this body. We need to let the American people know that we honor each of the principles that we talk about today. We should not step back one inch from honoring the principle of the rule of law, but we shouldn't be hesitant for one minute to welcome those who work here and study here because we also honor the principle of equal opportunity, being a nation of immigrants and the free market economy that we are.

I hope before we are through in these 3 weeks that we will do as the students did 4 years ago and realize that above all, when we talk about immigration, about people coming to this country, that what is distinctive about America, what is our greatest accomplishment, is not that we can figure out a way to create laws and virtual laws to control our borders, not that we can come up with some mathematical number of people who can work and study here, but what we have been able to do that France has not done, that Great Britain has not done, that China and Germany have not done—no country in the world has ever done the way we have—is that we have taken people from all different backgrounds and said we are the United States of America. And to become an American you believe in ideals, and it doesn't matter where you come from, what your race is, what your background is.

It is important that we keep that up front, that we honor our diversity but more important that we can be proud of where we come from but prouder where we are; that we honor the oath of allegiance that our amendment will seek to make law, where George Washington and his officers said we put aside where we came from—we may honor it, we may be proud of where we may go to reunions and talk about it, but we are Americans.

That is the most important subject for an immigration debate, and this bill will not be complete without it.

I look forward to offering an amendment at the appropriate time that adds to our discussion of helping prospective citizens become Americans. This would be the only country in the world in which such an amendment would have that kind of meaning.

EXHIBIT 1

VISAS FOR WORKERS COMING TO THE UNITED STATES (PER YEAR)

Type of Visa	Number per Year (cap)
--------------	-----------------------

"Green Card" or legal permanent residency includes exceptional, skilled, and unskilled workers (NOTE: a number of these folks originally came to the U.S. under H-1B or L but then applied to become permanent; see below). 140,000

VISAS FOR WORKERS COMING TO THE UNITED STATES (PER YEAR)—Continued

Type of Visa	Number per Year (cap)
H-2A (Temporary Ag Workers) .....	no cap, but averages only 30,000
H-2B (Temporary, non-skilled, non-ag) landscaping, construction, etc.	66,000
H-1B (Professional Skilled Workers) .....	65,000
L Visa (intercompany transfers) Executives and employees with specialized knowledge of a company's product (and their families).	no cap, has grown to 123,000 in 2005
Total .....	~424,000

Note.—Due to lack of applicability to the illegal population, this analysis does not include more obscure temporary visa categories, such as foreign diplomats, religious workers, athletes, entertainers, "treaty traders or investors," press, etc. All told, these additional categories would total about 100,000 additional visas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FRIST and Senator MCCONNELL be added as cosponsors to S. 1815, the Strengthening American Citizenship Act.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask consent that at 3 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Frist amendment at the desk related to a study on deaths on the border; provided further that no amendments be in order prior to that vote.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time before the vote be allocated as follows: the next 30 minutes beginning at 1:20 be under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee; the following 30 minutes be under the majority control; the next 30 minutes be under the control of the Democratic side; and finally that the remaining time before the vote be equally divided between the two sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senate is now engaged in a spirited debate about reforming our immigration policy. I rise today to share my perspectives and my priorities.



Let's remember, though, that this is not just about immigration; it is about the type of country we want to be, what we stand for, and what type of future we all want to build. It is easy to get caught up in the specifics of one policy or another, but I encourage my colleagues to not lose sight of the bigger picture. This debate touches nearly every aspect of American life, from our economy to security, from our classrooms to our workplaces.

I know there is a lot of pressure to do something about immigration, especially in an election year, but if we do the wrong thing, it will have a painful effect on millions of families, on our economy, and on our future for generations to come. Let's take the time to do it right. Perhaps the biggest mistake we could make is to think that addressing enforcement alone will create the changes we want to see.

I approach this debate with a clear understanding of what is at stake, frankly, with some skepticism that Congress can achieve this delicate balance in a heated political environment. But I will keep pushing for the right policies. These policies are based on my own personal experiences, on people who have shared their life experiences with me, and on the unique perspective Washington State provides.

Washington State does have a lot at stake in this debate over immigration reform. I have led discussions around my State with key stakeholders who have experiences in areas such as border security, labor needs, agriculture, education, and housing that have all helped form my perspective.

First of all, Washington State is a border State. We know the dangers of an insecure border. For years, I have fought Federal policies that steered critical resources away from the northern border to the southern border. Year after year, I have fought budgets that were biased against the needs at our northern border. My border communities have struggled with inadequate staff, equipment, and facilities. Tragically, it took the September 11 attacks to finally get the Federal Government to listen to what we had been saying all along: you cannot keep America secure if you shortchange the northern border.

Since then, we have made some progress. I have worked with Chairman GREGG and others to secure the money to triple the number of agents along our northern border. I helped to fund the northern border air wing that is in my State to patrol our skies and to provide enforcement and surveillance. I should note that we still need to extend their patrol hours beyond just 40 hours a week.

We have made progress but not nearly enough. Just this week, we learned that Federal investigators were able to smuggle parts for a dirty bomb across the northern border into Washington State. That is unacceptable.

As we have increased enforcement at the northern border, new challenges

have emerged. Federal agents are arresting more people for smuggling and other crimes, but the Feds are just handing those suspects over to local officials for holding and prosecution. As a result, communities like Whatcom County on the foreign border are struggling to deal with the huge new burden of Federal prosecutions. Whatcom County is spending \$2 million a year to process federally initiated cases. Whatcom County is not being reimbursed, but communities along the southern border are. That is not fair, and it is something I am working to correct.

Washington State understands the importance of border security. I believe any bill we pass has to treat the northern border fairly.

Our communities need help to combat the scourge of drugs and violence that accompany rampant smuggling operations. We cannot wait until a terrorist tries to move a dirty bomb across our northern border.

Washington State also has a great stake in how immigration reform affects one of our largest industries—agriculture. We rely on immigrants to harvest the crops that put food on our table and bring our State billions of dollars a year in economic activity. Last week in Moses Lake, WA, I heard personally from farmers and orcharders who had to leave fruit on the trees last season because they could not get enough help to pick it fast enough. This costs our farmers and our entire State economy.

Already, many farmers have told me that the 2005 season was the worst season they have had in trying to get the employees they needed. It is estimated that 700,000 undocumented workers are living in Washington State. That means Washington State has the highest per capita concentration of undocumented workers of any State in the Nation. We know how important laborers are for our economy.

Washington State public schools and universities are also impacted by our Nation's immigration policies. I hope we can all agree the children of immigrants deserve a decent education which builds our communities and our economy.

For years, I have worked to increase educational opportunities for all students living in this country. I am a proud supporter of the Dream Act, which helps make higher education more accessible to the children of immigrants. I have been proud to celebrate with young students through the Latino Educational Achievement Project and other organizations in my home State of Washington that break down barriers to education. Our educational policies have to ensure that immigrants and the children of immigrants are not denied the opportunity to share in the American dream.

Housing is another area that is connected to our immigration policy. Many communities in Washington State are struggling with the lack of

affordable housing. That can mean families are trapped living in unsafe or substandard housing. We also have to address the housing challenges in agricultural communities. For several years, I have been working on a farmworker housing initiative to help address a tremendous shortage of safe and affordable housing for the people who work on our farms.

All of these experiences—the northern border, agriculture, education, labor needs, and housing—help inform me on my view on immigration policy. I believe from that, that we need a holistic approach.

Enforcement is important. Securing our borders is important, but if we leave out things such as education and job training, if we ignore the tools families need to rise above their circumstances and build a better life, we will be missing the big picture and we will be throwing away the ladders of success generations of Americans have relied on to make their families and, subsequently, our country stronger.

Comprehensive immigration reform should do seven things: it should improve enforcement; it should treat the northern border fairly; it should include a guest worker plan which includes a path to citizenship; it should provide a path forward so that people who are here have an opportunity to become citizens and realize the American dream; it should protect the rights of victims and refugees; it should not turn into criminals those compassionate souls who care for their wounds, teach their children, or feed their families; and finally, it should provide the resources to help families rise above their circumstances through education and training.

Let me take a minute to talk about each of these priorities.

First of all, we should improve our enforcement, and that means providing personnel, equipment, facilities, and resources to enforce our borders. In the wake of September 11, security at our borders and enforcement of our immigration rules are now more critical than ever. That is why I have pushed for years to hire more Border Patrol agents, deploy more resources along the border, including the northern border air wing, and to make sure we are using the latest technology to secure our Nation's borders. We must continue to make investments in securing our border and protecting ourselves from those who seek to do us harm.

Second, we have to treat the northern border fairly. We will not be shortchanged as we have in the past. If we are going to secure our borders, we cannot leave the northern border behind.

Third, immigration reform should include a guest worker plan to keep our economy moving forward. We have tremendous labor needs in our country, especially in labor-intensive fields such as agriculture. Our economy cannot survive without access to the workers we need. A responsible guest worker

program can help address our country's economic needs. As one farm leader in my State put it, we need reform, but we cannot commit economic suicide in the process.

I am cosponsor of the bipartisan AgJOBS bill which allows current workers to retain citizenship and which would set up a guest worker program that will really work. I hope we can follow a similar path. But whatever we do, we can no longer tolerate a system that expects our farmers to be experts in document verification. Our farmers should not be turned into criminals.

One option is to provide a way to electronically verify someone's identity. If we pursue that approach, we must not put a new financial burden on our farmers who are just trying to follow the law and do the right thing.

We have to establish a realistic system that allows employers to legally hire the help they need. And agriculture is not the only sector that would be affected by these proposals. It would also affect the construction and hospitality industries as well.

Fourth, immigration reform should provide hope and a path forward for a resident to be able to earn—earn—legal status.

Fifth, any legislation must protect the rights of victims and refugees to access the courts. Over the years, we have worked to protect victims and refugees, but if we enact an expedited removal process, we could undo all that work and cause tremendous human pain. We have worked very hard through the Violence Against Women Act to protect victims no matter where they come from or what their legal status is. The act allows victims of domestic violence to petition to stay in the United States. We should keep those humane protections in place.

Sixth, we should not make felons of those who seek to help the most vulnerable. Churches and other support groups should not be threatened with jail time for showing compassion toward anyone who needs help. It is not the job of hospital workers or teachers or priests to enforce our immigration laws, nor should it be. We should not block any emergency room doors, any classroom, or any police station to the needs of all of our residents.

Finally, we need to invest in the things that help immigrants and all Americans rise above their circumstances. I am concerned that many important issues are being left out of this debate we are now having. As leaders, it is our duty to protect and foster the American dream for all of our citizens as well as those on the path to citizenship.

We need to invest in primary and secondary education. All of our children should have the opportunity to become more successful than their parents. We need to invest in adult education and literacy programs. Immigrants on the road to earned adjustment should have the opportunity to improve themselves and learn the English language.

We also need to invest in workforce training. All of our citizens should have the opportunity to increase their skills and earning power and achieve a greater share of the American dream.

We need to invest in health care and secondary education if this path to earned citizenship will truly allow all of our neighbors to participate in the American dream, while also allowing our economy to grow.

We are not talking about charity for someone else. We are talking about investments that help every American family achieve their dreams.

Throughout our history, the United States has been a beacon of hope for people throughout the world. That light shines as bright today as it ever has. As we work here to reform our immigration policy, let's make sure our actions reflect our security, our economy, and the opportunity America has offered generations of immigrants. Let's take the time to get this right. Our country's future depends on it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. 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. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes under Republican time.

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today, I intend to offer an amendment to the immigration reform bill. This amendment aims to bolster our efforts to stop the illegal flow of methamphetamine across our borders.

Colorado, as well as the Nation, must deal with the epidemic of methamphetamine. In just 10 years, methamphetamine has become America's worst drug problem, worse than marijuana, cocaine, or heroin.

In the Senate, we have passed comprehensive legislation to combat methamphetamine. However, I believe this initiative can be improved by concentrating our efforts to expedite an effective plan to tackle methamphetamine that is smuggled across our borders.

Methamphetamine is a dangerous drug. The Mesa County Meth Task Force, in my home State, notes that methamphetamine is highly addictive, cheap, widely available, easier to make than LSD, and therefore more attractive to users. The number of users is increasing, and more methamphetamine is starting to come across our borders and into our States.

Colorado has been particularly hard hit by methamphetamine trafficking. Numerous local task forces, police departments, as well as the Drug Enforcement Agency, report that the

availability of crystal methamphetamine has increased throughout Colorado. In recent years, Colorado has seen a significant increase in the amount of methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana being imported, stored, and distributed in the area. The use and abuse of this drug has spread because of the availability of high-quality imported methamphetamine.

According to the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, over half of the methamphetamine available in Colorado is manufactured abroad and trafficked across our borders illegally. The Colorado Drug Investigators Association agrees, stating that most of the methamphetamine available in Colorado is produced abroad or comes from large-scale laboratories in California. In recent years, the potency of methamphetamine produced in other countries has risen dramatically.

The Department of Justice cites that domestic methamphetamine production is decreasing. National Clandestine Laboratory Seizure System numbers demonstrate that the number of reported methamphetamine laboratory seizures is on the decline. In fact, Colorado lab seizures from 2003 to 2004 fell by more than half.

However, methamphetamine availability within our borders is not likely to decline because of increased production outside of U.S. borders. Production abroad has offset recent declines in domestic production. Foreign sources of methamphetamine appear to be increasing domestic supplies.

According to estimates from the DEA, an alarming two-thirds of the methamphetamine used in the United States comes from larger labs, increasingly abroad, while only one-third of the methamphetamine consumed in the country comes from the small laboratories.

The methamphetamine production abroad is dependent on a steady supply of ingredients from other foreign sources. These producers are able to secure large quantities of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine from sources in other countries which export massive quantities of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine and increase means of production. These foreign laboratories are often termed as "super labs." They are able to produce more than 10 pounds a day of highly pure methamphetamine. These labs then traffic their product into our country.

According to the National Drug Intelligence Center, the transportation of methamphetamine from abroad is increasing, as evidenced by increasing seizures along our borders. The amount of methamphetamine seized at or between U.S. border ports of entry increased more than 75 percent overall from 2002 to 2004. The sharp increase in methamphetamine seizures at or between U.S. border ports of entry reflects increased methamphetamine production abroad.

Methamphetamine has been a leading drug threat in Western States since the

early 1990s. The studies from the Department of Justice show that the trafficking and abuse of this drug have gradually expanded eastward with time. Methamphetamine now impacts every region of the country and is increasingly prevalent within the Northeast region. Without a sensible and timely effort, methamphetamine trafficking will continue to spread eastward and eventually encompass the entire United States.

Colorado is not just a hot spot for the distribution of methamphetamine. Often drug traffickers pass through Colorado on their way to other States. The majority of the methamphetamine that is distributed outside the Rocky Mountain region is destined for States generally to the north and east, such as Montana, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and as far away as Illinois.

The trafficking of methamphetamine across our country threatens the safety of communities. As distribution spreads, addiction will grow. Methamphetamine addicts are increasingly involved in violent crimes. The Mesa County Meth Task Force notes that methamphetamine-related crime ranges from auto theft, burglary, to murder. Methamphetamine users are unreasonable, erratic, and capable of causing great harm not only to themselves but others. We simply must protect our families and communities from violence.

We must recognize the immediacy of this issue and be able to curb the flow of methamphetamine into the United States. It is important that we protect U.S. borders to ensure national security and the safety of our communities. Therefore, I propose that we speed up our efforts to curb the flow of methamphetamine through our borders. We must have a formal plan that outlines the diplomatic, law enforcement, and other procedures the Federal Government will implement to reduce the amount of methamphetamine being trafficked in the United States.

The main thrust of my amendment takes a swift approach to fulfilling requirements for the international regulation of precursor chemicals as outlined in the PATRIOT Act. We must press upon the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security the immediate need for a firm plan of action. It is imperative that such a plan include, at a minimum, a specific timeline to reduce the inflow of methamphetamine into the United States.

There must be a tough standard for keeping excessive amounts of pseudoephedrine products out of the hands of methamphetamine traffickers. We must outline a specific plan to engage the top five exporters of methamphetamine precursor chemicals, such as pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, and phenylpropanolamine.

Also, we must be prepared to be able to address funding needs to secure our borders, ports of entry, and other methamphetamine-trafficking windows

that are currently being exploited by drug traffickers. These controls are critical to help law enforcement officials eliminate the flow of methamphetamine into our communities. This plan calls for a detailed funding request that outlines what, if any, additional appropriations are needed to secure our borders.

My amendment requires the administration to deliver a plan within 90 days of the enactment of this act. This amendment also calls for a Government Accountability Office report to ensure that our Government is fulfilling its obligation to combat methamphetamine.

Our Nation has been hard hit by the illegal trafficking of methamphetamine across U.S. soil. This is a national issue which is growing at a rate that is outpacing our law enforcement officials. Through our work on the Combat Meth Act, we have provided them with the necessities to fight methamphetamine. Now we must be vigilant and establish a responsive plan of action.

In conclusion, I thank State Representative Josh Penry and State Senator Ken Kester from Colorado for working with me on this issue and for their efforts to combat the horrific issue of methamphetamine in Colorado.

I intend to offer this amendment later today. I ask my colleagues to join me in my effort to stop the illegal trafficking of methamphetamine and all dangerous drugs at the border.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, there is an order of speaking locked in. I believe I am entitled to speak in about 5 minutes. Is it appropriate for me to begin at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

I rise to address the starting point of any discussion of comprehensive immigration reform, which is security at the border, and then move on to the other significant security aspects of this issue. I believe we need comprehensive immigration reform, which essentially boils down to four things: security at the border; security in the interior of the country, including at the workplace; a temporary worker program to accommodate our employment needs; and a way to deal with the people who are here illegally today. All of those issues need to be addressed. Ideally they should be addressed at the same time, but almost everyone agrees that the starting point is security at the border. What I wish to do today is to describe some of the reasons why it is so important for us to focus on that and then to discuss the underlying legislation which significantly deals with that problem.

As a result of including provisions of the majority leader's bill and provisions of the Cornyn-Kyl legislation in the Judiciary Committee's base bill

with respect to border security, we have a good start on getting a handle on border security. It is only a start, and it takes years to build out the fencing, to build up the Border Patrol, to add the new aircraft, the UAVs, to install the sensors and cameras, to build the detention space and all the other things that have to be done in a mosaic to gain control of the border. This bill offers a good next step in that regard.

I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, JUDD GREGG, who as chairman of the subcommittee on Appropriations has ensured over the last several months that there is additional funding available for more Border Patrol agents, more infrastructure at the border and the like. We have actually already started on this problem, but this legislation takes the next step in a significant way.

There are a lot of things going on on the border right now that I don't think Americans who are not from a border State would appreciate. I wish to start by talking about those.

While it is true that part of the issue before us is the millions of people who have crossed our borders illegally to come here to work, that is only part of the story. Today the border is a violent, crime-prone environmental disaster with people in jeopardy and even our military suffering as a result of illegal immigration. Let me explain.

Because we have added more Border Patrol, we are beginning to contest territory that the smugglers used to call their own. They are fighting back. The U.S. Attorney from Arizona testified before my Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee about a month ago that assaults at the border were up 108 percent over last year. Those assaults include not just rock throwing, which bashes people's heads in, but also assaults with weapons, including automatic weapons. I will get later the number of people who have been killed as a result of these assaults. I don't have that with me. But we have had people die in the line of duty trying to protect our borders from this increased violence.

Now criminals are coming into our country by horrendous numbers. Last year something like 150,000 criminals entered the country. These are not petty criminals. These are murderers and rapists and child molesters and drug dealers of the worst kind. Now about 10 percent—in fact, somewhere even between 10 and 15 percent—of the people apprehended at the border have significant criminal records.

Think about this for a moment: If the usual rule of thumb is that at least three people are able to cross the border and do so successfully for every one who is apprehended, think of the number of violent, vile criminals who are entering our country because we have failed to secure the border. This is a serious problem for the United States. It is estimated now that in some places over half of the population of prisons is illegal immigrants.

In addition to the crime that is occurring at the border and the criminals coming across the border, it is also true that the people who are illegally coming to the United States for a better life are prey to the coyotes and other criminal elements. They are raped, robbed, beaten, held hostage for ransom. They represent value that can be collected from their relatives back home. They are mistreated in the most horrible way. Many die because of the way they are being transported or not transported. We are all aware of the increasing number of deaths, most of which occur in my State and which were a record number last year.

There is also huge environmental degradation. To look at the Arizona desert from the air is to want to cry. Thousands of paths where thousands—indeed, millions—of illegal immigrants have trod crisscross the border. It was pristine, but it takes centuries for this very fragile ecosystem to revive after it has been trampled. Vehicles coming across by the hundreds, sometimes left behind because they get stuck in the sand or ran out of gas, but the trails can be seen all over. Tons and tons of trash left behind, fires started, vegetation trampled. It is an ecological disaster.

I mentioned the military. Because the Barry Goldwater Gunnery Range is located on the border with Mexico and is one of the largest areas for our pilots to train regardless of the service, that area is of great value to the United States for our defense preparedness. Two years ago—I don't have the numbers from last year—there were something like 400 to 500 missions that had to be aborted because pilots had their planes gassed up, ready to go, with the bombs ready, or maybe had even taken off, but when they got close to the range, the radio call came back that there are illegal immigrants in the area. Turn back. Don't drop your bombs. This is an area where strafing and bombing occurs on a regular basis. The Marine Corps is responsible for the western half of this gunnery range. They go out on a weekly basis and try to clear the area of illegal immigrants. But frequently, after they have cleared the area and radioed that it is OK for the mission to come in, they find there is somebody there and they have to abort. There were hundreds of flying hours that were lost 2 years ago and I am sure last year as a result of this phenomenon. Military training is being sacrificed.

The same thing is occurring on the proving ground, the Yuma proving ground, which is a pathway for illegal immigration. The point is, there are a lot of reasons to control our border beyond dealing with the problem of illegal immigrants. That is a huge problem. With at least half of the illegal immigrants coming through my State on an annual basis, it represents particularly a huge problem for my State. But I haven't mentioned one of the key elements, and that has to do with se-

curing our borders as a sovereign country, particularly in a time where there is a potential terrorist threat. It is not hard to transport contraband material across our border. The drug war is going on full blast on our borders. Methamphetamine is not made or manufactured so much in at least our State, and I understand other States now, because it is easier to bring it across the border where it is manufactured by the ton in Mexico and then brought over in backpacks, one backpack of value anywhere from a quarter to a half million dollars.

These kinds of things are coming across the border every day. If they can come across, then so can a backpack full of material for a radiological weapon, for example, or a biological weapon, and so can a terrorist. We now have 165,000 other-than-Mexican illegal immigrants apprehended. Remember the rule of thumb that for every one you apprehend, perhaps at least three more are not apprehended. These are people from countries other than Mexico. So when they are apprehended, they can't be returned to Mexico as we do with Mexican citizens. They have to be processed and put on an airplane back to their country of origin. I was told by the Director of Homeland Security that there are over 39,000 Chinese citizens in the United States, having come here illegally, who need to be returned but that only a few hundred are being returned every year. In other words, the problem is getting bigger and bigger every year.

There are not enough detention spaces for all of these people. As a result, they are released on their own recognizance. Do they show up when they are asked to? No, of course not. These other-than-Mexican illegal immigrants are caught and released, allowed to meld into our society. A large number of them are criminals. Many of them come from so-called countries of interest, meaning countries from which terrorists come. Yet we can't hold them and return them because we don't have the detention space to hold them and their countries won't take them back quickly, if at all. Some countries won't even take them back.

The Department of Homeland Security has announced a plan to end catch and release, but that is only possible when we have the detention beds to put them in, pending their departure. There is money in this bill for that purpose, but not enough. The point is, it will take years.

I hope I am beginning to create some picture of the magnitude of this problem beyond just the problem of illegal immigrants wishing to come here for a better life. This issue is frequently portrayed as nothing but that. It is far more than that, far more complicated, far more dangerous, far more destructive. We have to get control of our borders. If we don't, we are not a sovereign nation, we don't have control over our own destiny, and there are threats to our existence far beyond whatever

problems illegal immigrants who want to work here may create.

There is another aspect of enforcement that has received far too little attention. We talked about enforcement at the border but also enforcement in the interior. Illegal immigrants know if they get a few miles north of the border, they are home free. Border Patrol doesn't even operate 60 miles north of the border for the most part. As a result, there is no or very little enforcement in the interior of the country. There may be the occasional border checkpoint, but they are usually much closer to the border, the occasional Border Patrol officer in an airport to try to discourage illegal immigrants from transporting themselves by airplane, which they have done for years, but very little enforcement.

There is essentially no enforcement of the law against hiring illegal immigrants, a law that was written several years ago which has essentially never been enforced. The reason is because, A, it is not enforceable and, B, we don't have the will to enforce it. Employers are told they are supposed to check documents. The documents are all easily forged. Everybody knows that. The employer has a good idea when he is hiring the individual that that individual is an illegal immigrant, probably can't speak English and clearly comes from another country. And yet the employer can't do anything about it because the driver's license or passport or Social Security card looks like the one you and I have. The counterfeiters are very good at this.

So everybody pretends the law can be enforced when they know it can't. The Government doesn't do anything about it, the employers don't do anything about it. America sees that and Americans say: What happens to a country that isn't enforcing its laws and apparently doesn't have the will to do so? And, importantly, why should we believe that you in the Senate can create a workable, comprehensive immigration program with temporary workers and a way to deal with the illegal immigrants who are here today? Why should we believe you will be able to do that and enforce it when you haven't enforced the ones that are on the books today?

We are all familiar with the 1986 amnesty, 3 million people, but then we were going to enforce the law so it would never occur again. In 1996, once again, we provided for enforcement at the workplace, as I described it. It didn't happen. It is kind of like Lucy and the football. After about three times, Charlie Brown ought to start getting the idea that when he goes up to kick the football, Lucy is going to pull it away from him. That is the way the American people look at us. They ask: When are you going to assure us this will be done?

I dare say neither the administration, the previous administration or the current one, or the Congress has given the American people much to peg confidence on.

The administrations have not asked for enough money. The Congress has added money to the situation but has still not added enough. Our law enforcement doesn't seem to be willing to go after the employers who are clearly violating the law. Indeed, it would be hard because, in a sense, they are being precluded from asking questions about the documents that are given to them.

This all points the way toward the second and equally critical part of the legislation we are going to have to deal with. If we don't enforce the law in the interior, this whole exercise is a fraud, it is a deceit, it will not work, and the American people will react very negatively, I predict.

Now, it is relatively simple to make this work if we have the willpower to do it. You have to have a verification system that is pegged to a valid database, electronically verified and audited. The Social Security system has numbers that are assigned to everybody, but it is full of bad numbers today. It needs to be cleaned up. I believe we will have an amendment that will provide for the cleaning up of the database, for its maintenance in a proper way, and for an employer verification system that depends upon a Social Security number being typed in electronically and sent back to the headquarters in Washington, or wherever it is, verifying whether the number is valid.

That is half of the situation. OK. The number you have just been given is a valid Social Security number, it doesn't appear to be being used by somebody else, it has been validly issued by somebody with the name of John Doe, and the person standing in front of you claims to be John Doe. How do you know it is John Doe? I can go to an employer and rattle off a number and put it into the system, and he says: That is a valid number; what is your name again? I happen to know the number because I saw the card or asked my neighbor his name, or whatever the situation. Well, you have to have a way of tying the person in front of you to the number. This will also have that kind of system. They are working right now on exactly what kind of number to attach to that to make that work. Eventually, the REAL ID Act, which is based upon good documents, will connect the individual standing before you to the number, and therefore you will be able to validate identity in that way.

This is somewhat costly. It will take some period of time to put into place. Once it is put into place, it can operate efficiently. Employers will be mandated to use it. But it will be easy to use. So we should not be asking employers to be the cops here. It is an impossible job for them. If the Government has determined in advance who is legally employable and who is not, then the employer doesn't have to worry about it. All he or she has to worry about is when the number electronically comes back and it says

"valid," you are home free. If it says "invalid number," don't hire the person or you will be in big trouble.

This legislation will provide a way to clear up any problems, so if for some reason the number doesn't compute, and you say: That is really me and that is my number, you can straighten that out. The bottom line is that if we don't have a valid verification of employment, whether the individual is verified as a citizen, a temporary worker, a green card holder, or whatever the status is, if you are validly able to get employed, great. If you are not, then you won't be employed. Unless we have that kind of system, this entire thing breaks down.

In the legislation Senator CORNYN and I developed, this is a critical component, and it answers one of the questions that is frequently asked: How do you know people will eventually come out of the shadows and participate in a temporary worker program—or seek a green card, in any event—that they will eventually leave the United States in an illegal status and will come back in a legal status? The answer is: With a good validation of employment, verification of employment eligibility system, nobody is going to be able to get a job illegally.

So within a couple of years, it is not going to be possible to be in the United States, if you want to work, and be illegal. You are going to have to get legal and come in on a temporary worker status, if that is what you want to do. That is part of the answer as to what will cause people to comply with the law. They are not going to be able to get a job if they don't.

It is theoretically possible that an individual could go live with somebody else and remain in the shadows; that possibility could exist. Although, as the documents become better, it is going to become harder to do anything, in terms of purchasing or bank transactions or driver's licenses and the like, if you don't have valid documentation for your status in the United States.

These are the two key things which we refer to when we talk about enforcement of the law: securing the border and securing the interior, including the workplace. These two factors must be a part of any legislation we pass. The House focused only on the first part of that, primarily. There are others who think we should do that first and wait until we do the rest of the bill. I don't believe that is a good idea. We need to try to do all of these things together. But I support the idea that until these systems are locked in, until the American people can see that we have been serious about it, that a year or two has gone by and we have funded them and the administration is enforcing them, some of the rights that attach under various bills should not finally attach. In other words, let's make sure we are doing these things before future rights to citizenship or something like that come into play.

What do Americans think about this issue of illegal immigration, and what would they support in terms of what I have been talking about? This is according to a variety of surveys.

Time magazine, earlier this year, said 63 percent believe illegal immigration is an extremely or very serious problem. Another one says they see immigration first as a security problem, then an economic issue, and finally a civil rights/humanitarian issue. Again, the Time poll says they believe that illegal immigrants, overall, hurt the economy, 64 to 26 percent.

In a Quinnipiac poll, in February, they opposed allowing illegal immigrants to obtain driver's licenses, 72 to 25 percent.

In a New Models poll, 58 percent to 37 percent say they would like to see military troops be used for border security.

The American people want serious action. I believe that illustrates how concerned they are that we have not been able to control the borders so far.

They favor a proposal to build a 2,000-mile security fence by a 51-to-37 percent margin. That is a Fox News/Opinion Dynamics poll.

I don't think it is realistic to put a fence along the entire border. What you need is troops on the ground and fences. You can put up a fence, but if nobody checks it for 3 or 4 days, they can cut a hole in it and come through. You have to have boots on the ground to control the territory, as we have seen in Iraq. We are talking about controlling our own territory. Fences are a key part of that, but so are people—Border Patrol agents who can continually patrol and make sure the fence is doing its job.

Again, from the Quinnipiac University poll in February of this year, they support requiring proof of legal residency to obtain Government benefits by an 84 percent to 14 percent margin.

There are other polls. Let me cite a couple. There is a Gallup poll of March 27, just recently, where 80 percent of the public wants the Federal Government to get tougher on illegal immigration; 62 percent oppose making it easier for illegals to become citizens; 72 percent don't even want illegals to be permitted to have driver's licenses.

A Time Magazine poll found that 75 percent favor "major penalties" on employers of illegal immigrants.

An NBC/Wall Street Journal poll: 59 percent oppose a guest worker proposal.

I might say, there are different numbers on that. I think part of that depends upon how you ask the question. Nonetheless, there is an extreme amount of cynicism there.

An IQ Research poll done on March 10 found that 92 percent are saying securing the U.S. border should be a top priority of the White House and the Congress.

So the American people are pretty clear on this issue. They want us to act, and they want us to act to enforce the law.

We are going to be talking about a lot of other things here soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority has expired.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 2 minutes.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we will have more to say about a lot of other aspects of the pending legislation and what we need to do. I wanted to take this time at least to lay the groundwork for the discussion of why it is important to enforce the law.

The final point I will say is this: We are, it is often said, a nation of immigrants but a nation of laws. What do we mean by that? We mean that when we go to an intersection and the light is green, what do we know? We know we can drive on through because the people who have the red light will obey the law. We do that with everything in our society. We have contracts with each other that are very loose because we have a rule of law that if anything goes wrong, we have a way of resolving that legally. Everything we do, we do because of trust with each other based upon the rule of law. That is the way it works in our society. When everybody obeys the law, we can get along great. Once people disobey the law, bad things happen. You need more and more laws and enforcement, and you get into a situation like we are with illegal immigration. That is why we have to get back to the rule of law. People in America have to have confidence in their Government, in the businesses, in their fellow citizens, and they will if they know everybody is operating within the rule of law.

What happens if they begin to see that nobody appears to be adhering to the law? Remember what Mayor Rudy Giuliani proved in New York City: When little things begin to happen that are violations of law, soon it is bigger and more and more, and pretty soon you have a lawless society. If people understand that even the smallest things have to be within the rule of law, then you have a much better society.

We have to get back to the rule of law with respect to our employment practices, the internal operation in our country, and the security of our borders for all the reasons I have indicated.

I look forward to discussing some of the other significant issues relative to this entire issue. I hope we can agree that border security and enforcement of the law at the workplace are critical elements of any legislation we adopt.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, pending somebody else wishing to speak, I can quote for the record about 3 statistics I think are meaningful with respect to this debate.

I did not give a precise number on the number of illegal immigrants who died last year while crossing the United States-Mexican border. According to the most recent Border Patrol statistics, the number who died in 2005 was 473. That is the highest number since the Border Patrol began tracking such deaths since 1999.

Another statistic is that last year, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended 1.2 million illegal immigrants, which is roughly 1 person every 30 seconds. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, the estimate is that there are about 12 million illegal immigrants in the United States today, and about 56 percent of them are Mexican citizens.

Another statistic: The busiest U.S. Border Patrol station right now is the Yuma Border Patrol station. Last year, 138,460 immigrants were caught coming through that station.

I see my colleague from California. The Senator from California was very concerned about the lawlessness right near San Diego and the environmental degradation, crime on both sides of the border, and illegal immigration through there, as well as drug smuggling. As a result, as we all know, a fence was constructed in that area.

It is interesting, the fence clearly helped to prevent crossings. Right where the fence is, I am told, nobody has crossed illegally, and in that sector, the number of people apprehended declined from a peak in 1986 of 629,650—just in that one area, which is phenomenal to me; that is astounding—from almost 630,000 just in the San Diego sector, it is now down last year to 126,000 illegal immigrants were caught near San Diego. That is still a lot of people. We can see the fencing in that area has clearly had a significant impact.

There are other statistics, but if the Senator from California is ready, I will withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, shortly the Senate is going to be confronted with a vote on two bills, one of them being the leader's bill which deals with enforcement on the border, and the other the Judiciary Committee bill which essentially incorporates provisions of the McCain-Kennedy bill into a broad and comprehensive bill which will, I believe, be before the Senate for discussion and amendment.

The bill approved by the Judiciary Committee is a bipartisan bill. It had a 12-to-6 vote in the committee. It is the first step forward in a very difficult and consequential process to address what has become one of the most contentious issues in American life.

If this bill is approved by the full Senate, it will then have to go to a

conference committee and be reconciled against another bill, namely the House bill, which is very onerous in many of its provisions.

The reconciliation of these two bills is going to be extraordinarily difficult to achieve, and it remains uncertain whether any bill can be enacted into law in this current congressional session.

Any legislation approved by Congress, I think, has to take into consideration the reality of today's immigration world in America. It is very different from the 1990s, it is very different from the 1980s, and it is very different from the 1970s. There are very strongly held views on both sides. Most, though, of what is attempted by Federal agencies responsible for the administration of immigration services today and responsible for the protection of our borders has more often than not failed, and we have to deal with that failure.

Employer sanctions, which are the seed of current immigration laws, have failed. Border control is spotty at best. Naturalization takes years. Detention facilities are inadequate. And despite our attempts to gain operational control of our border and to secure the interior of the United States so that everyone plays by the rules, the Government has essentially failed.

We now have 10 million to 12 million undocumented people living in the United States. They have come here illegally. They live furtively. Many of them have been here for 20 to 30 years. I know many. They own their homes. They pay taxes. Their children were born in this country and educated in this country. This is the only home they know. They want to live by the law, but they have no way currently to live by the law.

Employer sanctions, I mentioned, do not and, I believe, in our global economy, will not work. That is evidenced by the fact that in 2004, only 46 employers in the United States were criminally convicted for employer sanctions out of 3,258 cases initiated.

I have watched in California. On the few occasions where immigration officials have gone to agricultural worksites and arrested employers, the public reaction has been entirely negative.

Both you and I know, Mr. President, that a law is only as good as the ability to enforce it. There is virtually today no ability to enforce employer sanctions in the United States of America. Therefore, a more punitive immigration philosophy that is based and dependent upon employer sanctions as working doesn't work and clearly creates a situation whereby there is disorganized chaos in the immigration world.

Another reason for this is our borders are a sieve, porous through and through. The Senator from Arizona correctly mentioned there are 14 miles on the California border with Mexico where there is a two-layer fence. It is an immigration border control process

known as Operation Gatekeeper. It was very controversial when put into play, but it works. And he is correct, immigrants coming in illegally in that corridor have been deterred.

But what has happened is, it has simply pushed them east into unfenced portions of the border, and those portions of the border where the desert and the heat wreak considerable destruction upon anybody crossing.

A concern with porous borders has also brought attention to a classification of aliens known as "other than Mexicans." In 2005, Border Patrol agents apprehended 165,175 "other than Mexicans" at the border, 155,000 of them on the southern border.

The concern here is that many of these people are increasingly from terrorist-supporting countries, and that presents a real potential national security threat to our country.

We continue to have a catch-and-release policy with respect to this limited category of people, but we don't have sufficient detention facilities. Consequently, they are released on their own recognizance pending a hearing. They are expected to show up at the hearing. More often than not, they do not show up. They simply disappear into the fabric of America, gone for all time.

I can go on and on, but I think this gives an accurate view of what has become an extraordinarily dysfunctional immigration system, and it has also made me realize that while we need strong border enforcement, it alone is not the only solution to the problem of illegal immigration.

The House bill, which focuses only on enforcement and criminalization of undocumented aliens, isn't the solution. We need to be much more realistic and comprehensive.

I see the Democratic leader on the floor, and I would be happy to cease and desist for the moment if he wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Through the Chair, I know the Senator from California is a member of the committee, and I certainly don't want to interrupt her statement. I have a statement to give, and I need to do that sometime. I am wondering how much longer the Senator is going to speak?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Probably about 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. What I will try to do is come back when the Senator has finished her statement.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. That is very generous of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed a bill, and I must tell you, I regret the way it was done. It was a kind of forced march, hour after hour of amendments on a bill that is very complicated, that I believe has actually come to the floor

somewhat prematurely. I don't believe there is yet a consensus in this body, and I hope the debate that takes place can be a respectful debate so Members will feel free to open their minds and then to change them if the facts warrant that.

But this bill is a beginning. It seeks to address the overall problem in a much more comprehensive and practical way.

First with regard to border enforcement. The bill doubles the number of Border Patrol agents. It adds 12,000 over 5 years. Senator KYL and I had testimony in the Terrorism and Technology Subcommittee from the head of Border Patrol that today there are 11,300 Border Patrol agents. This more than doubles that number over the next 5 years.

It also would add an additional 2,500 new ports of entry inspectors in this same period so that the ports of entry are strengthened and legal immigration is able to be handled in a more prompt manner.

It criminalizes the act of constructing or financing a tunnel or subterranean passage across an international border into the United States. Most people don't know this, but this has become a real problem. There are 40 such tunnels that have been built since 9/11, and the great bulk of them are on the southern border. Large-scale smuggling of drugs, weapons, and immigrants takes place today through these tunnels.

I recently visited a tunnel running from San Diego to Tijuana, and I was struck by the inordinate sophistication of the tunnel. It was a half mile long. It went 60 to 80 feet deep, 8 feet tall. It had a concrete floor. It was wired for electricity. It had drainage. At one end, 300 pounds of marijuana were found, and at the other end, 300 pounds of marijuana.

What was interesting is that the California entry into the tunnel was a very modern warehouse, a huge warehouse compartmented but empty and kept empty for a year. You went into one office, and there was a hatch in the floor. It looked much like the hatch which Saddam had secreted himself in. But when you lifted that hatch and you looked underground, you saw a very sophisticated tunnel. It went under other buildings all the way across the double fence into Mexico and up in Mexico in a building as well.

Today, interestingly enough, at this time, there is no law that makes building or financing such a tunnel a crime. A provision in this bill includes language from the Feinstein-Kyl Border Tunnel Prevention Act which would make the building or financing of a cross-border tunnel a crime punishable by up to 20 years.

This bill also authorizes additional unmanned aerial vehicles, modern cameras, sensors, and other new technologies to allow the Department of Homeland Security to work with the Department of Defense so the latter

can carry out surveillance activities at the border to prevent illegal immigration. So this bill is very strong on border enforcement. But it doesn't just leave it there, as the majority leader's bill does. It says, that is only half the problem; you have to deal with the other half of the problem, and there is the rub. That is the difficult part, and that is the controversial part as well.

The bill we have from the Judiciary Committee seeks to remedy the very real needs of our economy which, as much as we might want to, cannot be ignored. Our global economy has changed the face of the American workforce. I am not going to comment on whether this is good or bad. In some cases, it is one or the other. In some cases, it is mixed. But the fact of the matter is the needs are different and the workforce is somewhat different.

Let me give you a large industry: Agriculture. There are about 1,600,000 workers in this country who work in agriculture. In my State, there are 566,000. I would hazard an informed guess that half of the 566,000 are here in undocumented status. I have had farmer after farmer, grower after grower tell me they cannot farm, they cannot grow without this workforce. I didn't believe it, so I got in touch with 58—we have 58 counties—58 welfare departments and asked them to post notices saying: Please, there are jobs in agriculture. Here is where to come. Here is to what expect. Guess what. Not a single person responded anywhere in the 58 counties of California.

That was pretty convincing evidence to me that Americans don't choose to do this work. It is the undocumented workforce who has been the mainstay of American agriculture, whether through the H-2A program coming cyclically or whether it is through a large contingent of undocumented workers who remain in this country year after year and do this work.

Under this program—and this was an amendment that I made after negotiations with Senator CRAIG who has been one of the Senate leaders on the agriculture jobs program—and I was very pleased to negotiate with him and very delighted to see that he really cared enough to spend the day Monday in the Judiciary Committee. Between us, and with the committee's help, we have worked out a program whereby an undocumented worker could apply for a blue card if that worker could demonstrate that he or she has worked in American agriculture for at least 150 workdays within the previous 2 years before December 31, 2005. After receiving blue cards, individuals who have then worked an additional period in American agriculture for 3 years, 150 workdays per year, or 100 workdays per year for 5 years, would be eligible for a green card. Their spouses could work, and their children could remain in the country with them.

What would be the result of this? The result is that American agriculture

would have a stable base of employment which is legal, which has the opportunity to bring people out of the shadows into the bright light of day, assume additional responsibilities, grow in the process, and raise their families. I think that is healthy for America, not unhealthy.

Also, we reform the current H-2A program, which is the agricultural guest worker program, which employs, I would say around 30,000 people and is used largely in the tobacco-producing States. The way this is reformed is it makes it easier for an employer to apply for workers through an attestation system, the paperwork is simpler, the housing requirements are changed to make it easier. In general, the bill updates the H-2A agricultural program.

Returning to the larger bill, I suppose the most contentious part is what should happen to the 12 million people who are living here in the shadows, undocumented. Many would say they are here illegally; they ought to go back. Well, they are not going to go back. They are going to remain living furtively, and they are going to remain in the shadows. And most of them work.

The question before this body is: Does that make sound public policy sense over a substantial period of time? These immigrants live furtively. They are subject to work abuse, exploitation, threats, and blackmail. This bill would provide them with an opportunity to come into the light of day. But it wouldn't be easy for them. It is not an amnesty. An amnesty is instant forgiveness with no conditions. There are conditions on this. They must pay a fine of \$2,000, they must learn English, they must have paid all back taxes, and they must be evaluated as neither a criminal or a national security threat to this Nation.

Also, they would not go in front of anybody in the line. There are presently 3.3 million people waiting in other countries legally for green cards, and those people should and will be processed first. It is estimated it will take, believe it or not, up to 6 years to process 3.3 million. These workers, these undocumented 12 million would go at the end of that line, and then one by one, they would come through that line. If they have worked steadily for the 6-year period, if they can show they have paid all back taxes, if they have avoided any criminal convictions, if they have learned English in that time, they would be granted a green card. Therefore, they come out of a furtive lifestyle, hidden and in secret, living in fear that tomorrow they could or might be deported.

Over the years in the Senate, one of the things that we can do is put forward a private bill. If we see a family or an individual who we believe is an exceptional circumstance, we can try and get a private bill passed for them, and when we introduce the bill, their deportation is stayed. It is very hard to get a private bill through. Many Mem-

bers don't do private bills. I met some of the families. I want to give you three cases that I think are eloquent testimony to what is happening amongst the 12 million.

Let me share with you a family. Their last name is Arreola. They live in Porterville, CA. I have filed a private immigration relief bill for them over 2 sessions. I didn't get the bill passed, but their deportation has been stayed. Mr. and Mrs. Arreola came to the United States from Mexico illegally in the 1980s to work in agriculture. They have five children, two brought to the United States as toddlers, and three born in the United States. They range from 8 years old today to 19, and they know no other home but this country.

Their eldest daughter, Nayely, is a bright, engaging student. I have met her and talked with her. She is the embodiment of the American dream and what can happen when we give children a chance to excel in a loving, nurturing environment. She was the first in her family to graduate from high school and the first to go to college. And on a full scholarship. She goes to Fresno Pacific University. Mrs. Arreola works as a produce packer and Mr. Arreola now has an appliance repair business. They have no criminal background. They own their home. They pay their taxes. For Nayely, this bill offers a glimmer of hope that her family, once and for all, can come out of the shadows. They don't have to have that daily fear of deportation. They have been here for 20 years. They are and will be legal, productive citizens.

One other example. Shigeru Yamada is a 21-year-old Japanese national living in Chula Vista, CA. He is facing removal from this country due to a tragic circumstance relating to the death of his mother. He entered the United States with his mother and two sisters in 1992 at the age of 10. He fled from an alcoholic father who had been physically abusive to his mother, the children, and even his own parents.

Tragically, Shigeru's mother was killed in a car crash in 1995, and he was orphaned at the age of 13. The death of his mother also served to impede the process for him to legalize his status. He could not legalize his status. At the time of her death, his family was living legally in the United States. His mother had acquired a student visa for herself and her children. Her death revoked his legal status in the United States.

In addition, his mother was also engaged to an American citizen at the time of her death. Had she survived, her son would have become an American citizen through this marriage. Instead, today, he is an illegal immigrant leading a model American life. He graduated with honors from Eastlake High School in 2000. He has earned a number of awards, including being named an "Outstanding English Student" his freshman year. He is an All-American Scholar, and he is earning

the United States National Minority Leadership Award. He was vice president of the associated student body his senior year of high school. He is popular and he is trustworthy. He is an athlete. He was named the "Most Inspirational Player of the Year" in junior varsity baseball and football as well as varsity football. After graduating, he volunteered for 4 years to help coach the school's girl's softball team.

Sending him back to Japan today would be an enormous hardship. He doesn't speak the language. He is unaware of the Nation's cultural trends. He is American, raised here, educated here. He is one who is deserving, who would be helped by this legislation.

I see the minority leader, and I know he has a very busy agenda. Regretfully, I have a little bit more, so I will finish up.

Let me give a third example of the type and character of individuals that this bill would legalize. The Plascencias are Mexican nationals living in San Bruno, CA. They are undocumented. They face removal from the country due to the fact that they have received ineffective assistance of counsel. They have four children, all born in this country. The mother and father are subject to deportation; the children are not. They arrived in this country in 1988, and they have worked hard. Mrs. Plascencia studied English. She is now taking nursing classes at the College of San Mateo. She worked for 4 years in the oncology department of Kaiser Permanente Hospital, where she was a medical assistance.

Mr. Plascencia works at Vince's Shellfish Market. During the last 13 years he has worked his way up from part-time employee to his current supervisory position. He is now the foreman in charge of the packing department.

The Plascencia family has struggled to become legal residents for many years. Based on the advice of counsel, whom they were later forced to fire for gross incompetence, they applied for asylum. The application was denied, and they were placed in removal proceedings.

Their children—Christina, 13; Erika, 9; Alfredo, 7; and Daisy, 2—are entitled to remain. Their eldest daughter, Christina, is enrolled in Parkside Intermediate School in San Bruno, where she is an honor student. Erika and Alfredo are enrolled in Belle Air Elementary School. They are doing well. They have received praise from their teachers.

This family has worked hard to achieve the financial security their children now enjoy. This includes a home they purchased 3 years ago in San Bruno, CA. They own their car. They have medical insurance. And they have paid their taxes.

It is very clear to me and I think to a majority of Americans that this family has embraced the American dream and their continued presence in our country would do much to enhance the



values we hold dear. So I believe that by presenting a pathway for the 12 million to become legal, this bill offers the only realistic option. Think about it. How do you find 12 million people, and what do you do when you find them, if you do? If brought across the border, they return the next day. This is their home. This is their work. There are no adequate facilities to detain them. And most, today, have become a vital and necessary part of the American workforce—in agriculture, in restaurants, in hotels, in landscaping, and throughout our economy.

We need to build a border infrastructure that is modern and effective. We can do that. Operation Gatekeeper has shown irrefutably we can, in fact, enforce our borders if we have the will to do so and we are willing to spend the money to do so. But we also need to find an orderly way to allow those people who are already here, who are embedded in our communities and in our workforce, to be able to continue to remain. This bill does that.

I know this is tough for everybody because I know emotions run high and it is really hard to change your mind on this subject because there are so many conflicting pressures. But we have an opportunity to chart a new destiny for a lot of people. We have an opportunity to do something which has a chance to work, which is real, which meets the needs of real people out there, and which can stop the illegal infusion through our borders in the future if we act wisely, well, and effectively.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a man—well, actually a boy—by the name of Israel Goldfarb came to the United States from Russia with his parents. He and his family were forced to leave Russia because of the pogroms that were going on. The economic situation for the Goldfarb family was chaotic, and no end was in sight for the problems the family faced. The little boy came to America with his parents and found a home with his parents in Minnesota, got an education, changed his name from Israel to Earl, and eventually came to California, where he met his wife. She was also of Lithuanian extraction. They married and had a very good life.

The best part of their life was their having one child. They had one child from that union. The reason that is so meaningful to me is that one child is my wife. My wife's father was a Russian immigrant, may he rest in peace. Of course, he and his lovely wife are gone. But for me, whenever I hear stories of immigrants and immigration, I think, but for this great country that opened its arms to this Jewish immigrant family, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to fall in love with my wife, Landra, and have five children of whom we are very proud. So immigration to me is more than just a word.

I am very happy that the Senate has started debate on immigration reform. Last week, 8 days ago, I traveled to the border, the California-Mexican border. It was an eye-opening trip, to say the least. I was able to see firsthand the problems created by our broken immigration laws. We need a serious strategy to address this crisis, and that is an understatement.

I am always so impressed with public servants. Public servants are more than Governors and Secretaries in the Cabinet and Senators. Public servants are the people who work in these buildings here in Washington and all over the country, these Federal offices. People who work in these agencies we have created all over America, I saw them firsthand in California a week ago Wednesday. Such dedication is hard for me to comprehend. Every day, these men and women put their lives on the line to enforce laws that we pass. I am very proud of the people who work on our borders. Again, we need a serious strategy to address the crisis that we have—and it is one.

Immigration reform is a matter of national security. We must know who is crossing our borders, when they cross our borders, who is living and working in our country. We need tough and smart enforcement at the border and throughout the country. And we need realistic immigration laws that bring immigrants out of the shadows, paying taxes, learning English, and contributing to our communities.

I strongly support enforcement, but I also know that enforcement alone cannot solve the problem. We have tried that. We tried it for the last many decades. We have tripled the number of Border Patrol agents over the last two decades. I am glad we have. I voted for every one of them. We increased immigration enforcement in the budget 10 times over. We need to do more, but during the same time we tripled the number of border agents and increased our immigration enforcement budget 10 times over, the probability of catching someone illegally crossing our borders has fallen from 32 percent to 5 percent.

My recent visit to the border convinces me all the more that enforcement alone is not the answer. I flew over miles of the border—San Diego going into Arizona. As I said, I have talked at length with the Border Patrol agents. They recognize better than anyone in this Chamber that fences don't keep people out. Near San Diego, we have a big metal fence. I don't know how tall it is, maybe 8 feet tall. And then we put up another chain link fence—tall, maybe 9 or 10 feet tall. The agents explained to me that people cut through, climb over, tunnel under. They showed me the new fence, a big, thick, chain link fence. They showed me the dents in the fence, the secondary fence, from people throwing ladders up and hooking them and climbing up over these.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will use leader time.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the agents also showed me huge slingshots, for lack of a better description, metal slingshots that shoot ball bearings. These criminals who are trying to illegally bring people over the walls have these huge slingshots, and they will get a ladder over where the metal fence is, and they fire these and they do tremendous damage to our Border Patrol agents. That is just one example. I saw that famous tunnel. It was a third of a mile long; in some places 80 feet deep.

Half a million people come over our border, the Mexican border, every year. The fact is, our economy depends on them. We simply cannot get the situation under control until we acknowledge economic reality. To be sure, we need more Border Patrol agents, and we should give them the equipment and technology they need. We must shut down the flow of illegal immigration, but we also need realistic and enforceable immigration laws.

One crucial element of this strategy is to provide incentives for the undocumented immigrants already in the country to step out of the shadows. Today, there are more than 11 million undocumented people in our country, and more are coming every day. From a national security perspective, this is not acceptable. A sovereign government must know the identity of people crossing its borders and living in its cities. Of course, most of these 11 million people pose no threat, but those who do—we must know who they are.

Most of these 11 million have been here for a long time. Most have children and spouses who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents. Most pay taxes on property and are active, valuable members of their communities. Virtually all of them came here to work. But they are living in hiding. If they are the victim of crime, they don't report it because they are afraid to have contact with the police. They accept abuse and low wages in the workplace. They live in fear every day that they will be deported and separated from their families. They must have incentives to come out of the shadows. It is unrealistic to think we can round up these people and expel them.

As conservative columnist George Will recently wrote in the *Washington Post*:

We are not going to take the draconian police measures necessary to deport 11 million people. They would fill 200,000 buses in a caravan stretching bumper-to-dumper from San Diego to Alaska.

That is farther than San Diego to Miami.

He writes:

And there are no plausible incentives to get the 11 million people to board the buses.

Even if we could depart 11 million people, how would we? Do we want to? It would cost billions of dollars. Some

sectors of the U.S. economy would literally shut down, and it would be inconsistent with our core values as Americans.

There are two competing approaches to this issue. The House of Representatives has passed a bill that represents one approach. The Senate Judiciary Committee—and I compliment and applaud Senator SPECTER, Senator LEAHY, Senator KENNEDY, and all the members of the Judiciary Committee—reported out a bill that is bipartisan.

I believe the House bill is profoundly misguided. It purports to be a border security bill, but it contains provisions that are not about securing our borders at all. It makes criminals out of and demonizes a lot of hard-working people who are just trying to provide for their families. In my view, the House bill is mean-spirited and I really believe un-American and it would not solve the problem.

In contrast, the Senate Judiciary Committee bill would take real steps to restore order to our immigration system. It combines tough, effective enforcement with smart reforms to the immigration laws. It would strengthen our borders, crack down on employers who hire illegally, and bring undocumented immigrants out of the shadows. It would require them to learn English and pay taxes, have no criminal record, have a job, and pay fines in order to work toward legalization. And it is not amnesty. There is no free pass, no jumping to the front of the line. It is a bipartisan bill. Half the Republicans on the committee voted for it.

By shifting the flow of undocumented immigrants to legal channels and creating a hard-earned path to citizenship for those already here, we can finally focus on catching the criminals and terrorists who put our Nation at risk. That makes more sense than spending precious law enforcement resources trying to track down hard-working housekeepers, dishwashers, and other people who have jobs.

As we weigh these competing proposals in the coming days, we must not forget we are a nation founded on and built by immigrants.

My grandmother came from England. I talked to you about my in-laws—Russia, Lithuania. My great-grandparents came here to pursue the American dream. Let us honor that proud heritage and move forward on the committee-reported bill. That is a step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3191 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3192

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] proposes an amendment numbered 3191 to amendment No. 3192.

Mr. FRIST. 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 require the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to collect statistics, and prepare reports describing the statistics, relating to deaths occurring at the border between the United States and Mexico)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEATHS AT UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER.**

(a) COLLECTION OF STATISTICS.—The Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall collect statistics relating to deaths occurring at the border between the United States and Mexico, including—

- (1) the causes of the deaths; and
- (2) the total number of deaths.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Secretary a report that—

- (1) analyzes trends with respect to the statistics collected under subsection (a) during the preceding year; and
- (2) recommends actions to reduce the deaths described in subsection (a).

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the debate and discussion today has been superb in terms of addressing the overall issue of border security and immigration. It centers on the issue of security, of the economy itself, social issues, and issues of compassion. The amendment I have just proposed is an amendment that focuses on the latter; that is, the issue of compassion.

Over the past decade more than 3,000 men, women, and children have died along our borders. These deaths represent an immense humanitarian tragedy, a tragedy that all too often is shuffled off into the corner. While we have an obligation to protect our borders—and much of our discussion over the last 24 hours has been on the absolute critical importance of securing those borders—I think we have even a higher obligation to protect and preserve the life of every person who sets foot on American soil.

The people who die come here searching for a better life. They are not bad people. There are people such as Matias Garcia.

Mr. Garcia was the oldest of five children. He left school at the age of 8 to work in the fields. It is a story which is not too uncommon today. Each year he would cross that border illegally, unfortunately, coming into this country to enter California.

In the spring of 2003, he started crossing that border in May—one of the hottest months of the summer. A coyote—a human smuggler—left him with only 2 gallons of water. It wasn't enough. He became delirious, lost touch with reality and collapsed on the ground, to die within sight of the Arizona highway he had struggled to reach.

I commend the Customs and Border Protection's existing efforts to save

migrants. I know the men and the women of the Customs and Border Protection agency put human life first, but we are failing today.

When I first started looking into this issue, I asked for the statistics and the statistics simply were not available. I would have to go to a local newspaper, call that newspaper along that border and another newspaper to compile statistics.

We must better direct our efforts to understand why people die, where they die and, most importantly, what we can do to reduce that death toll.

I have already requested that the Government Accountability Office report to us about this. But we cannot wait. We must begin to count those deaths now to see what lies behind those deaths and to see what we can do to mitigate that unnecessary loss of life. We must reduce the death toll.

This amendment will do both of those things, and we must save all the lives we can. I ask my colleagues to support this vital amendment. It requires the CBP to begin compiling reports about the number of deaths along the borders and their causes, and to also analyze those trends in border deaths and suggest specific policies that might serve to reduce them.

I ask my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is absent attending a funeral.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is absent due to a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Bond	Clinton
Alexander	Brownback	Coburn
Allard	Bunning	Cochran
Allen	Burns	Coleman
Baucus	Burr	Collins
Bayh	Cantwell	Conrad
Bennett	Carper	Cornyn
Biden	Chafee	Craig
Bingaman	Chambliss	Crapo

Dayton	Kennedy	Reid
DeMint	Kerry	Roberts
DeWine	Kohl	Salazar
Dodd	Kyl	Santorum
Dole	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Domenici	Lautenberg	Schumer
Dorgan	Leahy	Sessions
Durbin	Levin	Shelby
Ensign	Lieberman	Smith
Enzi	Lincoln	Snowe
Feingold	Lott	Specter
Feinstein	Lugar	Stabenow
Frist	Martinez	Stevens
Graham	McCain	Sununu
Grassley	McConnell	Talent
Hagel	Menendez	Thomas
Hatch	Mikulski	Thune
Hutchison	Murkowski	Vitter
Inhofe	Murray	Voinovich
Imouye	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Isakson	Obama	Wyden
Jeffords	Pryor	
Johnson	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Byrd	Harkin	Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 3191) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized: Senator MARTINEZ, for up to 3 minutes; Senator CRAIG, for up to 15 minutes; Senator DORGAN, for up to 20 minutes; Senator LINCOLN, for 15 minutes, with a Republican speaker between Senator DORGAN and Senator LINCOLN; and that the majority leader or his designee be recognized at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 2 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. MARTINEZ are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to participate in what I believe is a fundamentally important, if not historical, debate about national security and border control and immigration and local law enforcement, of a magnitude and an importance that this country has not seen in a long while.

This afternoon, I want to focus on border control because border control is synonymous with national security. If there is one responsibility our Government has—it is, in fact, a constitutional responsibility—it is that of national security.

It is crucial, for observers, citizens, listening in, watching, trying to understand this debate—and oftentimes frustrated by it—to understand that while there are many contentious issues that

will be discussed and debated over the course of the remainder of today and tomorrow and next week—and that the news media may well focus on only segments of it, attempting to dramatize it, attempting to suggest there are great divisions amongst Members of the Senate and the Congress as a whole, and the citizens as a whole—Congress will start and end with legislation that serves, first and foremost, the national security interests of our country.

The bill that is now before us includes provisions that are unique and important and truly address those kinds of concerns that Americans have been speaking out about ever since 9/11, ever since we were thrust upon the issue of immigration and a reality that we had anywhere from 8 to 12 million foreign nationals, undocumented people within our country, and that some of them, while but a few, were intent on doing us harm, were intent on attacking our citizens and not here to work and to benefit themselves and their families. So it is appropriate that we start this discussion by looking at a critical element of national security, and that is simply border control.

I must tell my colleagues, that is as difficult, if not more difficult than attempting to address, understand, and identify some 11-plus million undocumented foreign nationals who are now in our country. Why? Because we have phenomenal borders. The United States has 7,458 miles of land borders and over 88,600 miles of tidal shoreline. We cannot possibly build a fence that long, that high, and that deep everywhere to accommodate with absolute surety that those borders are impenetrable.

I grew up with this as a very common statement amongst most Americans. When you read the history books and the government books of my day, while I was in the sixth and seventh and eighth grade and in high school and college, America was tremendously proud that it had literally thousands and thousands of miles of northern border and southern border that were unguarded, that we were a peaceful nation. And the nation to our north, Canada, and the nation to our south, Mexico, were peaceful nations. We didn't have to have guarded borders, and we didn't guard them. It was not only impractical in that day, it was simply unnecessary.

We realize the world has changed significantly and that clearly establishing workable security policies that act in many ways as a fence or a border must be called a virtual fence, a virtually impenetrable border because it won't be just building the fence where many propose it ought to be built. It goes well beyond that. It truly is a policy that works, that allows, that identifies, that controls, that shapes the relationship of our border so that while we want to stop those who may do us harm and control those who want to cross the border undetected, we must also recognize that we have to allow

and we must allow movement of innocent citizens and commercial traffic. That is the nature of a border—to control, to shape, to clarify, to identify those who move across our borders.

In the last 5 years, we have increased funding for border security by 60 percent. For those who say you have done nothing, you are just flat wrong. This Congress, understanding from 9/11 to today the responsibility of controlling our borders, has invested dramatically the resources of the American taxpayer. We now have some 10,000 Border Patrol agents along the southwestern border and 1,000 along our northern border. Our border protection agents have removed more than 4.5 million people, of whom some 350,000 have criminal records. In fiscal year 2005 alone, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended 1.19 million people attempting to enter our country illegally. Through the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Congress has provided more than \$4 billion to State and local governments to help with the cost of incarcerating criminal aliens. It isn't just making sure the border is impenetrable, but when they cross the border making sure that we at the local level can bring about the kind of law enforcement that apprehends at least the criminal element and incarcerates them and holds them for future prosecution.

Last year's emergency supplemental funding bill contained an amendment by Senator ROBERT BYRD and myself reprogramming funds from other programs to make an immediate and substantial downpayment on increasing Border Patrol as well as adding hundreds of other law enforcement agents and nearly 2,000 more detention beds for illegal immigrants the law requires to be held for criminal activity. We didn't even have space, once arrested, once apprehended, to put the criminal element or those we felt might be engaged in criminal activity.

However, even as we have increased border enforcement, net illegal immigration continues to be estimated at 400,000 to 500,000 people a year. We were all stunned last week at the report that undercover Federal agents managed to smuggle radioactive material through security checkpoints at the border. For all the billions we have invested, while there is no question the border is tightening, it is still penetrable in an illegal way.

Clearly, despite the resources we have poured into the border, and with many successes, there is still much left to be done. The legislation before us, incorporated in a much broader immigration policy, is the kind of legislation that ought to go first, coupled with a responsible national immigration policy.

Both bills before the Senate today contain numerous provisions aimed at improving our border security. They will increase the number of Federal officers policing our borders and improve their training. These bills will clean up

Federal laws addressing criminal aliens, increasing the penalties for alien smuggling and gang violence and illegal entry and reentry, and expanding the definition of aggravated felony that is the basis for removing aliens or denying them entry in the first place.

These bills support the President's decision to end the catch-and-release program. Can you imagine, that is exactly what we have been doing. You catch an undocumented worker, you file it, you release them. Why? We didn't have the capacity to detain them and hold them, to process them appropriately and make sure they were returned to the other side of the border. Clearly, that is now in here, instead of requiring detention of all aliens caught illegally across the border until they could be formally removed. We couldn't handle that. Now we are increasing the number of ports of entry and provide for improvement of existing ports.

There is much more to improve border security in this legislation. I thought I would refer to a few of the other areas of enforcement policy. The bill authorizes 250 new Customs and border protection officers, 200 new positions for investigative personnel to investigate alien smuggling, and 250 additional port of entry inspectors annually from fiscal 2007 to fiscal 2011. It also increases the number of Customs enforcement inspectors by 200 in section 5203 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. It authorizes 2,400 additional Border Patrol agents annually for 6 years, adding an additional 4,400 agents to the border over 6 years to the 10,000 already added by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, for a total of 14,400 new Border Patrol agents by 2011.

If America says nothing is being done, then America, listen up: This Congress is as committed as you are concerned about border control and building that fence. But it will not be a steel and concrete fence stretching from the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of California and the west coast. It will be a virtual fence of electronics, of surveillance flights, of the recognition of new ports and people, personnel, because the other is, at best, impractical and, at worst, once done, unworkable. That is why what we are doing now, many of us who have studied and worked with this issue for a good number of years believe, is the right approach.

Technical assistance and infrastructure: The bill authorizes such sums as are necessary in the acquisition of unmanned aerial vehicles, cameras, poles, sensors, and other kinds of technology to achieve operational control of the borders and to construct all-weather roads and add vehicles and vehicle barriers along the borders.

It requires the Department of Homeland Security to replace damaged primary fencing and double- or triple-layered fencing in Arizona's population

centers and on the border, and to construct at least 200 miles of vehicle barriers and all-weather roads in areas that are known transit points for illegals who traffic the border. Is this nothing? This is a phenomenal, historic investment in building that virtual fence that is necessary and appropriate at this time.

It is safe to say that nobody in Congress, House or Senate, believes our job is done until we have acted to increase security for America's citizens, knowing that those who cross the border cross it legally and that those who cross are not a criminal element, are not putting our citizens at risk. None of us believes our job will be done until the border is closed but open to legal entry, open to those who have a right to come across because we have so designated them, so recognized them for the purpose they would come—to work in our economy to provide for themselves and their families, to come here to work, to go home, to someday become an American citizen if they choose and if they stand in line and make the application and make the effort to become just that.

I have been very outspoken about agriculture and agriculture's need for foreign national workers. American agriculture needs some 1.2 million workers annually. Many will be foreign nationals, as they have been in the past. Without them, it is possible that we could collapse American agriculture. If we cannot find the workforce for American agriculture to come here to work, then American agriculture's investment will go elsewhere to fill the supermarket shelves of our country with the quality of plentiful food that American consumers have grown and expect to be there. What American consumers have not recognized is that over the last 20 years, most of that food has been harvested by illegal foreign nationals.

Next week, I will talk in detail about changes in policy that are embodied within this legislation to improve our immigration policy, to recognize those who have come who deserve to be treated fairly. But today, tomorrow, and clearly throughout the week, I hope Americans understand that first and foremost our effort is to gain control of our borders, to make them secure, to make Americans feel comfortable that we have done our very best to take the thousands and thousands of miles of border, both land and sea, and to secure them for the sake of our Nation's security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, some long while ago, I was on a helicopter flying in Central America between Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador, in the mountains and jungles, with two other Members of Congress. We, unfortunately, ran out of fuel. So we abruptly landed. It is a universal rule that if you are in a flying machine and you

run out of gas, you will be landing soon and we did. We were there for 4 or 5 hours until someone found us and sent other helicopters in to get us out.

The campesinos in the area had seen the helicopters landing and they decided to walk up and see who we were. So 30, 40 campesinos came to the helicopter that landed, and we talked with them. We had an interpreter with us.

I visited with a young woman with her three children in tow. We talked about her life. She had never met anybody from the United States. I asked about her life and I said: What would you aspire to do with your life? She said: I would like to come to the United States of America. I said: Why would that be the case? She said: Well, that is where there is opportunity—in the United States of America. This young woman, in the jungles of Nicaragua and Honduras, saw opportunity in the United States.

It is true that in much of the world, if you ask people what are your aspirations, they would like to go to the United States. We are a beacon of hope and opportunity. We have created a country that is quite extraordinary—a country in which we have developed a broad middle class. That middle class helped create jobs that paid well, that had retirement and health benefits, raised families, built communities, built churches, built schools, sent their kids to schools. What a remarkable country.

At the start of the last century, leading all the way up to this century, we had debates, which sometimes turned violent, about what are the conditions of freedom, what are the rights in this country. People died in the streets. James Fyler died. Not many remember his name. He was shot 56 times. Do you know why James Fyler was shot 56 times? It was because he believed that people who were going down into the coal mines ought to have a better deal. He stood for coal miners, for the right to form labor organizations and bargain collectively. He paid for that with his life.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the first third of the century, helped write and signed the Fair Labor Standards Act, which created rights for American workers. It changed the conditions of work in our country. When Roosevelt died—there is the story that I have mentioned previously on the floor of the Senate about the journalist covering his funeral. As his body lie in state in the Capitol of the United States, a long line of people formed to file past the body of the President. A working man holding his cap, with tears in his eyes, stood in the line a long while. The journalist came up to him and said: Did you know President Roosevelt? And the working man said: No, I didn't, but he knew me.

His point was that this was a President who stood with working men and women. Who knows the working men and women today? Who stands with them and for them today? Well, we

built a place that is quite extraordinary, and a lot of people want to come to this place. Now, if you fast forward to 2006, we see a strategy in this country with respect to trade, the outsourcing of American jobs, and now with respect to immigration, of insourcing cheap labor.

I know this is a sensitive subject and a very difficult one for the Congress and the American people. There are two elements of what is being discussed by President Bush and by those in the Chamber of the Senate. One deals with those who have come to this country illegally—the 11 million or so—and the second deals with an add-on to that, offered in unlimited quantity by President Bush and in the quantity of 400,000 workers per year by the underlying bill discussed in the Senate, called guest workers.

I will talk a little about this. This chart shows the illegal immigration over the past two decades. People don't like to use the term, but you have to use that term. We have processes for immigration here. Let me describe what that process is. We allow people, through H-2A visas and H-2B visas—agriculture and non-agriculture work—to come into this country legally. In addition, people immigrate to live here permanently. In 2004, 175,000 people immigrated here legally from Mexico. By comparison, last year, 1.1 million who attempted to come into this country illegally were stopped at the border.

Last year, we understand—although we don't have hard numbers—in addition to the 1.1 million who were stopped at the border, another 400,000 to 700,000 came across illegally, to add to this growing number of illegal immigrants in this country.

My colleagues say—and I understand the comment—nobody is going to round up 11 million or 12 million people and prosecute them and deport them and all that. I understand that. We are going to discuss the conditions of all of that, and that is important to do. I don't want to, nor would any of my colleagues want to, diminish the worth, the dignity of those who are part of this pool. They came here illegally, but many have been here a long time. I understand that is a difficult issue. But let me not talk about that.

Let me talk instead about the add-on by President Bush and by the underlying bill in the Senate dealing with guest workers. I want to talk about that because as we outsource American jobs through terrible trade deals and because big American corporations want to find cheap labor in China, Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka, as we outsource those jobs and decide to insource cheap labor to take the jobs on the bottom of the economic ladder here, the question ought to be asked: Mr. President, who knows today's American workers—especially those at the bottom of the economic ladder?

I know the folks at the top have had it real good for a long time. They have an increasing share of America's in-

come. But the folks at the bottom have struggled, lost ground, lost jobs, lost retirement, lost health care. Now this Congress is saying we want to change the status of 11 million people who are here illegally and make them legal, No. 1; No. 2, in addition to that, we want to have a guest worker program by which 400,000 people who now are outside of this country are going to be allowed in, in the next year, and that can increase 20 percent each year. As this chart shows, that guest worker provision, in my judgment, will likely lead to 4.6 million additional people coming into this country who now live outside of the country.

What is the purpose of this? I don't think there is much question at all. Why does the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and American business want this? They want to bring in cheap labor. We have seen lots of examples of this. Let me show a picture. This photograph shows immigrant workers who were doing work in response to Hurricane Katrina. I will tell you about this for a minute because I want to talk about motives and what is happening with respect to this proposal for guest workers which is of, by, and for American business that wants to import cheap labor.

On October 17 of last year, I chaired a Democratic Policy Committee hearing to talk about contracting practices with respect to the recovery effort due to Katrina. I heard from Al Knight and Mike Moran from Louisiana. They run a small business in Louisiana. Al and Mike run a New Orleans company. They were hired by a subcontractor of the Halliburton Corporation to provide 75 qualified electricians to work on a project they had begun at the naval air station in Belle Chasse, LA. The Halliburton subcontractor very quickly replaced their 75 local workers with workers from outside the region, many not trained as electricians and not from that region. Here is what Al Knight said, manager of the New Orleans company that lost that job, who had 75 workers who lost jobs:

Almost all of the workers were from out of State. Most did not speak English. Few seemed to be qualified electricians. According to the Halliburton subcontractor, they were being paid two-thirds of our prevailing hourly wage, with no benefits. At the time, they were living in small tents off base.

Another person who testified had this picture of the living conditions of immigrants being brought in at subpar wages to do this work. That is at the root of much of this discussion with respect to guest workers.

Five days after I held that hearing, the Washington Post ran an article that pointed out that there was a raid and they found the illegal workers down at that job site on a U.S. naval air base.

Look, I am not unsympathetic to people who want to work and come into this country. But I am much more sympathetic, as an American, to those people at the bottom fifth or the bot-

tom fourth of the wage scale in this country who are struggling to find good jobs, to hang onto those jobs.

We are told by companies: We cannot find American workers to take these jobs. Oh, really? I am telling you that there is a price at which people will take those jobs. You just want to pay dirt poor wages. How? Just bring in immigrants who work for lower level wages, and that way you never have to raise the income by which you attract American workers.

That, in my judgment, undercuts our economy, it disserves our workers, and it sends a message when you ask the question: Who knows American workers? Not this Congress, not this President. My hope is that we will start understanding what we are doing here. We are talking about American workers who all too often these days are seeing lost jobs, lost wages, lost retirement programs, lost health care, and lost opportunity. Now we are talking about a Congress that is talking not just about the 11 million people who came here illegally but about a Congress who says on top of that: Why don't we see if we can find a way, a formula by which we can add 400,000 a year; and at the end of 6 years, you conceivably could have said we want 4.6 million more workers who are now living in our country to come back to do this job. Is this about good government, about good economics? Is this sensible? Is this standing up for American workers? No.

I will tell you, it is about American businesses, big businesses who run most of the agenda around here, who want to continue to have access to a pipeline of cheap labor, because if you have cheap labor coming in, you never, ever have to increase wages at the bottom.

It has been 8 years since this Congress has increased the minimum wage for American workers—8 years. We have increased everything else—tax breaks for wealthy Americans, opportunities for companies to move jobs overseas. But we have not increased the minimum wage in 8 years. That is unbelievable. It is unforgivable, just in terms of values.

Now, we have quotas in this country by which we allow people in. Some don't like that. But the fact is, if tomorrow we had a new public policy and said as a country, look, there are no restrictions, no more quotas, no more immigration issues, whoever in this world wants to come here, God bless you, come and stay. If we did that, we all know what would happen. We share this small planet of ours with about 6.3 billion people; half of them live on less than \$2 a day. Half of them have never made a phone call, and they don't have access to clean, potable water. We simply cannot, as a country, having built what we built to increase our standard of living, decide that we can be the sponge for everybody everywhere who wants to come to our country. We cannot do that.

As a result, we have immigration laws. Those immigration laws provide opportunities for others to come to our country. Last year, for example, our Southern border allowed 175,000 people to immigrate legally. Second, through the processes of the visas that are issued for agricultural workers and temporary, seasonal nonagricultural workers, tens and tens of thousands more came across temporarily. That is the way we have always done business.

I understand those who have come to this floor saying let's try to find a way to address the status of the 11 million people who are already here. I don't understand this Congress, this President saying: Oh, by the way, we have this huge problem that has become a mushrooming problem, so let's bring in 400,000 more workers each year, and let's add to it by putting a formula in this bill that says we will have an expansion of 20 percent more each year, if you reach the 400,000 in the first quarter. I don't think that makes sense.

I understand all those who speak for immigrants, and I don't want to do anything to diminish their value, their worth, their dignity. God bless them all. But I also want to be here standing for American workers who are struggling trying to find their footing, trying to find a job.

There is no social program in this country, there is no social program that we work on in this Congress, as important as a good job that pays well because that allows everything else to be possible in a family. A good job allows people to take care of their kids. It allows people to do the things they want to do. There are fewer and fewer of those kinds of jobs.

To suggest on top of dealing with the 11 million-plus guest worker program to bring 400,000 a year in with a 20-percent expansion program on top of that, I think it defies all common sense. This is clearly a corporate strategy to keep wages low. It clearly will replace the jobs of American workers.

Let me describe a study that was recently done. Professor George Borjas of the John F. Kennedy School of Government did a study on the impact from 1980 to 2000 on U.S. wages by ethnicity. What he said is the kind of integration occurring with people taking substandard-wage jobs—and incidentally, corporations have been wanting to do that because if someone is illegal, they can pay them little or nothing. They don't have a lot of leverage with the employer. What he said is it has decreased income for the average American worker. It has decreased income for the Hispanic workers more than anyone, talking about the Hispanic workers who are part of the workforce legally, and it has decreased income for African Americans, Whites, and Asian. But Hispanics and African-Americans have been the hardest hit of all.

The fact is, with this illegal immigration and now on top of that, hundreds of thousands of so-called guest workers on top of the visas that al-

ready exist, there isn't any way to describe what this is going to mean other than it is going to depress income for the lowest 20 to 40 percent of the American workers, and it is going to take jobs from the lowest 20 to 40 percent of the American labor force.

I remember Ross Perot when he talked about NAFTA, the horrible trade agreement that has dramatically injured our country. He was then talking about American jobs going to Mexico. He called it that giant sucking sound, that giant sucking sound, sucking American jobs to Mexico. He was right about that. All the economists, all the hotshots who got paid all the money on behalf of American businesses particularly supporting NAFTA told us: Some jobs will go there. They will be low-skilled, low-wage jobs.

Oh, I am sorry. We have some experience now. Mr. President, do you know what those jobs are? The three biggest imports into this country from Mexico are automobiles, automobile parts, and electronics, all of them the product of high-skilled jobs but not high wages. They displaced high-skilled, high-wage jobs in this country. Now that giant sucking sound will be heard from the other direction. That giant sucking sound will be sucking 400,000 immigrant workers into this country each year at the bottom of the economic ladder to displace workers in this country. I am not talking about the 11 million; I am talking about 400,000 additional workers who will displace American workers and continue to put downward pressure on wages.

I don't understand what the thinking is of people who decide that they want to find a way to continue to diminish opportunities in our country for our workers. I think of what a turnabout this has been for this country in a century. There was a time when American workers were valued, work was valued. No one stood quite as tall as those who had a good job.

I am going to speak on this next week again, and I know others have some time, but I do want to make one final point. I have not yet spoken about the security on our borders. Senator DOMENICI and I introduced legislation dealing with real border security, which I expect we will talk about additionally. While I have talked about jobs and income and immigration, the issue here is in addition to security, a country targeted by terrorists has to have secure borders. A country that is such a magnet for illegal immigration has to have secure borders. A country that cares about its workers has to have secure borders. A country that cares about the ability of a worker to find a job and have a decent wage and have retirement benefits has to care about the security of its borders. It is just that simple.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Dakota leaves, I have been paying attention to his comments and feel strongly that he has made very good points. I am going to zero in on areas he did not cover. I suspect he will agree with many.

One point is there is an answer to stopping our perforated borders. There is a means of doing it a lot cheaper than people have talked about. And the other point is a requirement for English to be the official language. It is a rather complicated subject, but those two areas I think the Senator probably would agree with me, as I agree with most of the remarks he has made.

First, Mr. President, for some reason, I have never been sure why it is, but I have been invited to speak at more naturalization ceremonies in my State of Oklahoma than any other Members, I believe. It is always a very touching event for me because these people go through the process, the legal process, of becoming a citizen of the United States, as my grandparents had to do. They learned the language. They learned more about the history of this country than the average person you will run into on the streets of Washington, DC. And these people are so proud.

I recall one guy. He is from Vietnam. His name is Thi Van Nguyen. He is an outstanding young man, and he had worked hard to become a citizen. I happened to be a speaker at his naturalization ceremony that was taking place in one of the courthouses in Oklahoma.

After the ceremony was over, he went down and changed his name to James Thi Nguyen, instead of Thi Van Nguyen, which was the highest honor one can pay because here is a person who wanted to go through the process of becoming a citizen the right way. It appears to me anything short of a slap in the face to all these people who came here legally and did it right.

I would like to mention a couple of areas I am going to be offering in the way of amendments. One is what we call the National Border and Neighborhood Watch Program or the BRAVE Force. There is an acronym for everything. It stands for border regiment assisting in valuable enforcement.

I think we have learned one thing that probably most of us knew already. I draw from a background of having been a developer in south Texas right on the Texas border. I have been there many times, and I have been down there actually working and developing for some 35, 40 years.

It happens I am an aviator, so I would always fly my own plane down there and land at Cameron County Airport. It is adjacent to the immigration center. I would watch and see what was going on. Yes, we are taking good care of those people.

I started getting interested in it. I said: What is the negative? What are

these people facing should they be caught trying to come illegally over the border? They go into the center. So I looked over at the center and saw half were in brown jumpsuits and half were in orange jumpsuits. I said: What is the reason for that?

They said: A football team brown versus the green and basketball and other activities.

Probably the food—I went over and inspected it—is better than most people would eat in their country.

I looked at that and thought: We aren't really offering much of a disincentive for people to come in illegally.

This program we call the Brave Force Program recognizes that our borders can be closed, our borders can be strong borders, and we can stop people from coming in. I am sick and tired of people saying this can't be done or it can only be done with a certain kind of fence. There are areas with serious problems, but the answer is in numbers.

The minutemen demonstrated very clearly that if you have enough people down there and take a 35-mile area, you can stop people from coming across. I recognize the criticism of that program. I don't agree with it. Certainly there is some authentic argument against it when they say these people are not law enforcement people. They are not trained that way.

I found out something after 9/11 when we were dealing with the TSA, and that is that Federal law enforcement officers have a mandatory retirement age of 57. Since I have worked with them before, I started getting letters from them saying: Why can't we come in as sky marshals and other positions? We, as an organization, would be willing to do it just for cost, just to pay our expenses.

If we had an army down there, as my amendment calls for, these people are available. It is virtually just for the cost of sustaining these people while they are on watch. There would be an army of law enforcement officers for each trained Border Patrol agent. Then we have the neighborhood watch people who are volunteers and are not trained properly, but they can help the second tier.

There would be three tiers. We would have the trained Border Patrol people, then the retired law enforcement officers, and then, of course, the neighborhood watch people. It is a numbers game that has been very successful and has worked.

Civilian volunteers, much like the minutemen, would be able to report to those who are in a higher level of training. I think this BRAVE Force would be effective. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to see we can do something on the border. It is just we have not been able to do it.

Let me interject that as one of the high-ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I certainly don't want to get sucked into the point

where we are going to have to use military people on these borders when they are already overworked. The OPTEMPO of our military right now is at an unacceptable rate. By "military," I mean our standing forces, as well as the Reserve components—the Guard and Reserve. This wouldn't affect that. This would ensure we are not going to have to further dilute our military.

That is one of the amendments I am going to offer. The second one has to do with the English language. I know people get all exercised about this issue. The language is taken almost verbatim from PETER KING's House Resolution 4408 by strengthening a very weak provision in the Judiciary Committee bill that will be under consideration here, that illegal immigrants currently in the United States must merely "demonstrate an effort" to learn English when applying for a green card.

Anyone can demonstrate an effort to do anything. You don't have to do anything to do that. So that is a meaningless phrase. There is no requirement whatsoever. My amendment would require these immigrants to learn our language by making English the official language of the United States and making all official business of the United States conducted in English, including publications, tax forms, information material, and other items.

As a matter of fact, my amendment follows what at least 26 other States already have at the State level. They have English as the official language. Half the States already have that, and there is nothing wrong with making that uniform throughout the United States.

Making English the official language would eliminate about \$1 billion to \$2 billion annually that we spend on providing language assistance, including Federal agencies and funds recipients, according to the Office of Management and Budget.

Studies show that those who know English get better jobs, earn more money, and are less likely to be uninsured. As a result, English decreases Government dependency.

This will come as a shock to you, Mr. President, because they think—and I do speak Spanish. I have worked for many years in areas—I was a commercial pilot in some of the Latin American countries. I know the language fairly well, so I can communicate. But I do know this: There are a lot of immigrants in this country who support English as the language.

In 1995, there was a poll—I talked about this once before on the floor—by Luntz Research, and it said that more than 80 percent of immigrants supported making English the official language.

Eighty percent. These are the ones who are supposed to be against it. They are not against it, they are for it.

The need for official English appears in our newspapers every day—injuries in the workplace, lawsuits over

mistranslation in hospitals, people who are unable to support their families—all because they can't speak English. Making English the official language would also help immigrants assimilate, which is vitally important to becoming an American and preserving our rich heritage.

As my colleague, Senator ALEXANDER, said yesterday—and I thought so much of this, I got his quotes—he said:

Becoming an American—

This is very significant—

Becoming an American is also a unique accomplishment because it has nothing to do with ancestry.

In other countries, it has to do with ancestry. My family came from Germany, so we all come from different places.

He said:

America is an idea, not a race. We are united by principles expressed in our founding documents—the very principles that we are debating in this immigration legislation—not by our multiple ancestries.

I am still quoting from Senator ALEXANDER, who made this speech yesterday, which is well researched and well thought out.

Some suggest that our diversity is what makes our country great. To be sure, diversity is one of our strengths, but diversity is not our greatest strength. Jerusalem is diverse. The Balkans are diverse. Iraq is diverse. The greatest accomplishment of the United States of America is that we have molded that magnificent diversity into one Nation based upon a set of common principles, language, and traditions. That is why the words above the desk—

And the desks of many of us, including mine—

say "One from many," not "Many from one."

Clearly, as Senator ALEXANDER so eloquently stated, our Nation is unique among the nations of the world in that we welcome people from all countries and backgrounds to become Americans. By becoming Americans, they are saying they want to adopt our laws and our way of life, and this includes speaking English. It is very much like the case I just cited to you of Thi Van Nguyen coming in so emotionally wrapped up. It wasn't enough just to become a citizen of the United States, he wanted to adopt my name.

Some of our colleagues as well as the people watching us may think this amendment is unnecessary because they mistakenly think English is our official language anyway, but it is not. I have received constituent letters insisting that the Senate do something about bilingual ballots, bilingual education, and driver's licenses in other languages.

People in my State of Oklahoma are angry, and they have good reason to be so. It seems there are those who object to immigrants learning a single word of English. This is not an exaggeration. In the April 10, 2006, issue of *The Nation* magazine, an article called "Strangers in the Land" seriously asks:

Why should linguistic competence be a factor—or acceptable as an item for democratic debate—in determining citizenship? As my comrade for a day in Los Angeles would attest, a nonEnglish speaker in the United States not only can get and hold down a job; she—

Or he—

can also turn out the vote. Why should a nonEnglish speaker be allowed to mobilize for American democracy, not to join it as a citizen?

Learning the language and learning something about American history was something the ancestors of nearly everyone in this Chamber accomplished as a matter of course. All of a sudden, everything is changing, and we are told that it is unfair to expect today's immigrants to do likewise. Yet if people are not encouraged to learn English, they will be dependent upon translation services for the rest of their lives. There is nothing wrong with using a translator. I have done so on my trips to Africa quite often. But it is dangerous to rely entirely upon the accuracy of any translator, especially in one's own country. The competence of any given interpreter is all too often in the eye of the beholder.

Judge Wayne Purdom told the National Law Review that once interpreters are in place, the arguments have only begun:

Sometimes one interpreter is very critical of another's translation—right in the middle of the courtroom—and they will interrupt and contradict each other and say the other person's translation is inaccurate.

We have seen it happen. We have documented cases. Even the translation currently required at the polls has failed to accomplish its intended purpose: helping people cast an informed ballot.

Consider the 2000 election: In one community in New York, the Chinese bilingual ballot translated the "Democratic" label on all State races as "Republican," while "Republican" was translated to be "Democrat." Consequently, we know the results.

In the 1983 case of *People v. Diaz*—and we have talked about this before—a California court confessed, and I am quoting now from the record:

We recognize that frequently there is no single word in a foreign language which carries the identical meaning of a single word in the English language. We examined four different Spanish translations of the Miranda advisement at issue.

That was the case going on at that time.

We discovered that none of these translations was identical.

If governments do not agree on the proper Spanish translation of the phrase "You have the right to remain silent," how can they accurately translate the context of legal documents? And the short answer is, they cannot. But legal language is complex because it is meant to be exact. Translation may muddy that precision.

I can see the day when someone will go to court claiming that the Spanish translation of some piece of legislation

has a different meaning than the English version does. In the absence of an official language, there would be no way to resolve that dispute.

For decades now, we have looked the other way while multilingual mandate was piled upon multilingual mandate. State and local taxpayers have shouldered much of the fiscal burden for our insistence upon welfare forms in Spanish and school documents in Cantonese. Immigrants, too, have suffered from this "reign of multilingual micromanaging."

The National Review just this week put the problem in a very vivid perspective, and I will quote because I want this in the RECORD:

I was reading Li Shaomin's account of being held in China over long months.

Some of us will remember that.

Li recounted how the Communist security thugs taunted him and tried to break him. Taking his passport, they said, "This will do you no good. You may have an American passport, but you are not a real American, and never will be. You were born in China, and you will always be Chinese.

Every bilingual ballot and every multilingual government document sends this same message to immigrants: You are not a real American, and you never will be. This is wrong.

Thankfully, America's Hispanic immigrants are turning out this vile message that they need not bother to learn English.

Hispanic Magazine recently carried a story, "The Next Generation of Hispanic TV is in English." Allow me to read a paragraph from this news story:

Most U.S. Latinos are bilingual, 54.7 percent, say Census data, and consume media in both Spanish and English. The 2002 National Survey of Latinos by the Pew Hispanic Center found that 46 percent of second-generation and 78 percent of third-generation adult Hispanics speak mostly English.

The Pew Hispanic Center echoed these findings in 2004:

In one key segment of the Hispanic population—likely voters in U.S. elections—the English language media is the dominant source of news. More than half of Latino voters, 53 percent, get all of their news in English and 40 percent get news from media in both languages, while only 6 percent of likely voters get all their news in Spanish.

Statistics such as these are counter to what most people think. The idea that 80 percent of the immigrants want English to be the official language is really pretty incredible. Hispanics are learning English, they are willing to learn English and support the idea that immigrants should learn English. Only the groups which claim to represent the Hispanic people seem to have a problem with the English language. Of course, should Hispanic immigrants fail to learn English, these self-styled Hispanic leaders will benefit from their ignorance.

John Miller of National Review told *The Washington Post*, correctly, on May 28, 1998:

On the whole, there is an American national identity that immigrants ought to be encouraged to assimilate into.

A recent Zogby poll confirmed that most Hispanic Americans still agree with Mr. Miller. Eighty-four percent of Americans, including 77 percent of Hispanics, believe English should be the official language. So there were two totally different polls taken at different times coming to the same conclusions. We are not doing them any favors.

I think a lot of politicians are so afraid they are not going to get the Hispanic vote in some of these highly populated Hispanic States, and they are misinterpreting. To me, it is insulting to the Hispanic community to say: You cannot be a real American unless you learn—just by sitting on the side lines. I believe they are all capable of learning it and they are able to do it and they are willing to do it.

The other polls have similar findings. Ninety-one percent of foreign-born Latino immigrants agree that learning English is essential to succeeding in the United States, according to a 2002 Kaiser Family Foundation poll. A 2002 Carnegie/Public Agenda poll found that by more than a 2-to-1 margin, immigrants themselves say the United States should expect new immigrants to learn English. These are immigrants saying that they expect to have to learn English.

My official English amendment is the only popular thing to do, the right thing to do, and it is the fiscally necessary thing to do. Multilingual government is not cheap, and translation is not free. This Nation is at war with a relentless foe. Just as a family seeking to reduce expenditures will reexamine its budget to look for needless frills, so too must the U.S. Government.

I also wish to mention the two pictures I brought with me today. As the old saying goes, a picture is worth a thousand words. There is nothing I could say that would be more telling than these pictures, taken of high school students in California raising the Mexican flag above an upside down American flag. This is not only disgraceful, it is disgusting and a slap in the face at everything for which this great country stands. These students are living here enjoying the benefits of the United States, not Mexico. But this is happening all over the country, it is not just California. I believe this picture demonstrates what I have been talking about—that we desperately need to seal our borders and instill ways of helping immigrants know and love this country and appreciate the sacrifices made for the liberties they would be enjoying.

So there are two amendments that I have. One would go a long way to securing the border. I know it will work; it has been demonstrated by numbers. That is the name of the game. Secondly, making English the official language of the United States of America, to do away with this type of thing.

Over 2 years ago, on January 7, 2004, after President Bush's press conference



on Fair and Secure Immigration Reform, I announced my principles regarding immigration reform:

I would oppose any program that would shortcut the current naturalization process;

I would oppose any program that rewards illegal aliens for their illegal acts;

I would oppose any program that does not further address the porous nature of our borders.

I remain true to those principles today. Let me elaborate.

I agree with the 1997 U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform which stated that measured, legal immigration has led to create one of the world's greatest "multiethnic nations."

I also agree with the commission that immigrants who are "Americanized" help cultivate a shared commitment to "liberty, democracy and equal opportunity" in our Nation.

However, I cannot stand idly by and watch this great Nation collapse under the pressure of illegal immigration.

Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, a nonprofit organization dedicated to immigration reform, stated that:

A presence of 8 to 11 million illegal aliens in this country is a sign that this country has lost control of its borders and the ability to determine who is a member of this national community . . . a country that has lost that ability increasingly loses its ability to determine the rules of its society—environmental protections, labor protections, health protections, safety protections.

Beck goes on to say:

In fact, a country that cannot keep illegal immigration to a low level quickly ceases to be a real country, or a real community. Rather than being self-governed, such a country begins to have its destiny largely determined by citizens of other countries who manage to move in illegally.

Illegal immigrants continue to flood our borders and cause a myriad of problems for our country and law-abiding citizens like you and me.

For example, according to the Center for Immigration Studies, CIS, a nonprofit immigration reform organization, some of the most violent criminals at-large today are illegal immigrants, not to mention the terrorists who have illegally entered our country or overstayed their visas.

I would like to share a personal story regarding illegal aliens who commit crimes in the United States and then flee across the border to Mexico.

Last May, my friend's son, Jeff Garrett, was tragically shot by an illegal alien while Jeff was turkey hunting in Colorado.

After he shot Jeff, the alien fled to Mexico where he is hiding today.

I know this story is just one among many about police officers and other innocent Americans murdered each year by illegal aliens who then find safe harbor in Mexico.

We must prevent these criminals from coming across our borders.

Not only are illegal immigrants increasing by crossing the border in

droves, they are having "anchor babies" in rapid numbers.

These babies are helping the immigration population grow more rapidly than the birth rate of American citizens.

In fact, the Census Bureau estimates that at the time of the 2000 Census, the illegal immigration population reached approximately 8 million.

Therefore, according to this estimate, the illegal-alien population grew by almost half a million a year in the 1990s.

These numbers are derived from a draft report given to the House Immigration Subcommittee by the INS that estimated the illegal population was around 3.5 million in 1990.

In order for the illegal population to have reached 8 million by 2000, the net increase would be around 400,000 to 500,000 per year during the 1990s.

According to CIS, based on numbers from the National Center for Health Statistics, in 2002 there were about 8.4 million illegal aliens, which represent about 3.3 percent of the total U.S. population.

That same year, there were about 383,000 babies born to illegal aliens, which represented about 9.5 percent of all U.S. births in 2002.

Additionally, in the Spring 2005 issue of the American Physicians and Surgeons Journal, Dr. Madeleine Pelner Cosman says:

American hospitals welcome anchor babies. Illegal alien women come to the hospital in labor and drop their little anchors, each of whom pulls its illegal alien mother, father, and siblings into permanent residency simply by being born within our borders.

Anchor babies are, and instantly qualify for public welfare aid. Between—300,000 and 350,000 anchor babies annually become citizens because of the fourteenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside.

Dr. Cosman continues:

In 2003 in Stockton, California, 70 percent of the 2,300 babies born in San Joaquin General Hospital's maternity ward were anchor babies, and 45 percent of Stockton children under age six are Latino (up from 30 percent in 1993). In 1994, 74,987 anchor babies in California hospital maternity units cost \$215 million and constituted 36 percent of all Medi-Cal births. Now they account for substantially more than half.

These anchor babies are being used to enable their parents to skirt the law, cross our borders, and bring in additional, illegal aliens.

Furthermore, as the law currently stands, by allowing these children to be considered citizens, it is an incentive for more aliens to illegally cross into our country.

I am very concerned about the cost these illegal immigrants have on the U.S. economy.

Because illegal workers do not pay income taxes, it is estimated that the

Federal Government could be spending \$35 billion a year in unpaid taxes, according to Gear Stearns Asset Management.

This figure does not include additional costs spent on illegal immigrants for welfare, healthcare, education, and imprisonment.

In fact, according to Americans for Immigration Control, a nonpartisan, grassroots organization, the implications for these illegal immigrants in the future could cost upwards of \$1,500 per year if these same illegal immigrants are granted amnesty because they would suddenly have access to many social programs for which they are not currently eligible.

This means the government could spend an additional \$6 billion in welfare expenditures alone.

Taxpayers also pay for illegal immigrants' healthcare.

According to the Oklahoma Health Care Authority, illegal immigrant women living in my State gave birth to 2,600 babies in 2005. Delivery of these children cost \$6.5 million, or 83 percent of all Medicaid money that is spent on healthcare for illegal immigrants in Oklahoma.

Taxpayers also pay every time an illegal alien visits an emergency room; which they often use as their primary healthcare provider.

Federal prisons are also feeling the strain from illegal immigrants.

June 2003, criminal aliens comprised 34,456 of the prisoners held in Federal prisons.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, holding criminal aliens in Federal prisons cost taxpayers \$891 million in 2002.

In Oklahoma alone, the estimated annual operating expenditure for Federal prisons was almost \$12,000 per non-citizen inmate in 1999.

Additionally, elementary and secondary education is often one of the most expensive programs funded by State and local governments.

A 1982 Supreme Court ruling entitles children of illegal immigrants to taxpayer-funded government education.

Today, according to the Urban Institute, an estimated 1.1 million school-aged children of illegal immigrants are living in our country.

The cost of educating these illegal students is almost \$2 billion per year and is projected to top \$27 billion per year in the near future, according to Americans for Immigration Control.

Considering the burden and risk of the current level of illegal immigration, I firmly believe it is vital to secure our borders first, before we address any other immigration issue.

What the Judiciary Committee voted out is amnesty; it allows virtually anyone who is here illegally or who wants to come here to apply for citizenship.

This is a reward for law-breakers. It is essentially an open flow for immigration.

We have seen in the past that this approach does not work.

For instance, in 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act, IRCA, granted amnesty for illegal immigrants already here in return for strict prohibitions against future illegal entrants.

In place of promised outcomes, however, the number of illegal aliens has more than tripled since IRCA was passed.

Another problem with the Judiciary Committee bill has to do with college tuition for illegal aliens.

While current law allows States to determine whether or not they will provide in-State tuition at colleges and universities for illegal aliens, the Judiciary Committee bill includes a provision whereby the Federal Government mandates that States provide in-State tuition for illegal aliens.

This is unfair for the thousands of out-of-State students who must pay higher tuition costs than illegal immigrants who have broken the law and do not belong in our country.

Some say we don't necessarily need as many guest workers as the Judiciary Committee bill allows.

For example, economist Philip Martin of the University of California says that, when the "Bracero" program of the 1960s that brought in seasonal Mexican laborers was discontinued in 1964, the California tomato industry that had depended on these workers developed oblong tomatoes that could be picked by a machine—increasing California's tomato output five times more than what it was before the machines were used.

In a recent Washington Post article, Robert Samuelson expresses his view that with a massive guest worker program, we are importing poverty.

Referring to guest workers, Samuelson says:

... they generally don't go home, assimilation is slow and the ranks of the poor are constantly replenished. Since 1980 the number of Hispanics with incomes below the government's poverty line (about \$19,300 in 2004 for a family of four) has risen 162%. Over the same period, the number of non-Hispanic whites in poverty rose 3% and the number of blacks, 9.5%.

He continues:

What we have now—and would have with guest workers—is a conscious policy of creating poverty in the United States while relieving Mexico. By and large, this is a bad bargain for the United States. It stresses local schools, hospitals and housing; it feeds social tensions (the Minutemen have witnessed this) . . .

As a matter of fact, according to the Pew Hispanic Center, the illegal immigrants that are currently here only represent about 4.9 percent of the labor force; they represent 36 percent of insulation workers, 28 percent of drywall installers, and 20 percent of cooks.

These illegal immigrants, while large in numbers, are not the majority of the workforce.

I ask that we consider the Frist bill which, though not perfect, would increase enforcement and border security.

I further ask that we not bring up the Judiciary Committee's amnesty bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to add my voice to this debate on reforming our immigration system. While many of us here may have our differences, I think one thing on which we all agree is that the current system is broken and something must be done now if we are ever to get this situation under control.

There does seem to be a consensus in this body, and I think it is appropriate, that we absolutely must strengthen our borders. I personally believe that securing our borders has to be a priority in what we achieve in this legislation. Our borders have been porous for years and we must take adequate steps to secure them, and we must do it now.

This is a homeland security issue, first and foremost, but it is also a good government issue. American taxpayers continue to see their tax dollars spent on securing our borders without the results they deserve. While traffic from areas where we have placed more enforcement has decreased, border crossings in total have risen by 43 percent, despite tripling patrol personnel. The cost of an arrest has increased from 1992, when it was \$300, to the cost of \$1,700 in 2002.

Americans cannot afford this type of performance from a security standpoint or an economic standpoint. At a time when America is facing its most serious threat and dealing with record deficits, having our borders remaining unsecured as we spend more on them is simply unacceptable. It is unacceptable to the American people in terms of security and economics.

But securing our borders without dealing with the over 12 million undocumented immigrants who are in this country is not the solution either. One without the other is not going to achieve the results we want in the cost-effective way we must do it.

Many in this body are probably somewhat unaware that my State of Arkansas had the largest per-capita increase of its Hispanic population of any State in the Nation during the last census. Arkansas has become what is referred to as an emerging Hispanic community, with largely first-generation immigrants. These immigrants have a dramatic impact on our communities and on our economies. They are hard working, they are active in the religious community, they are law abiding, and they are putting their children through school. Whether they came here legally or illegally, they are establishing roots and we cannot dispute that. The majority of immigrants in my State came to the United States because they wanted good work and a better way of life for their families. A good number of them are educated and wanted to take advantage of the opportunities afforded to them in the U.S.

economy. This is why a plan based on ripping these roots out of the ground and deporting over 10 million people is simply not realistic.

First, we couldn't afford it. Second, I am not sure we could implement it. And then think of what it would do to our economy.

While these people may have come here illegally, many of them have been here long enough now to have become part of the fabric of our communities. Removing them will break up families and it will hurt our local economies.

I am not saying we should grant amnesty, and neither does the amendment Senator SPECTER has offered. It is critical to know that amnesty is not the answer. No reform should grant amnesty. Total and immediate forgiveness for past crimes—these are not things we believe in this country. The rule of law is critical. To do so would severely undermine the rule of law in this country.

As I stated, it is impractical to believe, though, that we can simply round up and deport all illegals in this country. It is also unlikely we can coax illegals out of the shadows by offering them a limited period to remain in this country before we eventually deport them. They will continue to hide and move around in the same networks that have protected them thus far.

I believe the solution is earned legalization, and that is why I have supported the McCain-Kennedy bill and the similar bill that was passed out of the committee, offered as a substitute by Senator SPECTER.

Some have characterized these bills as amnesty. Amnesty is a general pardon for a previous crime. By contrast, this reform plan includes serious consequences for those who remain in our country illegally.

Under the committee bill, an illegal immigrant faces an immediate \$1,000 fine, a security background check, application for a work visa, and an 11-year path to citizenship. Most immigrants who apply for citizenship now achieve that in 5 to 6 years. After staying continuously employed for 6 years, paying all back taxes, learning English—as my colleague from Oklahoma has expressed as being a very important part of this—learning U.S. history and government, and paying another \$1,000 fine in application costs, the worker could then apply for a green card and legalization.

That is not going to the front of the line, but it is going to the end of the line after those who have already chosen a legal path to begin with. Their green card application, as I said, will go to the back of the line behind all the legal applicants who are waiting for those green cards. Finally, this path is only available to the illegal immigrants who were here before January of 2004.

This does not sound like amnesty to me. It sounds like a challenge but a challenge that presents excellent rewards instead of the dire consequences

we would suffer if we took an irrational reaction to this enormous problem that is growing in our Nation.

The other path for an illegal immigrant would be to continue trying to hide. But now, under increased enforcement measures and stiffer penalties as we have seen that we would put into place under this bill, I believe the majority of the people who have come here illegally but came to make a better life for themselves, will emerge from those shadows to become legal residents of their communities, to engage in what we came here to seek, because we have provided for them a pathway to become legal.

It comes at cost. It comes at great cost to them, both financially as well as the time they have to spend to engage themselves in becoming legal residents of this great Nation. But it is worth it to them and it is worth it to us to set this issue straight, to begin to reform a problem that is growing desperately out of control.

Many of them already pay local taxes in the communities where they are. Some of them are paying into Medicare and Social Security with no promise of receiving any of the benefits. But think how we could strengthen those programs if we put them on a pathway to legalization. We know who these 12 million undocumented workers are and we put them into the system to strengthen Social Security and Medicare by assuring that their withholdings are coming out and going into the system as well.

I am reminded of an incident in my home State of Arkansas. Recently, we saw law enforcement officials who were acting on a tip from an informant. These were national law enforcement officials. They did not contact the local law enforcement in our small communities there in Arkansas, but the folks from Washington swooped into a poultry processing plant and they arrested approximately 120 workers who were carrying forged or illegal identification documents.

What occurred there does not make what those illegal immigrants did right. It doesn't make it right at all. They were there illegally. They were there with forged documents. Actually, it was a local U.S. citizen in the community who had helped produce those documents for them. But I want you for a moment to think about what occurred after these Washington law enforcement officials swooped into a community without notifying the local law enforcement and seized 120 workers.

Most of these workers were parents. They are parents who were not allowed to call home to tell their children what was happening. We had children who were left behind in the care of the Catholic Church, or friends, or anybody who would take care of these children. Some of them were as young as 12 months old—kids abandoned because the parents were not allowed to call.

It was a sudden and brutal act and it separated families and left a commu-

nity divided. Not because people wanted to defend the illegals who were there, the undocumented, or those who were there with false documents, but because of the way it was handled. That is what we are here to debate. Not that we differ about that. I don't think anybody in this body wants amnesty. They don't. What they want to do is to make sure we handle this issue in the right way.

I would imagine most of my colleagues in this body learned, as I did, at an early age from their parents that there is a right way and a wrong way to do everything. We have an opportunity to come together, to figure out the right way that is consistent with the American values we all hold dear, to figure out a solution to this enormous problem that continues to grow. It reflects on who we are as Americans with respect for the rule of law, making sure that people know they have to follow the law and they have to act within the confines of the law, but with the kind of encouragement that every human being should be allowed to reach their potential.

You can pay those fines, you can take the initiative and learn English and learn about this great country. You can get back at the end of the line after having tried to break into the line in front and still have the ability to reach that potential if you are willing to pay for your mistakes. That is what this bill is about.

When I think of the calls for the arrest and the deportation of 10 to 20 million undocumented immigrants in this country, I think of that frightful night in Arkansas where children and parents were severed in an unruly way. Their families were destroyed. Children were left by themselves without anyone to care for them because law enforcement had not thought that out.

I think of that frightful night in Arkansas and then I see it multiplied thousands of times across this country. That is not the right way to handle this issue. As Americans, we can be smart. Yes, we can be diligent and we can even be tough. But we can be tough in a way that reflects the values of who we are and how this Nation was created—by giving people opportunity and requiring responsibility.

We stand at a crossroads in this country. Over the last decade and a half, the Latino population has expanded in every area of our country, many of them coming here legally but some illegally. We are faced with a decision that gets to the heart of what values we hold dear as Americans. We have always said: If you work hard and you play by the rules, there is a place for you in America to raise your children and contribute to our great melting pot, to strengthen our communities, to be a part of this great land.

We are faced now with what to do with some who have broken the rules to come here but have since worked hard to provide for their families. I hope the Senate will give this very dif-

ficult question the reasoned and thorough debate it deserves, but that we will not forget the balance, the very intricate balance of American values that brings out the rule of law and the importance of the rule of law but also the desire and the compassion we feel. That is what the American spirit is all about.

I believe the Senate will agree to welcome those who came here illegally if they are willing to show another American value, and that is sacrifice. We all know a great deal about sacrifice as we see incredible Americans, men and women in the Armed Forces and all over this country, whether it is our emergency responders or others. If we see those who have come here illegally showing that willingness to exhibit that American value of sacrifice, then I think we as a body will be able to produce something to welcome them into our great society and our great Nation.

I urge my colleagues, as we continue in this debate, that we keep our heads calm and our minds open.

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.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3206 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3192

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], for himself and Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 3206 to amendment No. 3192.

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that this be designated the Kyl-Cornyn amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make certain aliens ineligible for conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status)

On page 329, line 11, insert "(other than subparagraph (C)(i)(II) of such paragraph (9))" after "212(a)".

On page 330, strike lines 10 through 15, and insert the following:

"(3) INELIGIBILITY.—An alien is ineligible for conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status under this section if—

"(A) the alien is subject to a final order of removal under section 217, 235, 238, or 240;

"(B) the alien failed to depart the United States during the period of a voluntary departure order entered under section 240B;

"(C) the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that—

"(i) the alien, having been convicted by a final judgment of a serious crime, constitutes a danger to the community of the United States;

"(ii) there are reasonable grounds for believing that the alien has committed a serious crime outside the United States prior to

the arrival of the alien in the United States; or

“(iii) there are reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States;

“(D) the alien has been convicted of any felony or three or more misdemeanors; or

AMENDMENT NO. 3207 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3206

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 3207 to amendment No. 3206.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

This provision shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, Senator CORNYN and I introduced this amendment, which is very simple in its terms but we think very important. The essence of it is to say that criminals should not participate in the temporary worker program and path to citizenship program that is allowed for under the bill that passed out of the Judiciary Committee.

It seems rather elemental that whatever program we have for immigrants to this country, that they be people who have worked hard and played by the rules, as some people characterize it, that they be hard-working people who, other than perhaps coming into the country illegally, have been law-abiding citizens. That seems fairly elemental.

As a matter of fact, in the 1986 law that many have described as amnesty and few think worked very well, there was a specific prohibition of that law applying to people who had been convicted of a felony or three misdemeanors. That is the exact term that our amendment provides for. If you have been convicted of a felony or three misdemeanors, you are not eligible to participate in this program.

In addition, if you have been ordered by a judge to depart the United States and you have violated that court order, you would not be permitted to participate in this program. Those are the two key points.

There is one other element to it, and that is having to do with prior convictions of crimes and posing a threat to the United States. If the Department of Homeland Security Secretary determines that you have been convicted by final judgment of a serious crime and you constitute a danger to the United States or that there are reasonable grounds to believe you have committed a serious crime outside of the United States before you arrived or that you are a danger to the security of the United States, then you would not be able to participate in this program either.

Now, as I said, this seems rather straightforward. Why would we allow criminals to become citizens of the United States? Why, indeed? Why was this provision left out of the underlying bill? Whatever the reasons, it shouldn't have been. This amendment fixes that.

Why is it important? For one reason, we have an awful lot of criminals that have either come into the United States or people who have illegally entered the United States and then committed serious crimes, serious enough that they have had to be imprisoned in U.S. prisons. In fact, one of the exercises we go through every year around here is to try to get Federal funding under SCAAP, which is called the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP funding, to reimburse States and local governments for housing illegal-immigrant prisoners.

In the past, we felt that since it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to control the border and that has not been done, that when one of these people commits a crime and is convicted of that crime and imprisoned, the Federal Government ought to at least pay part of the expenses. It has usually been in the neighborhood of a fourth to a third of the expenses.

Part of what Senator CORNYN and I propose is that we would increase the amount of Federal support for the State and local governments for housing these criminal illegal immigrants.

How big is the problem? Of the 1.5 million State and Federal prisoners in 2004, over 91,000 were foreign nationals. Think about that: 91,000 criminals in prison were foreign nationals. About 57,000 in State prisons, about 34,000 in Federal prison.

The SCAAP funding gives us some idea of the number of these people. As I said, it has paid roughly about a third of the expenses when we spend about \$600 million a year; unfortunately, last year we only funded \$305 million. Even if it were funded at \$700 million, it would represent about a third of State costs. That gives some idea of the magnitude of expense associated with the housing of these illegal immigrants.

With regard to the provision that deals with the so-called absconders, people who went before a judge and the judge said, for whatever reason, you must depart the United States, you are under court order to leave, but they don't, they just meld back into society, the Bureau of Immigration Customs Enforcement estimates that there are more than 400,000 such absconders and 80,000 fugitive criminal aliens with outstanding final orders of removal who are hiding in the United States. These are people who have committed serious crimes. There is no way that these people should be allowed to get on this path to citizenship or participate in this worker program.

The Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement estimated earlier this month that the number of fugitive aliens in the United States is about

465,000. Fugitives are foreign nationals who have been ordered removed by a Federal immigration judge but failed to comply with the order.

From March 1 through September 30, 2003, which is when ICE began tracking fugitive apprehensions, there were 3,409 fugitives with final orders of removal who were apprehended. In the same period, 2004, they apprehended 7,239 fugitives with final orders of removal, which was an increase of 112 percent over that period in 2003.

The point is that there are more and more criminal aliens coming to the United States or people committing crimes while they are here or people who are being given orders to depart and who are not doing so.

I noted before that between 10 and 15 percent of the apprehensions of illegal immigrants today are people who have criminal records. And they are serious criminal records. We are talking about murder, homicide, kidnapping, drug offenses, rape, assaults, and the like. These are serious criminals.

In Arizona, my own State—the most recent figures are about a year old—almost one in six inmates is a Mexican citizen. I don't mean to suggest by this that Mexican citizens are somehow more prone to be committing crimes. I don't have the statistics for foreign nationals of other countries. But the bottom line is, from only one foreign country, we have almost one in six inmates in Arizona prisons of this one foreign country. If you add the others, the number, obviously, will be larger.

In March of 2005, Phoenix jails housed 1,200 criminal aliens who by law should have been deported. And even when deportation is ordered, according to a FOXNews report, about 60 percent of those orders are ignored. So you still have a huge number of people who are unaccounted for.

In Los Angeles, in that same period, 95 percent of all outstanding homicide warrants and 60 percent of outstanding felony warrants were for illegal aliens. This is according to a FOXNews report. Let me repeat that statistic. If you want to know why we have offered this amendment, in L.A., a year ago, 95 percent of all outstanding homicide warrants and 60 percent of outstanding felony warrants were for illegal aliens. That is an astounding figure.

So while it is true many people come to this country to work and provide a better living for their families and the only crimes they have committed are coming into the country illegally and using fraudulent documents for employment and other purposes, it is also true a large amount of crime is associated with this phenomenon of illegal immigration.

One of the first things we should do when we talk about enforcement of the law is to ensure we are not adding those criminals to the group of people who would be authorized to participate in what is going to be a very humane program of temporary worker, and for some a pathway to citizenship.

Let me cite two other statistics, and then I would like to yield to my colleague from Texas.

In September of 2004, of the 400,000-plus illegal immigrants who were ordered to be deported, 80,000 had criminal records. Now we do not know their whereabouts, including the countries from which they came. The point here is that many were from countries that we call countries of interest; that is to say, countries where terrorists come from. We know there are tens of thousands of illegal immigrants today who are apprehended coming from those countries and probably three times as many who are not apprehended. So in addition to people who have committed crimes in the United States, there is a significant possibility some of these people pose the kind of threat this amendment would go to as well.

Considering this group of so-called other than Mexicans, people who cannot simply be repatriated to Mexico who have to be sent to their home country, this number has increased dramatically. In 2000, the number was only 28,598, although that is a lot of people. In 2004, it was 65,000. In the first 8 months of 2005, that number grew to over 100,000. And we are told that the end result from last year, if my recollection serves me correctly, was about 165,000.

So the bottom line is that, No. 1, there are illegal immigrants who are criminals coming into this country. There are people who are illegal immigrants who, once they get here, are committing serious crimes. There are people who clearly could be suspected of being a danger to the United States. And finally, there are close to half a million people who have been ordered by a judge to leave the country for one reason or another under our laws that constitutes a serious enough offense that they are required to leave—who are absconders; they have decided to ignore the court order—and have not done so.

These are not the kind of people we want to become U.S. citizens. These are not the kind of people we want caring for our lawns or caring for our children or doing any of the other work that has been discussed here earlier today.

The bottom line is, there are plenty of people who can do those jobs. We do not want to be adding to the problems of crime in this country by accepting on an equal footing, with the other kinds of folks whom we are happy to have here working with us on a temporary basis, known criminals, people who should not be in this country under any circumstances, certainly not under the generous provisions of the bill before us. I hope when we have a chance to vote our colleagues will agree that, whatever else, criminals should not be participating in this program.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas.

**Mr. CORNYN.** Mr. President, this debate we are having on this important

legislation is critical to our Nation. It is long overdue. I am glad we are finally talking about border security and immigration reform in a comprehensive way.

I know, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, our chairman, Senator SPECTER, and the committee have worked very hard on this legislation. There is a lot of the legislation that I think is very good. For example, the border security component of the bill is very strong. I am proud to say that a good chunk of that came from legislation Senator KYL and I have drafted and has been out there for a year or more.

But I believe with all my heart that what has brought us to this day and this debate on the Senate floor is because Americans are terribly concerned that in a post-9/11 world, we simply do not have control of our borders. And they believe—and I believe they are correct—it exposes us to a danger and that the Federal Government has a primary responsibility of making sure our security interests are protected. As I said earlier today, border security is national security.

Now, how did we get here? I believe this is important because I do not want people to get the wrong impression. We are a proud nation of immigrants. All of us—no matter who we are, how we pronounce our last name, where we were born—came from somewhere else. America has been the net beneficiary of the fact that we have been that beacon of freedom and opportunity which has attracted people from all around the world. What distinguishes this country from the rest of the world is that once you come to America, you become an American, not because of the color of your skin or your religious affiliation or beliefs or the country where you were born, you become an American because you believe in the American ideal and you believe that everyone, no matter who they are, is entitled to the opportunity to achieve their own American dream. That is really one of the greatest legacies this Nation will ever have.

But we are also a nation of laws. To me, the toughest part about this legislation has been, how do we reconcile that vision—our American values of a nation of immigrants—with this important notion and ideal of a nation that also believes in the rule of law?

One of the reasons I so strongly support this amendment is that while we are a welcoming nation and we open our arms to people who want to come to America to achieve a better life—hopefully through legal avenues of immigration—we know there are some who have not come here through those legal avenues. What we are attempting to achieve in this legislation is to create legal avenues of immigration into this country.

Some people may decide they want to come here to become legal permanent residents and citizens and become Americans. Others might figure they

want to come to this country on a temporary basis to work and to earn a living so they can support their family, so that they ultimately can return to their country of origin with the savings and skills they have acquired while working in the United States. But in a very real sense, these temporary workers do not intend to become Americans. They do not intend to sever their relationship with their country and their family and their culture.

The fact is, we need those legal workers here in the United States. We ought to create—and I do support creating—a legal avenue for them to come and work for a time and then to return to their country of origin. The fact is, that serves America's national interests. It also serves the national interest of those countries from whence they come. Indeed, one of the components of that, which we will talk about more as this debate continues, has to do with establishing a legal opportunity for people to work for a while in the United States and then to go home with savings and skills they have acquired here.

The reason that is important—and this should not be overlooked—is that no country could sustain the permanent exodus of its hard-working young people, which is what is happening to many countries south of our border today. Those economies are handicapped dramatically because of the massive immigration and permanent exodus of their young people to this country.

What we ought to be about, not only in our national interest but as a means of reaching out to those countries and enabling them to create economic opportunity there at home, is a way for them to build their own economy to create opportunity in their homeland.

While there are certainly people who will want to immigrate to the United States permanently, there are many others who, if given the opportunity to work for a while in the United States, would be more than happy to maintain their ties to their country and their culture and their family and return home and possibly to come back after a period of time.

But I say all that by way of predicate to say that we have a right as a sovereign nation not only to protect our own borders, we have an obligation to make sure the American people are not exposed to extraordinary danger that might occur if common criminals are given a free ride, inadvertently, in this bill.

Now, I do not imagine for a minute the authors of this bill intended that felons, persons who were guilty of three successive misdemeanors, people who are under final orders of deportation or criminal absconders—I do not actually believe the authors of this bill intended to grant an amnesty or to forgive those crimes or to welcome those people into the United States because I believe either these individuals, by virtue of the crimes they have committed,

should not be accepted into the United States—and we certainly have a right to control who comes and who does not come, and I think these people have disqualified themselves by virtue of their criminal activity—but there is also another segment of people, some 400,000 individuals, who have had their day in court, who have been ordered deported because they have had their due process, and they simply have failed to reappear so the law may be carried out. So they are what is called an absconder. And 80,000 of those some 400,000 people are criminal absconders, people guilty of felonies in the United States, people who have, since they have come here, disqualified themselves by virtue of their failure to comply with our law and no longer deserve to be able to live in the United States.

So I believe it is very important to make those distinctions. We ought to be able to distinguish between those individuals who have come to the United States because they do not have any opportunity, they do not have any hope of providing for their families where they live—we are willing to find a way to provide them a way to work in a legal system or, if they are willing to comply with the requirements of the law, to exit the country and return in a legal way and work and live in the United States, should they choose to do so and should they be qualified—but surely we can all agree there are certain persons who, by virtue of their misconduct, as evidenced by their unwillingness to comply with our laws and exposing the American people to danger in the process, that we ought to be able to protect the public safety and distinguish between people who have violated the immigration laws and those who have committed far more serious crimes or abused their rights and had the opportunity to be heard and are under final orders of deportation.

I will not go into any more detail other than just to say a few things about this amendment that I gladly join.

One of the reasons I am concerned that under the Judiciary Committee bill some people might perceive that what is granted is an amnesty is because while there may be some definitional disputes about what constitutes an amnesty, what I am confident of is that people will agree that in 1986, we had an amnesty. And I am confident the vast majority of people will agree with me, not only was it an amnesty, they will agree with me, I believe, that it was a complete and total failure. The tradeoff for the amnesty of 3 million people was to get worksite verification and employer sanctions, yet the Federal Government did not step up and provide that capacity. So what happened is that 3 million now becomes 12 million today. One reason I am so determined not to repeat the mistakes of 1986 is because I believe it would be a magnet for further illegal immigration.

This amendment is sensible. It provides that criminals can't get a green

card, and those who have had their day in court and proven themselves disqualified from further opportunity to immigrate to the United States legally and become American citizens or permanent residents should not be included in what some might regard as a repetition of the amnesty that was issued in 1986.

It is with pleasure that I join Senator KYL in cosponsoring this amendment. We urge our colleagues to support us.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple questions.

Mr. CORNYN. Certainly.

Mr. KYL. First, does our amendment criminalize anything that isn't already criminalized?

Mr. CORNYN. Absolutely not. That has been one of the misconceptions or perhaps straw men that have been hoisted out there because some people have suggested we are trying to criminalize people who merely want to come to this country for economic opportunity to provide for their families. This does nothing of the kind. These are people who have already been convicted of felonies in the United States or three misdemeanors or have committed serious crimes out of the United States, or that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security believes are a safety risk to the American people.

Mr. KYL. So nothing in our amendment makes any new kind of conduct a crime. It simply deals with people who have already committed crimes?

Mr. CORNYN. That is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I think that is a very important point. I know there are many people who were concerned about the House bill. Much of the marching that was done last week was against the House bill on the grounds that it was creating new crimes and even felony crimes. Nothing in either the legislation that Senator CORNYN and I have introduced nor in this amendment creates any felony offense, nor does this amendment create any misdemeanor offense. It simply says people who have already committed crimes should not participate in this program or who have violated a court order of removal.

There are millions of people who have come to the United States illegally but who otherwise, other than perhaps using false documents, have worked hard and abided by the rules. It is not in their interest to violate our laws. Yet when the subject is discussed, it is easy to roll all of the people up in one group and suggest that good and decent people are no better than people who have committed crimes, and they ought to all be treated the same. And some people have even said they ought to all be made criminals and thrown out of the country.

While we may not like the fact that we have permitted people to come into this country illegally, I believe it does

a great injustice to people to assume they are all alike and to bunch them up into the same group. We need to extract out of this group of people who all of us intend to try to treat in the most humane and responsible way we can, however, the ultimate framework of a guest worker program or other programs are developed, we need to separate that group of people from those who have committed crimes, people whom we don't want to be here. That is the purpose of our amendment. We have decided it is important for us to distinguish between the people who do not deserve to be automatically eliminated from consideration for whatever program is going to be adopted here, those people who have actually committed crimes and whom we would not want to bring into the country if we had a choice in the initial instance, in other words, people who would be admissible in the country, certainly people who would be deportable for having committed these kinds of crimes. So clearly if they should not be admitted into the country or they should have been deported for committing certain kinds of crimes, it wouldn't make any sense to allow them then to participate in a guest worker program or to put them on the path to citizenship.

That is the essence of our amendment. Of all of the things we disagree about—we understand there are many—we think it is important to distinguish between that group of people who otherwise have been law-abiding people and the group of people who have committed crimes. And ironically, most often the crimes these people are in jail for are committed against other immigrants, frequently illegal immigrants. They rape them. They rob them. They beat them up. They hold them for ransom. In all of the big cities in the Southwest, the largest number of crimes are committed by illegal immigrants against primarily illegal immigrants. So to help those who are otherwise innocent from being further preyed upon, we need to remove from this country, not allow them to participate in the program, to remove those people who would continue to prey upon the innocent. That is what our amendment would do.

I hope when it comes time to vote, our colleagues will recognize that whatever other disagreements there are, these are the people who should not be allowed to participate in the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, before commenting on the pending amendment, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HAGEL be added as a cosponsor to the committee bill.

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

Mr. SPECTER. First, I thank Senator KYL and Senator CORNYN for coming to the floor to start the debate and

offer an amendment. We are trying to push ahead with this bill. It is appreciated that they have come early. I am advised that the other side of the aisle would not be prepared to vote on this amendment today or tomorrow. What we are trying to do is to line up a series of votes for Monday afternoon. I am advised that Senator BINGAMAN wishes to offer an amendment to add resources to Border Patrol, and on the surface, without final commitment, it looks as if it is an acceptable amendment. We want to have an opportunity there. Senator ALEXANDER has already spoken about an amendment which has a number. It has not yet been called up.

We are anxious to move ahead. It is always difficult getting started on a bill, but it had been my hope that on a Thursday afternoon, when we went to this bill yesterday, had opening statements and had a full afternoon of discussion and extensive discussion today, that we would have been prepared to have amendments and have some votes. Thursday is supposed to be our late night. Maybe more accurately stated, our late night, if we ever have a late night. Well, we are not going to have a late night tonight because there is not a whole lot we are going to be able to do.

I believe the thrust of the Kyl-Cornyn amendment is a good one.

If I may have the attention of Senators KYL and CORNYN while I am saying good things about them.

Mr. KYL. We are all ears.

Mr. SPECTER. I believe the thrust of the amendment is a good one. I want to take a look to see what is meant by "voluntary departure" under 240B. But it looks to me when you want to exclude the criminal class from being on the path for working in this country, the citizenship path, that is desirable.

It is my hope we can move ahead and transact some business and hear some amendments and hopefully move to votes at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I see Senator BINGAMAN. I will be brief in my remarks because I assume he wants to speak. If I could say to the chairman, who was here earlier, I hope very much we can begin to move to votes. I spoke earlier today about an amendment which I filed which is amendment No. 3193. It is filed at the desk. It already has the cosponsorship of Senators CORNYN, ISAKSON, COCHRAN, and SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent that Senators MCCONNELL and MCCAIN be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. The majority leader, Senator FRIST, is also a cosponsor.

While I do understand and am disappointed by the fact that we are not going to be moving to votes tonight, this is not a new idea that I have made in my amendment. My first speech on

the floor of the Senate in 2003 was about the importance of becoming American, how in our country we are unique because we do not base our backgrounds on race or ancestry but on a set of ideas, and how important it was for us to put the teaching of American history back in its rightful place in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

Senator REID, the Democratic leader, joined me on that. Senator KENNEDY joined me and Senator REID. He and I are working together to create Presidential academies for students and teachers of American history. We are trying to take the National Assessment of Educational Progress and make sure that it includes another way of putting the teaching of American history back in the right place in our curriculum.

The reason we do that is because our common schools were created to help immigrant children learn the three Rs and what it means to be an American. Because if you don't know the principles upon which our country is based, it is difficult to become an American. We have this advantage over other countries in the world who base their nationality on race or on the color of their skin or their ancestry. We don't do that. It is important to become an American by understanding the principles of our country. We agree on that. It is those principles that we debate here.

This is not a debate about who is pro or anti-immigrant. We are all pro-immigration because that is an important part of our character. But we have more than one principle at issue here. The first one is the rule of law. We are all for the rule of law because people who come to this country don't come to a country where we don't stop at stop signs and we don't observe contracts and we don't follow the law. We follow the law here or there are consequences. We have those principles. And we have the principle of equal opportunity. And we have the principle of a free market or laissez faire. We have the principle above the President's desk of E Pluribus Unum. Our great achievement is that we have taken this magnificent diversity and forged it into one country. We are the United States of America, not the United Nations.

Therefore, the amendment that I had filed today and is ready to be voted on tonight or tomorrow or Monday, whenever we are ready, ought not to be very controversial. It is simply to help the half million to a million people from other countries who are legally here and ready to become citizens, to help them become Americans. It does that by providing them with \$500 grants so they can learn our common language. It doesn't make them learn it; it helps them, if they want to learn it. It says to those who become fluent in English that they may become citizens in 4 years instead of 5. It doesn't penalize

them. It gives them rewards. It gives grants to organizations to help them learn our history. It codifies the oath of allegiance George Washington and his troops took and that millions of Americans have taken which basically says I am not Scotch-Irish anymore, which my family was. I am an American. I am proud of my Italian heritage, but I am proud to be American. That has been our history.

Senator SCHUMER and I in two Congresses have introduced legislation making that oath a law, not just some administrative dictum that someone could mess around with, but put it right up there with the Star-Spangled Banner, the National Anthem, and other great symbols of America.

My amendment establishes a reward to recognize the contributions of outstanding new citizens. It asks the Department of Homeland Security and the National Archives to develop ways to dignify and celebrate these wonderful ceremonies such as the one the President attended on Monday where 30 people stood up and said: I have been here 5 years. I have demonstrated good character. I have learned English, and I am proud of where I came from. But I am prouder to be American. I swear allegiance to this country, the same oath George Washington and the officers took at Valley Forge in the year 1778 and which new citizens have taken in this country ever since then.

We could talk about border security. It is important, and that is the rule of law. We can solve that problem. We know how to do that. We can agree on that. We can talk about how many guest workers we want. We already authorize 500,000 or more work visas a year. Perhaps we need more. We can figure that out. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I have been working for a year with the National Academy of Sciences to make certain that we in-source brainpower so we can keep our jobs from going to China and India. I would like, through this legislation, to make it easier for the brightest people in the world to come here and help us create our high standard of living.

I mentioned earlier in the day that the top three jobs at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, our largest science lab in America, are held by three foreigners with green cards from England, Canada, and India. The Senator and I have worked together to recapture our advantage in supercomputing in America so that America can be the leader in computing. Who runs that program? It is a citizen of India who is living here. Not only is there nothing wrong with that, but he is here helping improve my standard of living and the next person's standard of living.

I want our discussion to be a comprehensive discussion. I want us to deal with border security. That is the rule of law. But I want us to set rules for welcoming the people who temporarily work here and study here, but I also want us to make sure we do the most

important thing and remember those three words up there in the Senate Chamber, “e pluribus unum.” They are not there by accident. They mean that we need to devote extra effort to making sure that those who come here legally also become Americans. That is the real limit on the number of new citizens who can come here—whether they can become a part of our culture, a part of our country, and become Americans.

If we don't do that, we are nothing more than a united nations; we are not the United States of America. I think there is broad agreement in this body about that. That is why Senator SCHUMER and I introduced the oath of allegiance bill. That is why myself and others are working on helping to put American History back in our schools for children. I am ready to vote on this amendment tonight or tomorrow, but I certainly hope the chairman and the leaders on both sides of the aisle would allow Senator BINGAMAN's amendment and my amendment and others to be voted upon as soon as possible.

The American people are expecting us to deal with immigration. We are here and we are ready to do it. Let's get on with it. It is time to stop debating and start acting, and a good way to start would be to help prospective citizens become Americans. That would finish a comprehensive bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendments so that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3210 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3192

Mr. BINGAMAN. I send an amendment to the desk to amendment No. 3192.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 3210 to amendment No. 3192.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide financial aid to local law enforcement officials along the Nation's borders, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**TITLE \_\_\_\_—BORDER LAW ENFORCEMENT RELIEF ACT**

**SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2006”

**SEC. 02. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) It is the obligation of the Federal Government of the United States to adequately secure the Nation's borders and prevent the flow of undocumented persons and illegal drugs into the United States.

(2) Despite the fact that the United States Border Patrol apprehends over 1,000,000 people each year trying to illegally enter the United States, according to the Congressional Research Service, the net growth in the number of unauthorized aliens has increased by approximately 500,000 each year. The Southwest border accounts for approximately 94 percent of all migrant apprehensions each year. Currently, there are an estimated 11,000,000 unauthorized aliens in the United States.

(3) The border region is also a major corridor for the shipment of drugs. According to the El Paso Intelligence Center, 65 percent of the narcotics that are sold in the markets of the United States enter the country through the Southwest Border.

(4) Border communities continue to incur significant costs due to the lack of adequate border security. A 2001 study by the United States-Mexico Border Counties Coalition found that law enforcement and criminal justice expenses associated with illegal immigration exceed \$89,000,000 annually for the Southwest border counties.

(5) In August 2005, the States of New Mexico and Arizona declared states of emergency in order to provide local law enforcement immediate assistance in addressing criminal activity along the Southwest border.

(6) While the Federal Government provides States and localities assistance in covering costs related to the detention of certain criminal aliens and the prosecution of Federal drug cases, local law enforcement along the border are provided no assistance in covering such expenses and must use their limited resources to combat drug trafficking, human smuggling, kidnappings, the destruction of private property, and other border-related crimes.

(7) The United States shares 5,525 miles of border with Canada and 1,989 miles with Mexico. Many of the local law enforcement agencies located along the border are small, rural departments charged with patrolling large areas of land. Counties along the Southwest United States-Mexico border are some of the poorest in the country and lack the financial resources to cover the additional costs associated with illegal immigration, drug trafficking, and other border-related crimes.

(8) Federal assistance is required to help local law enforcement operating along the border address the unique challenges that arise as a result of their proximity to an international border and the lack of overall border security in the region

**SEC. 03. BORDER RELIEF GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to an eligible law enforcement agency to provide assistance to such agency to address—

(A) criminal activity that occurs in the jurisdiction of such agency by virtue of such agency's proximity to the United States border; and

(B) the impact of any lack of security along the United States border.

(2) DURATION.—Grants may be awarded under this subsection during fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

(3) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis, except that the Secretary shall give priority to applications from any eligible law enforcement agency serving a community—

(A) with a population of less than 50,000; and

(B) located no more than 100 miles from a United States border with—

- (i) Canada; or
- (ii) Mexico.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded pursuant to subsection (a) may only be used to provide additional resources for an eligible law enforcement agency to address criminal activity occurring along any such border, including—

- (1) to obtain equipment;
- (2) to hire additional personnel;
- (3) to upgrade and maintain law enforcement technology;
- (4) to cover operational costs, including overtime and transportation costs; and
- (5) such other resources as are available to assist that agency.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought; and

(B) provide such additional assurances as the Secretary determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “eligible law enforcement agency” means a tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency—

(A) located in a county no more than 100 miles from a United States border with—

- (i) Canada; or
- (ii) Mexico; or

(B) located in a county more than 100 miles from any such border, but where such county has been certified by the Secretary as a High Impact Area.

(2) HIGH IMPACT AREA.—The term “High Impact Area” means any county designated by the Secretary as such, taking into consideration—

(A) whether local law enforcement agencies in that county have the resources to protect the lives, property, safety, or welfare of the residents of that county;

(B) the relationship between any lack of security along the United States border and the rise, if any, of criminal activity in that county; and

(C) any other unique challenges that local law enforcement face due to a lack of security along the United States border.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) DIVISION OF AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) 2/3 shall be set aside for eligible law enforcement agencies located in the 6 States with the largest number of undocumented alien apprehensions; and

(B) 1/3 shall be set aside for areas designated as a High Impact Area under subsection (d).

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts appropriated for grants under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other State and local public funds obligated for the purposes provided under this title.

**SEC. 04. ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW.**

Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize State or local law enforcement agencies or their officers to exercise Federal immigration law enforcement authority.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to assist



border law enforcement agencies—that is, local law enforcement agencies—in addressing border-related criminal activity.

Border law enforcement agencies incur significant expenses in dealing with crimes, such as human smuggling, vehicle thefts, drug trafficking, and the destruction of private property. These crimes occur and this enforcement is required because of their proximity to the international border and because of the failure of the Federal Government to adequately secure that international border.

According to the study by the Border Counties Coalition, criminal justice expenses related to immigration alone exceed \$89 million a year.

Mr. President, it is time that the Federal Government help these border communities cover some of those costs. Specifically, this amendment that I have offered, which is based on the bill I earlier introduced entitled “the Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2006,” would establish a grant program within the Department of Homeland Security to help local law enforcement situated along the northern and southern borders to obtain the resources they need to secure our border communities. It would authorize \$50 million a year to help law enforcement hire additional personnel, obtain necessary equipment, cover overtime expenses of their personnel, and cover transportation costs of their personnel.

Eligible applicants would include agencies serving communities within 100 miles of the U.S. border—the border with Mexico or with Canada—and any other department located outside of that jurisdictional limit if it is designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security as a high-impact area. The designation would be made because that area is greatly impacted by the flow of illegal immigration, drugs, and other such problems.

Securing our Nation’s borders is the responsibility of the Federal Government. However, as we all know, the Federal Government has failed to provide adequate security along our international borders. The result is that local communities are having to pay for a variety of costs, from health care to law enforcement. It is wrong to place this additional burden on these local communities. They do not have the resources to deal effectively with these increased burdens.

It is time that Congress recognizes the tremendous burden with which local law enforcement agencies along our borders have been saddled. I hope my colleagues will support this important measure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3193

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 3193, which I filed at the desk, be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. ALEXANDER] proposes an amendment numbered 3193.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3206

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a short while ago, Senators KYL and CORNYN offered an amendment. They claim that the committee bill would allow criminals to become permanent residents under the committee bill, and this is not correct.

The committee bill requires all applicants to undergo criminal and security background checks, and all applicants must also show that they have not committed any crimes that make them ineligible under our immigration laws.

As many Senators know, Congress passed sweeping changes to our immigration laws, and just about any crime makes one ineligible for a green card. This includes aggravated felonies, crimes of violence, drug crimes, crimes of moral turpitude, money laundering, murder, rape, sexual abuse of a minor, drug trafficking, possession of explosives, theft offenses, child pornography, forgery, counterfeiting, bribery, perjury, and many others.

Anyone who has committed any of these crimes cannot—cannot—and will not get a green card under the committee bill.

What the amendment does, though, is undermine the earned citizenship program in the bill. Millions of Mexicans, Central Americans, Irish, and nationals from other countries would be prevented from applying for legal status not because of criminal crimes but status violations. The goal of comprehensive immigration reform is to encourage illegal workers to come out of the shadows, be screened, and be given work permits, and if they are on the track to eventually being eligible for citizenship, they have to earn it. This is not an amnesty program. No one is forgiven. Anyone who wants to get on this path has to pay a fine, demonstrate that they have a work record, also demonstrate that they paid their taxes, and then get to the end of the line of those who want to come to the United States, and for 11 years meet those responsibilities.

That is one part of this legislation. This amendment that is offered would end the possibility for earned legalization. That would be the effect if this amendment is accepted.

If the proponents of the amendment are interested or concerned just about crimes, other crimes being added to the list, we are ready to talk with them, and we will try and engage them in a conversation and see if that is their purpose. If their purpose is to undermine a key element of the proposal, that would be unacceptable, and we will have the opportunity to express our views with a vote in the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, there is one more thing I wanted to say this evening about the amendment Senator CORNYN and I offered, an amendment which provides that criminals cannot participate in the program that we adopt here—whatever that program is—in terms of being temporary workers or being put on the path of citizenship, or however this body ultimately defines what happens to immigrants who have come here illegally, or so-called future flow workers. I think almost everybody can agree it shouldn’t apply to criminals, or to people who have violated a court order to depart the country.

I made the point earlier, and I want to reiterate it, that it is important to separate out the group of people who have come here, albeit illegally, to do hard work and not otherwise violate our laws, except perhaps using fraudulent documents. Those people end up being the primary targets of other illegal immigrants who commit heinous crimes against them.

So one of the reasons for denying these criminals the right to participate in the same program is to get them away from the people who are most susceptible to being preyed upon.

We talked to chiefs of police, to sheriffs, to the Border Patrol, to other law enforcement officials, and they have different statistics, but by and large they all agree that predominantly the serious crime in their communities, particularly large communities, is immigrant on immigrant and it is mostly illegal immigrant. And the crimes that are committed would just break your heart.

There are stories like this. Immigrants pay a couple of thousand dollars, roughly \$2,000 is the going price now, to a coyote to be smuggled into Arizona from Mexico. They may have had to pay different people along the way on the bus up to Altar, where they could then come across, or wherever. But the fee is probably in the neighborhood of \$2,000.

Before they come across somebody comes and says it is now going to cost you an additional \$500 or, I am sorry, we can't do it. So they have to somehow communicate to somebody else in their family or a friend to come up with some more money.

They then attach themselves to the coyote who brings them across the border. A lot of different things can happen. First of all, another group vies for that group of illegal immigrants because they are all worth money. We had a shootout on Interstate 10 between Tucson and Phoenix involving two vehicles with illegal immigrants in them with two different coyote gangs. They were having a shootout on the freeway, and people were killed and injured, over who was going to control the load of immigrants because that is value. You could hold the illegal immigrants here in a safe house and tell them that until they come up with another \$1,000, let's say, they are going to be held hostage, basically, or the coyote or his friends will call the police or Border Patrol if they don't come up with the money.

Women are forced to commit improper acts. There are assaults, sexual assaults. There is a great deal of crime perpetrated on these illegal immigrants. If they have not been beaten or raped or robbed or held ransom for more money, then what happens is they are waiting in the safe house and the Phoenix Police Department shows up at the safe house because they have gotten a call of a disturbance in a house.

It wasn't a disturbance at all. It was the coyote calling the Phoenix police because he has another load coming in that night and he needs to get rid of these people. He has gotten all he can out of them. He sucked them dry. They don't have any more money. He has taken all they have. They don't dare go to the police. Now he has called the police and said there is a disturbance. They show up at the house and pick up these illegal immigrants. If they are from Mexico they are put on a bus back to Mexico.

That is what can happen to these people. These are the ones who do not die in the desert and who are not abused some other way. We cannot allow the criminal element here, people who have committed crimes, who are criminals, to continue to prey on these people. It is one of the reasons our amendment says that criminals cannot participate in this program.

There is another reason. Citizenship in this country is a tremendous privilege. Anyone who knows immigrants who have come here or who has participated in a swearing-in ceremony knows how much legal immigrants value this privilege. As I said before, my grandparents came here and they were so proud of their American citizenship. They felt so privileged to have been able to come here. It is not fair to them or for the millions who are waiting in some country, waiting to come

here and who have to attest to their good character. They have abided by the laws. They have committed no crimes. To then see somebody else who has not only entered the country illegally but also in some other way has committed crimes or has refused to depart after a judge's order, to then be able to participate in a legal program allowing them to become a temporary worker or be on a path to citizenship—what kind of a signal does that send? It cheapens American citizenship. It cheapens legal permanent residency.

It is wrong to simply say that because we have a hard time with the amount of people who have come here illegally, we are not going to differentiate among them in any way, we are just going to take them all in and let them all get on this path to citizenship. That is wrong. I do not think the American people will allow us to permit that kind of individual to participate in this program.

That is what the underlying bill allows. There are a lot of things wrong with this underlying bill. This is just one of them. But I hope with each of these things that we point out, our colleagues will come to realize that there is an answer here somewhere, but it is not every provision of this bill. So, piece by piece, we will focus attention on this bill to try to determine where we can make changes so at the end of the day we have a good product—comprehensive immigration reform, enforcement, and an opportunity for people our society needs to work here on a temporary but legal basis.

If we can do that, we will have succeeded. But if we simply pass a bill that has a tremendous number of flaws in it, we will have failed. I hope we can correct this first flaw with the amendment that Senator CORNYN and I have offered to at least ensure that criminals can't participate in this program.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, just for a question. I want to first say how much I value the insights of the Senator from Arizona into this important issue. On the Judiciary Committee he is one of the Senate's most knowledgeable members on immigration issues, and one of the best lawyers here. I think he has raised a very troubling point.

This is part of the legislation that is moving forward, for reasons I am not quite sure of. But it does seem to have moved too fast, and it has a lot of real problems—almost anybody would agree.

But this deal about crime is a very important issue. I have had the sense that we may be seeing more criminality on the border. Sheriffs from Arizona and Texas came up and told us about the rising crime rate, the increased number of assaults on their people and Federal people.

I recall a recent trip I just took with the Armed Services Committee to Europe. I met with General Jones, who

has Africa. He talks about the border areas that tend to be the areas that are the most dangerous.

Is the Senator concerned that we are creating areas in the country, as a result of lack of enforcement around the borders, that are really more dangerous than other parts of his State?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Alabama, that is exactly the case. I would cite two parts of the testimony before our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security.

We had the U.S. attorney for Arizona testify that just from last year, the number of assaults at the border has gone up 108 percent. It is not just on law enforcement officers, but a lot of the assaults are perpetrated against them. I intended to get the statistics on the number of homicides. But there are homicides and then there are an awful lot of other kinds of assaults. The border, in many places, is becoming a very violent place.

There is one good news element that was confirmed by the testimony that was taken in the committee. The reason for this increased violence, they said, was that the Border Patrol was actually improving its ability to control territory. Territory that previously had been the sole jurisdiction of the cartels and the coyotes was now being contested by law enforcement. So naturally they were fighting back.

The bad news, of course, is they fight back with high-caliber weapons. They are organized. It is a very dangerous place. As a result, our officers are seeing assaults every day.

The other thing that this testimony confirmed was that it is not just nice people coming across the border, it is over 10 percent who are criminals. I mean, if you stop and think about it, if you have 600,000 people coming into the country illegally who are apprehended, so it is maybe three times that many who are coming in who are not apprehended, and over 10 percent of them are criminals, you are talking about tens of thousands of people who have decided that this is a good way to get into the United States, come in as an illegal immigrant. These are not the kind of people we want in our country.

When you look at the type of crimes that the people who have been apprehended have been accused of committing or have been convicted of committing, it is homicides, it has been rapes, serious assaults, drug crimes—serious crimes. So not only is the border becoming more violent, but the people coming into the United States are an increasingly criminal element, and they are continuing to commit crimes in our cities, in particular against other illegal immigrants. That is why we believe it is very important that at least one group that ought not to be able to participate in whatever program we adopt is this group of criminals. That is another reason our first effort should be to get control of the border.

Forget the problem of people coming here to work. If for no other reason, you want to keep the people from terrorist countries out, keep out the people smuggling methamphetamine into the country, and keep people with criminal records out of this country.

That is why many of us think the first thing we ought to do is get control of the border.

I went on a little long in answering the question.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is good. I wanted to follow up because the Senator mentioned methamphetamine. I had an opportunity today to meet with the executive director of the Alabama District Attorneys Association. Through Alabama laws and the Federal law we passed pseudoephedrine is not so available now, from which methamphetamine is being made in the United States. He just told me casually this morning, now all the methamphetamine is coming in from Mexico.

You are on that border. Do you sense that there is a growing problem with methamphetamine being brought in across the unsecure border?

Mr. KYL. I would say to the Senator from Alabama, this is what we have been briefed. The President was at the border. He was briefed likewise on this phenomenon. Sheriff Larry Dever from Cochise County, Sheriff Ralph Ogden from Yuma County, they both told me this. The chiefs of police in Tucson and Phoenix told me this, the Chief of the Border Patrol in both the Tucson and Yuma sector, all of them agree that methamphetamine is now the No. 1 drug coming across and, by the way, also underneath—in some of these tunnels. We need to make that a crime as well. It is not even a crime to dig a tunnel under the border. But we have an amendment that hopefully will cure that. But now a backpack of methamphetamine is said to be worth, by these law enforcement officials I identified to you, to be worth between a quarter of million and a half million dollars. You can take a poor, illegal immigrant, many of them in a group, and put this backpack on each of them and give them \$10,000—more money than they have seen in a long time—and say: You scoot across the border and you'll be met by XYZ. That is a cheap way to get it across. They are not making it as much in Arizona, in fact, anymore. It is all coming across the border, as you pointed out.

Mr. SESSIONS. One more question because I think this is very important for all of us here who strive to be responsible to the citizens we serve, and that is, we have had some amendments, some of which were accepted that I offered, that would increase bed space or increase Border Patrol agents and that kind of thing to improve enforcement. That is part of the bill that is before us. But I have been here long enough to get a little bit dubious about some of these things and learn the ropes around here.

One of the things that I have learned is, just because you put something in

an authorization bill, that you authorize a barrier, you authorize more patrol officers, you authorize more detention space, does not mean it will actually be created and done.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Alabama, I have to summarize this answer because welling up in my chest is a big complaint about the Congress, about the Clinton administration, about the Bush administration. Let's be honest. Nobody has done their job completely here.

We authorized.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is the committee you serve on, Judiciary, the authorizing committee, and that I serve on.

Mr. KYL. That is right. Senator FEINSTEIN and I got an amendment passed in 1996 to double the number of Border Patrol agents. It passed the Judiciary Committee, passed the Congress. It is an authorization. Do you think that in 5 years we had double the Border Patrol agents? No.

We couldn't get the administration to ask for enough funding in the budget, and, of course, if it is not asked for, then Congress is loathe to appropriate. So it took us about, as I recall, 7 years or maybe 8 years to get the number of agents doubled. We have succeeded in doubling them and adding another 2,000 or 3,000 on top of that. But it took far longer than it should have.

We have authorized SCAAP—the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—that reimburses the jails and prisons in your State, my State, and other States for the criminal aliens housed in those prisons. The program is authorized. This administration this year requested in the budget exactly how much money for this program? Zero, nothing; same as last year. Congress had to find the money. And we ended up appropriating about \$300 million, which is less than half of what we should have. Had we done \$700 million, we would have reimbursed the States about one-third of their expenses. We only did \$305 million, as I recall.

Mr. SESSIONS. Isn't it a Federal responsibility?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe Senator KYL has the floor. I was asking a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL, has the floor and has yielded for a question.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the bottom line is that many things we have authorized—additional Border Patrol agents, additional equipment, additional aircraft, radar, UMWs, cameras—neither the President nor the Congress over the years has seen fit to provide. We have gotten a lot more in recent years than we have in the past. But the bottom line is merely because we authorize something doesn't necessarily mean it is going to be appropriated.

It is not just a matter of money. Sometimes it is a matter of enforcing

laws that we have on the books—such as the employers who find it very difficult to differentiate fraudulent documents and, therefore, they end up hiring illegal immigrants. But we don't enforce that law. It is hard to blame the employer, but the Government isn't trying to enforce it, either. Simply authorizing something doesn't necessarily mean it will happen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, isn't that in fact what happened in 1986? We passed the amnesty bill, and the American people were told this would be a one-time thing, it would solve this problem, and we are going to have enforcement on the border. That was promised. But, in fact, it never occurred. The monies were never appropriated. The President never aggressively asked for the resources necessary to make this occur, and we ended up not enforcing the law.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, my perception is that having passed the law, one reason people referred to it as amnesty is because it was not enforced. There was a commitment to enforce it. I don't know the reasons why it wasn't enforced, but in many respects it was not.

The key thing we need to do here, since the American people are skeptical of our ability and our commitment to enforce the laws, in order to be able to adopt the guest worker program and deal with the people who are here illegally and have a work program, in the future we are going to have to demonstrate to them we have the ability and we will make the commitment to enforce whatever law we end up adopting.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments.

I see Senator MCCAIN. Maybe there is time he wants to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Alabama seeking recognition?

Mr. SESSIONS. I seek recognition from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this is a very real concern Senator KYL and I have talked about. The concern is we are basically telling the American people that in good faith we are going to recognize that somehow we failed to follow the law, that we failed to enforce the law and create a workable system. The last time in 1986 we said we had a million people here illegally, and we admitted we were going to give them amnesty, and that we were going to try to create a system in the future that would not lead to these kinds of problems again.

What happened was 3 million people showed up—not 1 million—and they claimed amnesty. We never enforced the borders. Here we are 20 years later, and we have an estimated 11 million people, although I think one of the survey firms in the country said there may be 20 million people here. We will find out, I guess, when this passes.

But the question is, What will we do to ensure with this implied promise we are making to the American people that won't happen again?

The truth is, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, the former, President Clinton, and this President Bush have not come to the Congress and said, Congress, we are not getting the job done on the border. Give us more money and we will fix it. We have this problem. We need a computer. The employers are telling us they can't ask the proper questions because of this law or that law. The employment enforcement is not working. Help us change the law, Congress, so we can create a workable system. They never asked for it. They never did anything to suggest that. The system has gotten completely out of control.

How do we know, when we pass this legislation and immediately provide for the benefit of those who come illegally new rights and privileges and a path that would lead them straight to citizenship, how do we know we are not going to have the problem again?

That is all I am asking. I don't know how you can do it.

You could say, Well, this law won't take effect until we have a border system that works. Is that the way we will do it? I am not sure.

But the American people have every right to be skeptical. They have every right to be skeptical. They have a right to wonder if we are at all serious about what we are saying here.

I was a Federal prosecutor for 15 years. That is what I have done the biggest part of my professional life. I tell you it breaks my heart to see a legal system so ineffective. What has been going on here is a mockery of law.

Time and again we come back and we admit we haven't enforced the law. What good is the law if it is not enforced, let me ask you. You can't make everybody happy. You can't do everything for everybody.

I believe very strongly that this Nation is a nation of immigrants. I am perfectly prepared to approve allowing quite an additional number of people to come into this country legally. But in exchange for that, I think we have to have the balancing act of a legal system that works so we do not continue to see the large numbers of people coming in illegally.

I will summarize again what I have said before. I think we can do it. This is not that difficult. We increase border security, we use barriers, we use the virtual fence concept, we use computer systems and biometric identifiers, the United States VISIT Program, which needs to be completed, and then we use enforcement in the workplace.

As C.J. Bonner—people who have followed this heard him speak out before. He represents the Border Patrol agents. He said that absolutely we can do this. It is not going to cost a fortune and it is not going to break the Treasury of the United States, but it is going to cost some money.

If we will step it up and do these things, we can create a tipping point where people come into the country legally instead of illegally. That is it.

Right now, they come illegally. Why? It is easier to come illegally, that is why. People do what they are allowed to do.

I believe we can make this system better. I believe the legislation that came out of committee moved far more aggressively to the amnesty direction in the bill that Chairman SPECTER started out with.

The legislation that is pending before the Senate today does not represent the settled opinion of the American people. Once they find out about it, they will not be as happy as we would like them to be.

It is time to slow down, listen carefully to what is occurring, make sure we have a plan in place that will guarantee enforcement on the border, that will guarantee workplace enforcement and a plan that will allow more people to come in a legal way, an effective way, using a biometric identifier so they can come through the border and maybe go back and forth every weekend if that works for them and create a system by which this country can decide how many workers and what category we need so that if we have a downturn in our economy, we are not driving Americans out of work in large numbers. Those are things that a rational country would do.

This legislation, as presently configured, does not do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama. He is a man of passion and commitment and willing to stay late no matter what to make his points and advocate his positions. I always enjoy doing business with the Senator.

I want to make one comment; that the President of the United States today in Cancun made a very positive statement about what we are doing in the Senate. I am very appreciative of his comments. He said that we have to obviously put people at the back of the line that want to be citizens, but he also felt very strongly that we needed a viable guest worker program.

I am hoping over the weekend we can all think about our positions and perhaps get into some associations so that we can resolve this issue amongst everyone because it seems to have generated not only a lot of attention but a lot of controversy as well, particularly in the media.

I know we are all trying to achieve the same goal of securing our borders and at the same time resolving the issues of how people can come here and work legally if they are both qualified and needed, and, of course, addressing the issue of the 11 to 12 million people who are already here, some of them coming yesterday, some of them here 50 or 60 years.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have an amendment to fix a broken bureauc-

racy and help noncitizens who are serving in our military become citizens of the United States.

There are over 40,000 non-U.S. citizens serving in the U.S. military today. Many want to become U.S. citizens but are caught up in red tape and paperwork, bureaucratic run-arounds and backlogs. That is wrong—many of these young people are on the front lines in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the world fighting terrorists. They are focused on fighting the enemy; they shouldn't also have to fight the bureaucracy just to become a citizen of the country they are fighting for. My amendment makes sure that it is easier and quicker for non-U.S. citizens serving in our military to become citizens.

This amendment is called the "Kendell Frederick Citizenship Act of 2005." Why? Because Kendell Frederick's death in Iraq shows clearly how broken our bureaucracy is, and why it is so important to pass this bill. Kendell Frederick was an Army soldier from Maryland killed in Iraq on October 19, 2005. He was 21 years old. Kendell was killed by a roadside bomb on his way to be fingerprinted to become a U.S. citizen. But he was also killed by the botched bureaucracy of the U.S. Government: by their incompetence, by their indifference, by their ineptitude. This is inexcusable.

Every military death in Iraq is a tragedy, but this one did not need to happen. Kendell died in Iraq, fighting for America. Yet he wasn't born in America, he was born in Trinidad. He came to this country when he was 15 years old. As many who come to this country to pursue the American dream, he was filled with hopes about his future in this country. He got an education and graduated from Randallstown High School in 2003. While in high school, he decided to join ROTC. After he graduated from high school, he decided to join the Army with hopes that he would be able to go back to school.

In the Army, Kendell was a generator mechanic assigned to a heavy combat battalion. His job was to keep all of the generators running, which kept his battalion running. Kendell wanted to become an American citizen. Yet a series of bureaucratic screwups and unnecessary hurdles prevented that—and cost him his life.

Kendell had been trying for over a year to become a U.S. citizen. He started working on it when he joined the Army, while he was training and learning how to become a soldier. Kendell sent his citizenship application in and checked the wrong box. Specialist Frederick was busy training for war, packing to go to Iraq, saying goodbye to his mother, his brother, and his two sisters. All the while, he was also worrying which box to check to become a U.S. citizen.

After that, Kendell's application was derailed by immigration three times. First, after his mother checked the

correct box saying Kendell was in the military, Immigration sent the application to the wrong office, not the office that handles military applications.

Second, Immigration rejected the fingerprints he sent them, with no explanation. Kendell had his fingerprints taken when he joined the military. He had an FBI background check for the military. We have high standards to be in the U.S. military. There was no reason Immigration could not have used the fingerprints taken when he joined the military, but they refused.

Third, and finally, Kendell was told to get his fingerprints retaken in Maryland—but he was in Iraq fighting a war. His mother called 1-800 Immigration. That's supposed to be the HELP line. She told them: My boy is in Baghdad, he can't come to Baltimore to get fingerprinted. She would have loved for her son to come to Baltimore, but he was fighting in a war, fighting for America. Immigration told Kendell's mom there was nothing they could do. They were wrong. That was the wrong information. They were no help.

On October 19, Specialist Kendell Frederick was traveling in a convoy to a base to get fingerprinted. He did not usually go on convoys, but that day he was in the convoy. Kendell Frederick was killed when a roadside bomb struck that convoy. He was granted his United States citizenship a week after he died. He was buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Kendell was trying to do the right thing, yet he was given wrong information. He got the run-around. His sergeant tried to help, but he didn't know all the rules. It was not his job to know the rules—he was fighting a war. Kendell's mother did the right thing; she tried to cut through the bureaucracy, making phone calls, sending letters. She was diligent and relentless. The system failed—again and again. And a wonderful young man lost his life.

Kendell's mother, Michelle Murphy, could have just sat there. She could have boiled in her rage, but, no, she wanted to do something with her grief. When I spoke with her, she told me she didn't want any mother to have to go through what she went through, what her son went through. Service members and their mothers should not be worrying about what box to check on a citizenship application, which of many addresses is the right address to mail it to, or where to get fingerprints taken. When a service member is fighting for America, mothers have enough to worry about. Service members have enough to worry about.

This amendment makes it easier for military service members to become citizens. The provisions of this amendment cut through the red tape. First, it requires Citizenship and Immigration Services, CIS, to use the fingerprints the military takes when a person enlists in the military, so a service member doesn't have to keep getting new fingerprints. Second, it requires the

creation of a military Citizenship Advocate to inform the service members about the citizenship process and help with the application. Third, it requires CIS to set up a customer service hotline dedicated to serving military members and their families. Finally, it requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct an investigation into what is wrong with immigration services for our military.

No one should ever again have to go through what Kendell and his mother went through. I am proud to stand here today with Senator KENNEDY to offer this amendment named after Kendell Frederick, just as his mother asked me to do. The Kendell Frederick bill will make sure that anyone in the military who wants to be a U.S. citizen will be able to do so, quickly and easily. If you are willing to fight and die for America, you should be able to become an American. I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this important amendment. Help the brave men and women fighting for this country become the U.S. citizens they deserve to be.

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 rescinded.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL JACK FETTERMAN

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the passing of an exceptional leader, as well as a respected Floridian. VADM John "Jack" Fetterman passed away last Friday at his home in Pensacola, FL, at the age of 73.

Following graduation from Albright College in Pennsylvania and Aviation Officer Candidate School in Pensacola, Admiral Fetterman began his career as a naval aviator. He later went on to become a Pacific Fleet naval Air Force commander in 1987 and was promoted to vice admiral.

I had the pleasure of meeting and working with Admiral Fetterman during the Base Closure and Realignment process last year. I found him to be a fierce and eloquent defender of the Navy and of the military.

Admiral Fetterman, in 1991, became the chief of Naval Education and Training at Pensacola Naval Air Station. He created and was the father of

the Core Values Training Program, which earned him the title of the "Father of Navy Ethics."

Admiral Fetterman retired as a three-star admiral in 1993. But upon his retirement, he did not just retire, he continued his love of the Navy and his service to the Nation by becoming the president and CEO of the Naval Aviation Museum Foundation.

Admiral Fetterman, with a great deal of love and care, guided and directed the Museum of Naval Aviation in Pensacola, which is truly a wonderful and remarkable place where the many heroic feats of people over the years connected to naval aviation are recorded and appreciated.

Admiral Fetterman, to the very last, continued to serve his Nation and his country well. I extend my condolences to the members of his family, to his beloved wife, and to all those in the community, in the naval community, who came in contact with such a fine American, who served his country so well.

At times such as this, I know we are always reminded that life is finite, and that we also have to harken and always appreciate a life well lived, as was Admiral Fetterman's.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### CAMBODIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today is a tragic anniversary for Cambodia.

Nine years ago, on March 30, 1997, a peaceful and legal rally held by the opposition Khmer Nation Party was disrupted by a grenade attack. To date, there has been no justice for the victims or their families, including American Ron Abney who was injured in the attack.

While I am aware of the many lawsuits relating to this incident that have been filed, dropped, or dismissed, I encourage the State Department to work with the Government of Cambodia to secure the return of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, so that the FBI can conclude its investigation into this crime. Bringing the perpetrators to justice is the only way to honor those killed and injured on that tragic day.

I am hopeful that the ongoing dialogue between Prime Minister Hun Sen and opposition leader Sam Rainsy will continue and that Hun Sen's pledges for reform are matched by concrete and measurable actions. My only advice to the Prime Minister is that he thinks before he speaks. It is counterproductive, at best, to call for the sacking of Yash Ghai, the U.N.'s special representative for human rights in Cambodia, because of critical comments he made on the Government's crackdown on dissent.

The desire for democracy and justice in Cambodia remains strong today, and I encourage the Cambodian people to remain vigilant. It is my hope that they, one day, know freedom from fear, can rely on good governance, and know

that justice is neither bought nor sold. The Government of Cambodia bears the burden of proving that it is part of the solution—and not part of the problem. International donors should not forget for a single moment that those killed 9 years ago were peacefully calling for judicial reforms.

As I have in the past, I ask unanimous consent that the names of those murdered on March 30, 1997, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I know they remain in the thoughts and prayers of their families and friends in Cambodia, as do they in ours.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Mr. Cheth Duong Daravuth, Mr. Han Mony, Mr. Sam Sarin, Ms. Yong Sok Neuv, Ms. Young Srey, Ms. Yos Siem, Ms. Chanty Pheakdey, Mr. Ros Sear, Ms. Sok Kheng, Mr. Yoeun Yorn, Mr. Chea Nang, Mr. Nam Thy.

#### FRAUDULENT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS IN BELARUS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I want to express my concerns about the recent presidential election in Belarus.

I have previously noted the tremendous hardships Belarus has endured throughout its history. For centuries, Belarus has been fought over, occupied and carved up. But Belarus' declaration of independence from the Soviet Union in 1991 held great promise for a better future. As it broke from communist rule, it had the opportunity to build a free nation and become part of a peaceful, more secure Europe. The country began to embrace economic and political reforms and democratic principles. It established a constitution and held its first Presidential election in 1994.

Unfortunately, the prospect of democratic change in Belarus was quickly frozen as its first President, Alexander Lukashenka, adopted increasingly authoritarian policies, including amending the constitution in a flawed referendum to extend his term and broaden his powers. Lukashenka's regime has been marked by a terrible human rights record that is progressively getting worse, with little respect for freedom of expression, assembly or an independent media. A pattern of disturbing disappearances of opposition leaders fails to be seriously investigated by authorities. The living conditions in Belarus are declining and Lukashenka's refusal to institute economic reforms has only aggravated the situation.

The 2005 State Department Human Rights report states that "the government's human rights record remained very poor and worsened in some areas with the government continuing to commit numerous serious abuses." The report goes on to acknowledge that Lukashenka "systematically undermined the country's democratic institutions and concentrated power in the executive branch through flawed

referenda, manipulated elections, and undemocratic laws and regulations." Mr. President, the litany of human rights abuses documented in this report show that Lukashenka has only used the last 12 years to increase the reign of tyranny and oppression in Belarus.

The elections of March 19, 2006 continued Lukashenka's repressive tactics and total disregard for democratic principles. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, which observed the elections, stated in its report that "the arbitrary abuse of state power, obviously designed to protect the incumbent President, went far beyond acceptable practice. The incumbent President permitted State authority to be used in a manner which did not allow citizens to freely and fairly express their will at the ballot box." The report cited a "climate of intimidation and insecurity" and a "highly problematic" vote count during and after the election.

The recent so-called "color revolutions" in Georgia, the Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan, showed what can happen when a country's people become fed up with the oppression of tyrants and call for democratic, representative government. Let us hope that the fledgling democracy movement in Belarus has a similar chance to flower. A number of courageous Belarusians braved intimidation and took serious risks to denounce the election results in peaceful public demonstrations; unfortunately, these risks were made imminently clear when Belarusian security forces marched into the public square where they were rallying and forcibly detained a number of them in the early morning hours of March 24. I add my voice to the chorus of those calling for the Belarusian authorities to respect the rights of their citizens, hold valid elections, and immediately release those who were detained simply for peacefully expressing their views.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

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 November 14, 2001, Pablo Parrilla was charged with first-degree intentional homicide in the shooting death of his sister's girlfriend, Juana Vega. Parrilla confronted Vega outside her Milwaukee, WI, house and shot her repeatedly. According to reports, Parrilla was shouting sexually derogatory slurs toward Vega throughout the attack.

I would note that recently in the House, hate crimes legislation was

passed in a bipartisan vote. I strongly believe that we must also move similar legislation in the Senate. In the months ahead, I look forward to working with Senator KENNEDY as we continue our work in passing a hate crimes bill.

#### NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate National Women's History Month.

This is an important national observance that reminds us to celebrate the immense accomplishments and everlasting contributions of women. Women have helped shape our society since the first settlers landed on America's shores, and women continue to lead us into the future.

It is important that we remember the efforts of women such as Harriet Tubman, Amelia Earhart, Eleanor Roosevelt, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Madeline Albright, Maya Angelou, Ella Fitzgerald, Betty Friedan, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Billie Jean King, Margaret Mead, Sacagawea, and Chien-Shiung Wu. We celebrate the diverse contributions of each of these remarkable women to all facets of American society.

The State of New Jersey is home to many commendable women. Alice Paul, Elizabeth Coleman White, Mary Norton, and Mary Roebling are just a few.

Alice Paul was as a leader of the women's suffrage movement, founder of the National Women's Party, and author of the equal rights amendment. This longtime activist for women's equality is well known for picketing the White House, which landed her in jail during the summer of 1917 but helped secure women's right to vote. Few have had as great an impact on American history as Alice Paul.

Elizabeth Coleman White was born on her family's cranberry farm in New Lisbon, NJ. She partnered with Frederick Coville on her farm to create the first commercial crop of blueberries. Ms. White was also the first person to use a cellophane wrap in fruit shipment.

Mary Norton was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1924 and served in Congress for 26 years. She was a member of the famous Petticoat Front in the 80th Congress, which was a bipartisan group of women who fought to gain equal footing with men as legislators. At the time, only seven women served in the Congress. Today, thanks in part to Mary Norton's pioneering efforts, a record 84 women are Members of Congress.

Mary Roebling was the first woman to head a major commercial bank, the Trenton Trust Company, and in 1958 she became the first female governor of the New York Stock Exchange. She has proven that women can be just as successful in the business world, and any sector, as men.

These four women are only a handful of those who deserve recognition for their contributions to America.

In 1981, Congress passed a resolution establishing National Women's History Week, which coincides with International Women's Day. At the request of the National Women's History Project, this was expanded to a month in 1987. I have always been proud to support this effort.

I hope that National Women's History Month will continue to help educate Americans about women's accomplishments and inspire more women to reach for the stars.

#### A SPEAKER FOR IDAHO

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I never had the opportunity to serve with Bruce Newcomb in the Idaho State Legislature, but having been privileged to get to know him, I very much would have enjoyed working with a man of his caliber.

Bruce is retiring from the Idaho House of Representatives at the end of the 2006 session, and he will be sorely missed by his colleagues in the legislature and his constituents in Idaho. Bruce has developed a reputation of being an honest and evenhanded speaker of the house whose sense of humor helps in tackling contentious issues and a heavy workload. In addition, he is a strong leader who is not afraid to make a strong stand when the situation calls for it.

Having grown up on a working farm and ranch in Idaho myself, I understand the difficulty of going to Boise to serve in the legislature in the middle of the calving season. Bruce has been able to handle his work as a rancher while serving the constituents of Idaho, without sacrificing the quality of either profession—not to mention his important duties as a family man, the husband of Celia Gould and father of five children. It takes a truly talented man to handle all these responsibilities and continue to have such strong loyalty and respect from colleagues, family, and friends.

Over the 2006 President's Day recess, I had the opportunity to share the floor with Bruce at the Mini-Cassia Lincoln Day Luncheon in Burley, ID, to answer questions from the constituents of Idaho. Bruce fielded all the State-related questions and handled them with impressive knowledge, not to mention a down-home country charm which made complicated issues easy to understand. After seeing Bruce in action with his constituents in his home district, it is easy to understand why he will leave such huge boots to fill when he retires.

Bruce served 20 years in the Idaho House of Representatives, where he held many different leadership roles: majority caucus chairman, assistant majority leader, majority leader, and four terms as speaker of the house. His four terms as speaker marks him as the longest-serving speaker in the Idaho House of Representatives.

Bruce, thank you for your service to our State. You truly are a speaker who speaks for Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, when the 2006 session of the Idaho State Legislature adjourns this year, it will signal the end of an era. The longest-serving speaker of the Idaho House of Representatives will be retiring. Bruce Newcomb, a rancher from Burley, will leave the legislature after a total of 20 years. He spent the past four terms as speaker and leaves boots that will be difficult to fill, to say the least.

Bruce and I served together in the legislature in the late 1980s. My former colleague is a thoughtful man of principle and a terrific sense of humor. Bruce is also one of my closest friends. Over the years, I have worked with him on many issues important to Idaho, and I know that I can always turn to him for solid advice and counsel. His reputation for cooperation and collaboration is well deserved. He consistently seeks out fair and just solutions to policy challenges, even the more contentious and divisive such as water issues and term limits. Nevertheless, Bruce is unafraid to take a respectful but strong stand when circumstances require it. He earned such loyalty among colleagues and coworkers that when he lost his hair in a bout with cancer in the 1990s, many of them shaved their heads in a show of solidarity.

Bruce takes his public service very seriously. Idaho has gained from his wisdom, love for our State and ability to see clearly a path forward. Idaho's legislature is losing a remarkable man who has served all Idahoans faithfully and with excellence. I wish him and his family the very best in retirement, and thank him for his steady, close friendship over the years.

#### COMBAT METH ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to include in the RECORD an additional comment regarding the Combat Meth Act, which was passed into law earlier this year as part of the USA-PATRIOT Reauthorization Act.

While much has been said about the portions of this bill that address the national meth problem, I wish to highlight the commonsense approach this legislation provides for preventing the diversion of controlled substances.

The Controlled Substances Act requires its registrants to ensure that controlled substances do not fall into the wrong hands in the places where they are manufactured, distributed, or sold. To this end, it has always been the Drug Enforcement Administration's goal to encourage such registrants to investigate fully the backgrounds of potential employees who might have access to such substances, specifically for drug-related criminal convictions.

However, certain State and local privacy laws have had the potential to hamper this objective. These laws frustrate the purpose of the Controlled

Substances Act and the objectives of the Drug Enforcement Administration by, among other things, purporting to prohibit registrants from asking questions relating to an applicant's experience with controlled substances, including whether they have been convicted of drug-related crimes. The real-world implication has been, in a word, nonsensical. In my own State of California, for example, there is a State law that provides that employers are not allowed to question a potential employee about certain drug-related criminal convictions that are older than 2 years. This prohibition also purports to cover employers who are registered under the Controlled Substances Act. If a registrant complied with this State law, it could mean that a responsible pharmacy could hire someone to work at the cash register who would be in a position to divert pharmaceutical products, and the employer would never have any clue about the applicant's past. This runs counter to the purpose of the Controlled Substances Act and undermines the DEA's efforts to prevent the unlawful diversion of controlled substances.

The law we passed clarifies once and for all that registrants can and should fully vet applicants, including asking them about any and all drug-related criminal convictions—not as an infringement on someone's privacy but as a safeguard to ensure that people with access to controlled substances do not pose risks to the public welfare. This legislation makes clear that those on the frontlines of preventing controlled substance diversion have a crucial tool they need to do their job.

#### RELEASE OF JILL CARROLL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today is a day of great celebration for Jill Carroll, and her friends and family. The Christian Science Monitor reporter and Ann Arbor native was set free today in Baghdad nearly 3 months after being kidnapped in an ambush that killed her translator. The U.S. Embassy is now working hard to reunite Jill with her family as soon as possible.

In Michigan, we all anxiously watched and prayed for the release of this young woman, and I want to express my gratitude to everyone who worked hard for her release. I want to thank the Arab-American and Muslim-American leaders in Michigan and across the country for their hard work.

The Islamic Shura Council of Michigan which represents more than two dozen mosques and Islamic organizations in Southeast Michigan held a press conference publicly calling for her release. The Council on American-Islamic Relations sent a delegation to Baghdad to lobby for her release. The American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, The Arab American News and the Congress of Arab American Organizations also issued public statements calling for Jill Carroll's release.

These groups spoke out not just because of Jill Carroll's ties to Michigan or because this was a humanitarian issue, but because kidnapping and killing are an affront to the principles and values of Islam and Arab-American culture.

I want to wish Jill Carroll and her family the very best. She is safe, she is free, and very soon she will be home with her family.

#### TRIBUTE TO KAY LEBOWITZ

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable woman in Bangor, ME, the city I am proud to call home.

Her name is Katherine Lebowitz, but her friends call her Kay. And she has lots of friends: the citizens of Maine she represented so well in the State legislature, the residents of Bangor she served as mayor, the countless people who benefit from her tireless volunteer work for educational, cultural, and charitable causes.

Also among her close circle of friends are the more than 260,000 members of the U.S. Armed Forces who have passed through Bangor International Airport during the last 3 years of conflict. Whether Bangor is their last stop before going overseas or the first American soil they touch on the way home, Kay Lebowitz and the wonderful Bangor Troop Greeters are there. Nearly 1,500 military flights have landed in Bangor since 2003, and the Troop Greeters have met every one day or night with cookies, homemade fudge, cell phones to call loved ones back home, cheers of gratitude, and hearty handshakes.

At the age of 90 soon to be 91 Kay has arthritis that prevents her from shaking hands, so she hugs. She hugs until her arms ache, but there is a hug for everyone. To the returning troops, she says, "Welcome home." To those headed out, it is "See you on the way back." And she will.

Today K-I-S-S radio in Bangor is holding a roast in honor of Kay Lebowitz. This event will include the ceremonial "retirement" of a pair of her trademark eyeglasses very stylish eyeglasses into the Troop Greeters Hall of Fame at Bangor International Airport. This is precisely the kind of light-hearted gesture Kay enjoys most, and it is fully in keeping with her generous spirit.

I am sure my Senate colleagues join me and all Americans in thanking the Bangor Troop Greeters for their extraordinary efforts in expressing the gratitude we all share, and in wishing the very best on this special day to Kay Lebowitz. She is a remarkable woman and a great patriot.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### CONGRATULATING LAHAINALUNA HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I extend my warmest congratulations to a sec-

ondary school in my State of Hawaii, on the island of Maui, that has reached a significant milestone this year. All my best to Lahainaluna High School, as it proudly celebrates its 175th anniversary. Lahainaluna sits in the foothills of the West Maui Mountains overlooking Lahaina, a former whaling village once the capital of Hawaii.

As with many schools, Lahainaluna, known as "the leading star of the Pacific," began as a seminary for young men. It opened on September 5, 1831, following a vote of the Hawaiian Mission of the American Board of Commissioners to create the institution. Rev. Lorrin Andrews served as the school's first headmaster for 25 students. By June of 1836, the class size increased to accommodate 32 boys, some of them beginning the tradition of boarding that continues today.

Lahainaluna's initial curriculum included subjects that missionaries to Hawaii wished to require of teachers. These were traditional subjects such as arithmetic, writing, geography, and natural history, and later, advanced mathematics, astronomy, scriptural history, and theology. Students were also instructed in useful trades including farming, animal care, carpentry, navigation, surveying, printing, and engraving. Members of this institution were inventive and innovative, and on February 14, 1834, the first issue of *Ka Lama Hawaii*, the first newspaper published west of the Rocky Mountains, was printed at the school.

The school's curriculum expanded tremendously from its original offerings by the turn of the century. Students learned grammar, bookkeeping, typing, mechanical and architectural drawing, sanitation, civics, business math and English, in addition to vocational subjects such as auto repair and agriculture.

Lahainaluna kept pace with the times and in 1923 became known as a "public high school" for boys and girls, rather than as a "special school." Two years later, the school became a 4-year high school and graduated its first senior class in June 1926.

Statehood came for all of us in Hawaii on August 21, 1959. About 20 years after that, Lahainaluna's traditionally male boarding department opened its doors to admit female boarders.

Lahainaluna was accredited in 2004 by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for a 6-year term. It received a 2006 Superior Schools award at the Environmental and Spatial Technology conference in Hot Springs, AR.

Today, Lahainaluna continues to be one of Maui's flagship high schools, educating a diverse student body of 1,000 students each year and sending them to colleges across the country. Certainly, the school has weathered many changes, particularly the rise and fall of Maui's sugar industry, and the inevitable impacts on the families of its student body. It is my hope that the school will continue for many years into the future to educate bright,

young minds and inspire them to become productive citizens who give back to the community.

Congratulations to Principal Michael Nakano, members of his administration, faculty, staff, current students, and their families, and all of its alumni who have continued Lahainaluna's proud traditions and seen the school to its memorable 175th anniversary this year.

The school's philosophy is an enduring one, and I will end by noting part of it here, "We recognize the importance of each student. All students can learn and we must give them the opportunity to maximize their potential. We encourage students to think independently, to have a sense of responsibility for themselves and for society and to experience the satisfactions and rewards that come from creativity."•

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROSWELL PUBLIC LIBRARY

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am proud to join the citizens of southeastern New Mexico in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Roswell Public Library. That this should happen on the cusp of National Library Week makes the distinction even more gratifying. I would like to take this opportunity to commend Library Director Betty Long and the Roswell Public Library staff, both former and present, for their hard work and dedication to the public library system. Their devotion and commitment to the citizens of Roswell and Chaves County are exemplary.

On April 2, 1906, through the perseverance of the Roswell Woman's Club, the library opened at its original location on Richardson and Third Streets. The Roswell Public Library was established before New Mexico received statehood; it also preceded the historic Chaves County Courthouse. Throughout the decades, the Roswell Public Library has remained steadfast in providing Roswell the scholarly and leisure resources necessary to stimulate a vibrant and growing community.

During my time in the Senate I have come to understand the importance of increased funding for and awareness of library services in the 21st century. Libraries do more than just loan books; they serve as meeting places, repositories of knowledge, and safe havens where ideas can be strengthened or challenged. They have played a vital role in the development of human culture throughout history. It is clear that the role of the Roswell Public Library in this most worthy pursuit will be even greater in the decades to come.

Once again, I would like to congratulate the Roswell Public Library on their centennial. I wish them continued success as they move forward.•

#### MESABI EAST SCHOOLS, AURORA, MINNESOTA

• Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Mesabi East School



District, in Aurora, MN, which recently earned an Award for Excellence in Education for its exceptional and innovative achievements in educating children.

The Mesabi East School District is truly a model of educational success. The district believes the education of our students goes beyond the classroom walls to include helping children develop compassion and the desire to serve their community.

Toward that goal, for the past 9 years, the Mesabi East Schools have sponsored Project Elf, which provides clothing, food, and toys for less fortunate families in the area who apply for the assistance. Donations are solicited from local merchants, and student volunteers receive a budget to shop for each family. All names are kept confidential. Recently, Project Elf inspired another initiative, called Elf Central. Participating students and staff volunteer to stay after school to make gifts for people in need of a cheerful message. The effort became a groundswell; now, 457 students volunteer often, throughout the year.

Students' community involvement exceeds helping families and those in need. Over the past 6 years, the students of the Mesabi East Schools have sponsored a carefully planned Veterans Day celebration to honor the men and women who have given so much for their country. The Veterans Day ceremony has become a hallmark of community pride and a wonderful form of appreciation for the sacrifices of all our Nation's veterans.

In addition, the Mesabi East District has focused particular attention on early childhood education. Recently, the District created a nonprofit entity dedicated to researching the best possible way to provide services to families. This group has quickly organized a variety of early childhood activities within the community.

Much of the credit for the success of the Mesabi East School District belongs to its superintendent, Gene Paulson; the principals, Sam Wilkes and Jorma Rahkola; and all the dedicated teachers. The students and staff at Mesabi East Schools understand that, in order to be successful, a school must go beyond achieving academic success; it must also provide a nurturing environment where students can develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for success throughout life. All of the faculty, staff, and students at Mesabi East Schools should be very proud of their accomplishments.

I congratulate the Mesabi East School District in Aurora for winning the Award for Excellence in Education and for its exceptional contributions to education in Minnesota.●

#### JOHN A. JOHNSON ACHIEVEMENT PLUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

● Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School,

in Saint Paul, MN, which recently earned an Award for Excellence in Education for its exceptional and innovative achievements in educating children.

John A. Johnson Elementary School is truly a model of educational success. A state-of-the-art community school, it was the first recipient of the Richard W. Riley Award for Excellence in Community Schools, which is conferred by the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, a public education philanthropy in Ohio. John A. Johnson Elementary, which serves 320 children in kindergarten through grade six, was deemed the best community school in the Nation and won this distinction merely 4 years after opening its doors.

As one of Minnesota's best-performing schools serving children of a predominantly low-income population, Johnson has accumulated truly impressive academic accomplishments. For example, during the school's first 2 years of operation, 2000-2002, only 50 percent of the children tested average or above average on standardized reading tests. However, for the past 2 years, nearly 80 percent scored average or above average.

Improvements in math scores at John A. Johnson Elementary are equally remarkable. Last year, standardized test scores in math were within two percentage points of the district average. Only 3 years ago, John A. Johnson pupils were 30 points below the district average.

John A. Johnson Elementary does more than teach children; it is structured to assist families and reduce barriers to education that impede children's learning. The school integrates support services by forming partnerships with many community organizations and making these services available to help parents.

Much of the credit for John A. Johnson School's success belongs to its principal, Frank Feinberg, and the dedicated teachers. The students and staff at John A. Johnson Elementary School understand that, in order to be successful, a school must go beyond achieving academic success; it must also provide a nurturing environment where students can develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for success throughout life. All of the faculty, staff, and students at John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School should be very proud of their accomplishments.

I congratulate John A. Johnson Elementary School in Saint Paul for winning the Award for Excellence in Education and for its exceptional contributions to education in Minnesota.●

#### LAKE HARRIET COMMUNITY SCHOOL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

● Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Lake Harriet Community School, in Minneapolis, MN, which

recently earned an Award for Excellence in Education for its exceptional and innovative achievements in educating children.

Lake Harriet Community School is truly a model of educational success. The school is fully committed to its mission of guiding students to love learning and to celebrate and respect a diverse population, and also to empower young people to reach their full potential as knowledgeable, responsible, and confident citizens of the global community. The school focuses on educating the whole child. Opportunities abound across a broad spectrum, so that virtually every interest is served: love of music and art, athletics, competitive chess, the environment, and history. At Lake Harriet, young people are invited to get involved and are helped to excel in pursuing their interests.

Lake Harriet School reflects the diversity of its city, and it opens its doors to the entire community. Students are given the privilege of meeting other young people of many different cultures, experiences, and abilities. Students come to Lake Harriet Community School from a variety of Minneapolis neighborhoods, and the school is proud of its record of fostering respect and appreciation for diversity.

The academic achievements of the students who attend Lake Harriet Community School are among the highest in Minnesota. For 2 successive years, the school has earned five-star status in both reading and math from the Minnesota Department of Education, an accomplishment realized by fewer than 5 percent of all schools in the State of Minnesota.

Much of the credit for Lake Harriet Community School's success belongs to its principal, Marsha Seltz, and all the dedicated teachers. The students and staff at Lake Harriet Community School understand that, in order to be successful, a school must go beyond achieving academic success; it must also provide a nurturing environment where students can develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for success throughout life. All of the faculty, staff, and students at Lake Harriet Community School should be very proud of their accomplishments.

I congratulate Lake Harriet Community School in Minneapolis for winning the Award for Excellence in Education and for its exceptional contributions to education in Minnesota.●

#### TRIBUTE TO BRAD COHEN

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable young man, Brad Cohen. Brad is a teacher and an author. Brad Cohen is one of the more than 100,000 people in the United States who have full-blown Tourette syndrome.

I first met Brad through his loving father and my friend Norm Cohen. Later, as chairman of the State Board

of Education, I visited Brad in his classroom at Mountain View Elementary. I marveled at Brad's ability to teach and hold young children spell-bound. I watched as Brad's occasional twitches and noises went unnoticed by his class. I watched a young teacher master both teaching and Tourette syndrome through determination and personal commitment.

Brad has authored a book titled "Front of the Class, How Tourette Syndrome Made Me the Teacher I Never Had." It is a story of personal challenge and determination. It is a story of a young man's dreams coming true. Brad's book is for everyone, and his twenty motivational tips on living with a disability are an inspiration for anyone. I commend Brad Cohen on the power of his life of achievement and the inspiration he has to the children he teaches. ●

TRIBUTE TO HOOSIER ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I wish today to share with my colleagues the winners of the 2005–2006 Dick Lugar/Indiana Farm Bureau/Farm Bureau Insurance Companies Youth Essay Contest.

In 1985, I joined with the Indiana Farm Bureau to sponsor an essay contest for eighth grade students in my home State. The purpose of this contest is to encourage young Hoosiers to recognize and appreciate the importance of Indiana agriculture in their lives and subsequently craft an essay responding to the assigned theme. I, along with my friends at the Indiana Farm Bureau and Farm Bureau Insurance Companies, am pleased with the annual response to this contest and the quality of the essays received over the years.

I congratulate Sangeeth Jeevan, of Vigo County, and Brittany Blazier, of Wells County, as winners of this year's contest, and I ask to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of their respective essays. Likewise, I would like to include the names of all of the district and county winners of the 2005–2006 Dick Lugar/Indiana Farm Bureau/Farm Bureau Insurance Companies Youth Essay Contest.

The material follows.

INDIANA FARM SUPER HEROES

(By Sangeeth Jeevan—Vigo County)

Introducing the Indiana Farm Super Heroes!

Corn Man—with his super riboflavin power to boost energy, can change from a solid, corn starch, to a liquid, corn syrup.

Wheat Gal—with her supernatural ability to deliver more energy with carbohydrates and make food delicious!

Powerful Poultry—delivering protein needed to build muscle and provide the best tasting meat!

Big Beef—teams up with the Powerful Poultry to provide even more protein.

Potato Pal—a tasty hero that delivers the carbohydrates to energize our health.

Vivacious Veggies—these veggies pack a punch of healthy vitamins and minerals essential for our health!

Today, they will face the challenge of creating a nutritious cookout.

Corn Man: Ok team, what should we do? We need to create the best cookout only with Indiana farm products.

Wheat Gal: I have an idea. Maybe Big Beef should help create a delicious steak!

Powerful Poultry: Yeah, and I could make some mouth watering chicken skewers!

Corn Man: Yeah! Good thinking, Wheat Gal. Veggies, do you think you can create some kind of barbecue sauce for the meat?

Vivacious Veggies: Of course! We could use our tomatoes packed with vitamin C.

Corn Man: Great. I can create a couple of scrumptious grilled corn-on-the-cob!

Wheat Gal: MMM! This cookout sounds tasty. Maybe I can create some buns for cheeseburgers. Hey, Big Beef, do you think you can help me?

Big Beef: Of course! After all, burgers are my specialty. Hey, can you Veggies help me add some condiments?

Vivacious Veggies: Coming right up!

Potato Pal: Maybe I can whip up some snacks for us; say how do potato chips sound! Everybody: GREAT!!!

Powerful Poultry: I can't believe we can make all these cookout foods just from Indiana farm products. It's amazing!

Wheat Gal: Yeah, and to think these items are so delicious and nutritious!

Corn Man: This is the best cookout ever!

MEMORABLE COOKOUTS FROM HOOSIER FARMS (By Brittany Blazier—Wells County)

"Lunch time!"

My head popped out of the chilly lake water like a jack-in-the-box. I didn't need to be told twice. Scrambling out of the water, I ran to the shore and flung a sun-warmed towel around me, the breeze making goose bumps on my skin. It was another beautiful day in Indiana.

"What are we eating?" my brother asked as he sat down at a picnic table.

"The usual," I shrugged.

Of course, as Grandma and Mom brought out plate after plate of piping hot food, "the usual" was absolutely music to my taste buds. Corn on the cob, strawberries, and an apple pie looked especially appetizing.

Quickly buttering my corn, I felt my mouth water. "This is your corn, isn't it, Grandpa?"

Indiana is the seventeenth largest producer of sweet corn in the nation. In 2003, it produced 18,600 tons! Along with the fact that sweet corn tastes delicious, it's also very healthy. Corn is a good source of protein, carbohydrates, fiber, iron, and potassium.

After the corn, I moved on to devour the strawberries. Also grown in Indiana, strawberries are jam-packed with vitamin C. In fact, one cup of strawberries is eighty-two milligrams of vitamin C, which is twenty-two more than my diet requires.

Finally, the apple pie was last with apples straight from our orchard. Indiana ranks sixteenth in the country for apple production. Apples are another great source of vitamin C and other nutrients.

I put my fork down and sighed with happiness. My stomach was full, and so was my heart. These memorable cookouts with our homegrown food—heavenly Hoosier horticulture—are ineffably priceless.

2005–2006 DISTRICT ESSAY WINNERS

District 1: Elizabeth Zubrenic (Lake County) and Michael Rice (Marshall County).

District 2: Jeff Teeters (Allen County) and Megan Ramus (DeKalb County).

District 3: Jill Griffin (Carroll County) and Victor Gutwein (Jasper County).

District 4: Jared Wilkinson (Miami County) and Brittany Blazier (Wells County).

District 5: Andrew Keck (Hendricks County) and Chelsea Carroll (Morgan County).

District 6: Nick Johnson (Hamilton County) and Cierra Edwards (Randolph County).

District 7: Sangeeth Jeevan (Vigo County) and Amy Goodman (Green County).

District 8: Megan Hein (Johnson County) and Doug Wicker (Rush County).

District 9: Blake Kleaving (Perry County) and Austen McBain (Posey County).

District 10: Julia Hunter (Floyd County) and Jordan Agan (Washington County).

2005–2006 COUNTY ESSAY WINNERS

Adams: Elizabeth Goebel.  
Allen: Jeff Teeters and Ivy Strubel.  
Bartholomew: Chrissy Day.  
Benton: Michael Strasburger and Allyson LaGrange.

Brown: Sherry Lynn Bube.  
Carroll: Jill Griffin.  
Cass: Ethan Sell and Katelyn McKaig.  
Clark: Austin Mann.  
Daviss: Elizabeth Anne Bohnert.

DeKalb: Dean Behrendsen and Megan Ramus.  
Dubois: Matthew Wilmes and Katie Whitsitt.

Elkhart: Bennett Tyson and Emily Zimmerman.  
Floyd: Stephen McCoskey and Julia Hunter.

Franklin: Chase Howell and Molly Schwab.  
Greene: Corbyn Bales and Amy Goodman.  
Hamilton: Nick Johnson and Meera Chander.

Hendricks: Andrew Keck and Rachel Douglas.  
Henry: Zach Emerson and Emily Thornburgh.

Jackson: Derrick O'Sullivan and Kourtney Tiemeyer.  
Jasper: Victor Gutwein and Lindsey Park.  
Jay: Ben Vance and Kellie Howell.

Jennings: Aaron Simmons and Morgan Siener.  
Johnson: Ben Diekhoff and Megan Hein.  
Lake: Patrick Cudzilo and Elizabeth Zubrenic.

Madison: Jessica Driggers.  
Marion: Alex Schroeder and Anasuya Shekhar.

Marshall: Michael Rice and Rachel Conley.  
Miami: Jared Wilkinson and Adeline Jackson.

Monroe: J.P. Tapp and Deana Fox.  
Morgan: Chelsea Carroll.  
Newton: Colin Lawrence and Megan Tornquist.

Perry: Blake Kleaving.  
Posey: Logan Schmitt and Austen McBain.  
Pulaski: Evan Criswell.

Putnam: Laura McGaughey.  
Randolph: Jordan Wall and Cierra Edwards.  
Rush: Doug Wicker.

St. Joseph: Mark Greci and Vanessa Noriega.  
Scott: Trenton Johnson and Anna McGuire.

Starke: Nick Hofferth and Rachel Lugo.  
Switzerland: Maggie Armstrong.  
Tippecanoe: Natasha Scheffee.

Vigo: Sangeeth Jeevan and Paige Cook.  
Wabash: Matthew Andersen and Marissa Stoffel.

Warrick: Ethan Schnur and Amanda Downey.  
Washington: Jordan Agan and Cora Carter.  
Wayne: Shaun Sizemore and Elizabeth Lim.

Wells: Brittany Blazier.  
White: Cory Thomas and Amanda Spear. ●

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL LANCE W. LORD

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to

GEN Lance W. Lord, commander of Air Force Space Command, and his wife Beccy for their lifetime of service and unflinching dedication to the U.S. Air Force and our great country.

As both an airman and leader, spanning 37 years of military service, General Lord's contributions to our Nation's strategic deterrence and space missions were critical to the warfighter, global economy, and the safety of our families. General Lord's leadership was an essential element in winning the Cold War and vital to Air Force Space Command's support of combat operations around the world to include Operations Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom, and the global war on terrorism.

General Lord prepared for his illustrious Air Force career by graduating from Otterbein College and its Reserve Officer Training Corps in 1968. In January of 1969, General Lord was introduced to the Air Force through Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, ICBM, operational readiness and combat crew missile training. This training led to his first assignment to North Dakota as a Minuteman II combat crewmember. General Lord's Air Force journey would take him and Beccy through a series of Air Staff and Department of Defense assignments relating to space and strategic and tactical missile systems. He was assigned as the military assistant to the director of Net Assessment and directed the Ground-Launched Cruise Missile Program in Europe. He served as the commander of the 10th Strategic Missile Squadron in Montana, vice commander of the 351st Strategic Missile Wing in Missouri, and later commanded two ICBM wings in Wyoming and North Dakota. In California, General Lord commanded the 30th Space Wing responsible for satellite launch and ballistic missile test launch operations. Leading professional development and educational programs was a hallmark of General Lord's career. He led Air Force's education and training programs as commandant of Squadron Officer School, commander of Second Air Force in Mississippi, and commander of Air University in Alabama. Prior to assuming his current position, General Lord served as the assistant vice chief of staff for Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.

During General Lord's tenure as commander, Air Force Space Command, he provided inspirational leadership to over 39,000 service men and women responsible for a global network of satellite command and control, communications, missile warning, space launch, and ensured the combat readiness of America's ICBM force. General Lord guided the command to a number of historic firsts: 44 successful consecutive operational space launches, establishment of National Security Space Institute, the launch of the last Titan IV, and transition to the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle, deactivation of the Peacekeeper ICBM weapon sys-

tem, and the establishment of the quarterly High Frontier, Air Force Space Command's first scholarly space and missile journal. General Lord has been a stellar Air Force advocate for the creation of the Space Power Caucus, orchestrated the "50 Years of Air Force Space and Missiles" celebration, and developed the Space Professional Development Strategy. Most recently, he answered the President's call to service with the creation of the High Frontier Adventures, a program designed to inspire students to explore space, mathematics, science, engineering and technology.

General Lord's impeccable service is characterized by his Command Space Badge, Space Professional Level III certification, operational space experience in nuclear operations and spacelift, weapon systems expertise in the Minuteman II, Minuteman III, and Peacekeeper ICBMs, and the Atlas E, Delta II, Titan II, and Titan IV Boosters. General Lord is the recipient of numerous prestigious recognitions: Space Champion Award, General Bernard A. Schriever Award, General Jimmy Doolittle Fellow Award, General James V. Hartinger Award, and the General Thomas D. White Space Trophy.

Today, I have mentioned but a few of GEN Lance W. Lord's many achievements. General Lord is a visionary, steadfast military leader, and honorable man. I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to him and his wife Beccy and their two sons, Jason and Joshua, for the years they have dedicated to our country and to the betterment of the U.S. Armed Forces. As a distinguished space pioneer, General Lord widely proclaimed the mandate, "If you're not in space, you're not in the race." General Lord, we wish you well.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:21 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 bills:

H.R. 1259. An act to award a congressional gold medal on behalf of the Tuskegee Airmen, collectively, in recognition of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces.

H.R. 4911. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 30, 2006, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2116. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain real property to the Supreme Court.

S. 2120. An act to ensure regulatory equity between and among all dairy farmers and handlers for sales of packaged fluid milk in federally regulated milk marketing areas and into certain nonfederally regulated milk marketing areas from federally regulated areas, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6186. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Process for Requesting Waiver of Mandatory Separation Age for Certain Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Air Traffic Controllers" (RIN2120-A118) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6187. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Flight Rules Area and Flight Free Zones" (RIN2120-A171) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6188. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Port Isabel, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 04-274) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6189. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cuba and Knoxville, Illinois)" (MB Docket No. 05-118) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6190. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Lancaster, Pickerington, and Westerville, Ohio)" (MB Docket No. 03-238) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6191. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Old Forge and Black River, New York)" (MB Docket No. 05-279) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6192. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Matagorda, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 04-215) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6193. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Otter Creek, Florida)" (MB Docket No. 05-54) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6194. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Tomahawk, Wisconsin; Waynoka, Oklahoma; Wasco, California; Richland Springs, Texas; and Hermitage, Arkansas)" (MB Docket Nos. 04-202, 04-271, 04-272, 04-273, and 04-431) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6195. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Coupeville and Sequim, Washington)" (MB Docket No. 04-280) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6196. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (New Harmony, IN and West Salem, IL)" (MB Docket No. 04-341) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6197. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Fernandina Beach and Yulee, Florida)" (MB Docket No. 05-240) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6198. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cuney, TX)" (MB Docket No. 05-33) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6199. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bend and Prineville, Oregon)" (MB Docket

No. 03-78) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6200. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bairrol and Sinclair, Wyoming)" (MB Docket No. 05-117) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6201. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Harrisonburg, Louisiana; Mecca, California; Taos, New Mexico; San Joaquin, California; and Rosepine, Louisiana)" (MB Docket Nos. 04-266, 04-267, 04-268, 04-269, and 04-270) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6202. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Grand Portage, Minnesota)" (MB Docket No. 04-432) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6203. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Okeene, Oklahoma)" (MB Docket No. 05-296) received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6204. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (27); Amtd. No. 3150" (RIN2120-AA65) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6205. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (18); Amtd. No. 3151" (RIN2120-AA65) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6206. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (44); Amtd. No. 3153" (RIN2120-AA65) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6207. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (42); Amtd. No. 3154" (RIN2120-AA65) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6208. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Class E Airspace; Big Delta, Allen Army Airfield, Ft. Greely, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 05-AAL-13)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6209. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Koliganek, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 05-AAL-30)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6210. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of High Altitude Area Navigation Routes; South Central United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 05-ASO-7)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6211. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Gothenburg, Quinn Field, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 06-ACE-1)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6212. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of the Minneapolis Class B Airspace; MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 03-AWA-6)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6213. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-100 and DG-400 Sailplanes and DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Models DG-500 Elan Series and DF-500M Sailplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-CE-44)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6214. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2004-NM-178)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6215. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls Royce plc RB211 Trent 553-61, 553A2-61, 556-61, 556A2-61, 556B-61, 556B2-61, 560-61, and 560A2-61 Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NE-41)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6216. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-052)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6217. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model HS 748 Airplanes"

((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2004-NM-141)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6218. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model DH.125, HS.125, and BH .125 Series Airplanes; Model BAe.125 Series 800A, 800B, 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; and Model Hawker 800 and 1000 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-017)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6219. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-120, -120ER, -120FC, 120QC, and -120RT Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-191)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6220. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11, CL-600-2A12, and CL-600-2B16 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-157)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6221. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2003-NM-168)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6222. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-197)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6223. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model Hawker 800XP Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-188)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6224. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310-203, -204, and -222 Airplanes, and Model A310-300 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-143)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6225. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 1B, 1D, 1D1, and 1S1 Turbo-shaft Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NE-09)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6226. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-NM-161)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6227. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. 2005-CE-51)) received on March 28, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6228. A communication from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Atlantic highly migratory species for 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6229. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of action on a nomination and the discontinuation of service in the acting role for the position of Assistant Secretary (Public Affairs), received on March 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6230. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6231. A communication from the Chairman and President (Acting), Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 65. A bill to amend the age restrictions for pilots (Rept. No. 109-225).

By Mr. SPECTER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 829. A bill to allow media coverage of court proceedings.

S. 1768. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

[Treaty Doc. 108-7 Protocol of 1997 Amending MARPOL Convention (Ex. Rept. 109-13)]

The text of the committee-recommended resolution of advice and consent to ratification is as follows:

TEXT OF RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to Understandings and Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol of 1997 to Amend the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 Relating Thereto (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "Protocol of 1997"), signed by the United States on December 22, 1998 (T. Doc 108-7), subject to the understandings and declaration in sections 2 and 3.

#### Section 2. Understandings

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following understandings, which shall be included in the United States instrument of ratification:

(1) The United States of America understands that the Protocol of 1997 does not, as a matter of international law, prohibit Parties from imposing, as a condition of entry into their ports or internal waters, more stringent emission standards or fuel oil requirements than those identified in the Protocol.

(2) The United States of America understands that Regulation 15 applies only to safety aspects associated with the operation of vapor emission control systems that may be applied during cargo transfer operations between a tanker and port-side facilities and to the requirements specified in Regulation 15 for notification to the International Maritime Organization of port State regulation of such systems.

#### Section 3. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration, which shall be included in the United States instrument of ratification:

The United States of America notes that at the time of adoption of the Protocol of 1997, the NO<sub>x</sub> emission control limits contained in Regulation 13 were those agreed as being achievable by January 1, 2000, on new marine diesel engines, and further notes that Regulation 13(3)(b) contemplated that new technology would become available to reduce on-board NO<sub>x</sub> emissions below those limits. As such improved technology is now available, the United States expresses its support for an amendment to Annex VI, that would, on an urgent basis, revise the agreed NO<sub>x</sub> emission control limits contained in Regulation 13 in keeping with new technological developments.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPECTER for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Michael A. Chagares, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Patrick Joseph Schiltz, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Gray Hampton Miller, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Sharee M. Freeman, of Virginia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of four years.

Jeffrey L. Sedgwick, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

(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. SCHUMER:

S. 2481. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to hire additional full-time non-supervisory import specialists of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2482. A bill to authorize funding for State-administered bridge loan programs, to increase the access of small businesses to export assistance center services in areas in which the President declared a major disaster as a result of Hurricane Katrina of 2005, Hurricane Rita of 2005, or Hurricane Wilma of 2005, to authorize additional disaster loans, to require reporting regarding the administration of the disaster loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2483. A bill to establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force in the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers during major disasters; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 2484. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the disclosure of tax return information by tax return preparers to third parties; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a source for payments to States and counties under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 2486. A bill to ensure that adequate actions are taken to detect, prevent, and minimize the consequences of chemical releases that result from terrorist attacks and other criminal activity that may cause substantial harm to public health and safety and the environment; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENSIGN:

S. Res. 415. A resolution expressing the continuing support of the Senate to the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), and commending the efforts of that vital program as it carries out its mission of instilling the values of citizenship and service in the hearts and minds of the youth of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 185

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend

title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for the reduction of certain Survivor Benefit Plan annuities by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation and to modify the effective date for paid-up coverage under the Survivor Benefit Plan.

S. 513

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 513, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of S. 811, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to enhance and further research into paralysis and to improve rehabilitation and the quality of life for persons living with paralysis and other physical disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1440

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1440, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services.

S. 1815

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1815, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prescribe the binding oath or affirmation of renunciation and allegiance required to be naturalized as a citizen of the United States, to encourage and support the efforts of prospective citizens of the United States to become citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 1865

At the request of Mrs. DOLE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1865, a bill to establish the SouthEast Crescent Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 1952

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1952, a bill to provide grants for rural health information technology development activities.

S. 2025

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2025, a bill to promote the national se-

curity and stability of the United States economy by reducing the dependence of the United States on oil through the use of alternative fuels and new technology, and for other purposes.

S. 2284

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2284, a bill to extend the termination date for the exemption of returning workers from the numerical limitations for temporary workers.

S. 2292

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2292, a bill to provide relief for the Federal judiciary from excessive rent charges.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2292, supra.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille.

S. 2370

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2370, a bill to promote the development of democratic institutions in areas under the administrative control of the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 2403

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2403, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include in the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park land and interests in land of the GT Park Subdivision, and for other purposes.

S. 2426

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2426, a bill to facilitate the protection of minors using the Internet from material that is harmful to minors, and for other purposes.

S. 2460

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2460, a bill to permit access to certain information in the Firearms Trace System database.

S. 2475

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.

2475, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of the American Latino Community, to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino Community in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 65, a concurrent resolution recognizing the benefits and importance of Federally-qualified health centers and their Medicaid prospective payment system.

S. RES. 408

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 408, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should declare lung cancer a public health priority and should implement a comprehensive interagency program that will reduce lung cancer mortality by at least 50 percent by 2015.

S. RES. 409

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, a resolution supporting democracy, development, and stabilization in Haiti.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, *supra*.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2482. A bill to authorize funding for State-administered bridge loan programs, to increase the access of small businesses to export assistance center services in areas in which the President declared a major disaster as a result of Hurricane Katrina of 2005, Hurricane Rita of 2005, or Hurricane Wilma of 2005, to authorize additional disaster loans, to require reporting regarding the administration of the disaster loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor with my ranking member and leader on this issue, Senator JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, to speak for a few moments about a bill the two of us are going to introduce today, the Gulf Coast Open for Business Act of 2006, by Senators LANDRIEU, KERRY and others. Let me first commend my colleague and thank him for joining me here today. He will be giving more details about the act, which he has worked with my staff and others to craft, so let me add some personal perspective.

I stand here again, on behalf of the people of Louisiana, and the whole gulf

coast, who have just been devastated by the two most powerful storms to ever hit the United States in recorded history, and as you yourself know, because you were down in the gulf and have been a frequent champion for our cause. It is still hard, though, to describe to our colleagues the current situation there. Not only were these two hurricanes quite powerful, at some point category 4 and 5, which are killer storms, but just as devastating was the flooding that ensued by the collapse of the Federal levee system—a collapse because of inadequate engineering. Both the hurricanes and the flooding have literally devastated a major metropolitan area which sits in the heart of America's only energy coast, the gulf coast, and has been devastating to large and small businesses alike. We are here today to talk about our small businesses and their struggle for survival. They are indeed the backbone of our economic recovery.

We have first focused on levees, appropriately, and gulf coast restoration efforts, without which no recovery will be possible. We have also tried to struggle keeping children in school, keeping families sheltered, literally from the elements in temporary housing, when we think 7 months on after Katrina and Rita, recovery is going to start with our small businesses.

As I mentioned, yesterday marked the seven month anniversary of Hurricane Katrina. Katrina was the most destructive hurricane ever to hit the United States. The next month, in September, Hurricane Rita hit the Louisiana and Texas coast. It was the second most powerful hurricane ever to hit the United States, wreaking havoc on the southwestern part of my state and the east Texas coast. This one-two punch devastated Louisiana lives, communities and jobs, stretching from Cameron Parish in the west to Plaquemines Parish in the east.

We are now rebuilding our State and the wide variety of communities that were devastated by Rita and Katrina, areas representing a diverse mix of population, income and cultures. We hope to restore the region's uniqueness and its greatness. To do that, we need to rebuild our local economies for now and far into the future.

Before last year's storms, Louisiana had 86,000 small businesses, employing over 850,000 people. Their annual payroll was \$21.9 billion.

My State estimates that there were 71,000 businesses in the Katrina and Rita disaster zones. A total of 18,752 of these businesses catastrophically destroyed. However, on a wider scale, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, over 125,000 small and medium-sized businesses in the gulf region were disrupted by Katrina and Rita. As of this month, local chambers of commerce report that as many as two-thirds of their members had not resumed business operations. We will never succeed without these small businesses. They will be the key to the

revitalization. I am here with my colleague to say that the regular approach, the standard operation, the mousetrap that we created to handle past disasters is simply not sufficient.

Some of the people who work for the Small Business Administration and FEMA are terrific. You could not find better human beings on the face of the Earth. But it is not the individual human beings who are lacking here; it is the system that is insufficient and inadequate to the task.

Senator KERRY and I come to the floor today to speak about this bill that will create new models, create enhanced help from the Federal Government so that the businesses in Louisiana can at least be met halfway in their struggle to get their roofs back on, their inventories back in supply, and new markets opened up, since the markets around them have collapsed. The communities they served and hold to are in some cases destroyed, in others dispersed across the country. If we don't help them now, building a strong gulf coast will be all the more difficult without our small businesses.

After talking to the business leaders and small businesses in my State, there are three things that they need right now: technical assistance, contracting assistance, and assistance with SBA disaster loans. For example, many of our small businesses need help navigating the SBA assistance programs or, with much of their customer base in other States, others are now looking overseas for new markets. Our bill includes a provision to waive the \$100,000 cap on portability grants to SBDCs and allows SBDCs to receive these grants for disaster relief. Our bill also contains funds for the SBA to create a gulf coast international finance specialist, based in the gulf, who would provide essential technical assistance for small businesses looking for export financing.

It is vital to the economic recovery in Louisiana that our small businesses are given the opportunity to take part in the reconstruction of their State. Our businesses want to help rebuild their communities, but continue to have trouble getting Federal recovery contracts and keep getting mixed signals from FEMA.

With these facts in mind, our bill sets a small business prime contracting goal of 30 percent for Federal emergency contracts to rebuild the affected areas. This is to ensure that small businesses, particularly those located in the disaster area and that employ individuals in the affected areas, should receive a fair share of Federal contracting dollars. Our bill also makes the disaster areas eligible for HUBZones status to promote business growth.

Our businesses are struggling to deal with the SBA bureaucracy. Too often, when they get action on their loan application, it is a letter of rejection rather than a check.

The SBA has repeatedly touted how it has staffed up and increased its loan

processing productivity in recent months. They even cite record loan approvals in the gulf. But recent numbers show it is still taking the SBA 104 days to process and close on a business application. That is time many struggling businesses that are holding on by their fingernails in a challenging environment simply do not have.

Many times, when businesses are approved for an SBA loan, they find the terms and conditions to be unduly burdensome. Some are put in the position of having to make payments while they take care of expenses they have incurred for the months they spent waiting for the loan.

Our bill provides substantive relief to small businesses in the disaster areas by allowing them to defer repayment of disaster loans for 1 year from the time they received the loan. This will give them time to resume operations and build back a customer base as displaced residents gradually return home. Our bill also increases the SBA's disaster mitigation loan amounts so that borrowers can more effectively invest in products such as sea walls or storm shutters, that mitigate against damage from future disasters.

It is important to not only address our current needs from past hurricanes but to also look ahead to the next hurricane season—which is only 63 days away. I am concerned that the SBA has not incorporated 'lessons learned' from recent storms. I am concerned that they remain unprepared for what may be another active hurricane season—if not in my State then perhaps in other coastal States in 2007.

One provision included in our bill is a requirement that the SBA submit to Congress a detailed proactive disaster response plan by June 1, 2006, the start of the 2006 Atlantic hurricane season. I want to make sure the SBA is ready to respond should that become necessary.

As we reflect on the 7-month anniversary of the worst natural disaster to hit our Nation, now is the time for action—not words or empty promises. Today, right here in the Senate, is a time for fresh ideas and fiscally responsible plans to help our small businesses rebuild.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

With that, I turn the floor over to Senator KERRY who will go into additional detail about the Gulf Coast Open for Business Act. I thank him for his leadership, not only for this week but since the week of the storm. Our chairwoman, Senator SNOWE along with Senator KERRY, have focused a great deal of their own efforts from outside of our region to help our small businesses. I commend them for their continued efforts and, along with my fellow Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER, look forward to working with them in the coming months to give our small businesses the help they need so that they may rebuild and prosper once again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. She has been terrific to work with on this issue, but, more important, she is absolutely tenacious with respect to the recovery issues in her State. I think she has offered tremendous leadership in the Senate on a constant basis. On almost every bill that comes through, she has fought to find a way to assist with the recovery. It has been a pleasure to work with her. I know she has to go to another meeting. I am pleased to join with her in introducing this legislation today.

Senator LANDRIEU has tried to spread the word that New Orleans has plenty to offer, that people should not be scared away by negative press reports but instead be looking for opportunities to help rebuild one of our greatest cities.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, more than 125,000 small and medium sized businesses were disrupted or destroyed by the hurricanes. It's been seven months since the Gulf was hit by the hurricanes, and it is time to take a look at the long-term needs of businesses in the region if we are going to truly foster an economic recovery.

It is well known, the SBA's disaster loan program has done an abysmal job of getting out capital to businesses and homeowners over the past seven months, still with almost 80,000 applications to be processed out of 400,000 applications submitted. To help clear out the backlog, this bill enlists the agency's private-sector lending partners to help process loans. They are experienced SBA lenders, and in exchange for their expertise, SBA would pay them a fee to process loans. This is much faster than building a separate infrastructure of lenders, losing time to train them, when the experience and infrastructure already exists. Along with the American Bankers Associations, we urged the SBA back in November to enlist the agency's private-sector lending partners to help process loans. SBA refused, saying they had a better idea. That idea failed. With this bill, SBA can increase processing, get small businesses their loans faster, and local lenders can participate in the recovery of their communities.

We also identified a need for export assistance. There is an interesting phenomenon occurring right now as a result of Katrina. Companies from around the globe, having witnessed the tragedy of New Orleans, are trying to reach out to businesses along the Gulf Coast. For companies that had already established relationships overseas, this has meant big bucks. Many smaller businesses, however, don't have those relationships and are struggling to take advantage of these new international opportunities. The U.S. Export Assistance Centers, or USEACs, are ready and willing to help, and they are a tremendous resource for businesses looking to branch into foreign markets. But the problem is that the

Small Business administration doesn't have an employee in the New Orleans USEAC to help direct businesses to the financing programs that they need. Senator LANDRIEU and I recognize that this is because the SBA's international trade resources are stretched too thinly, so we are authorizing extra funds for the SBA to use in hiring an employee for the New Orleans USEAC.

Shortly after Hurricane Katrina hit, Small Business Development Centers across the country decided to devote all the funds in the portability grant program, which is designed to help communities recover after suffering significant job losses, to helping the Gulf Coast SBDCs. Not only did the SBDC community sacrifice money to help their colleagues in the Gulf, they tried to volunteer employees and other resources. Unfortunately, the good intentions of the SBDC network were stopped by legal technicalities. Limitations on the amount of money a State could get for a portability grant and restrictions on SBDC employees working outside of their State hampered recovery efforts. Senator LANDRIEU and I were disturbed to hear of these problems, and with our legislation today we will correct these problems so that bureaucracy isn't preventing the Gulf Coast recovery.

This bill also focuses on contracting opportunities for small businesses. The full participation of this Nation's small businesses, particularly those in and around the affected region, in the rebuilding effort is essential to the long-term success of the region's economy. New Orleans, in particular, was a city built on a foundation of small business and they will be the driving force behind its rebuilding.

Unfortunately, not enough is being done to ensure this participation. Just last week, I sent a letter to FEMA about their failure to award approximately \$1.5 billion in relief, recovery, and rebuilding contracts to small businesses. They told Senator LANDRIEU and me, and the other members of the Small Business Committee in November that they would award those contracts by February 1. We were disappointed that it would be another four months to get those funds to small businesses that desperately needed the work, but we were even more appalled when the deadline came and went, with no action from FEMA.

Thus, this legislation has a number of provisions to help small businesses in the disaster areas compete for Federal contracts in the short term and in any future disaster recovery effort.

This bill would make the declared disaster areas an Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone). This would give a preference to small businesses in the disaster zone when they bid on Federal contracts.

To help jumpstart the local economies affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and Wilma, the bill requires the Federal Government to award 30 percent of prime contracts and 40 percent of subcontract dollars spent on



disaster relief, recovery or reconstruction in the four affected States to be awarded to small businesses. Small businesses performing work in the area are more likely to turn over Federal dollars in the local economy, reinvigorating the local economy. The provision also includes a requirement of a weekly small business utilization report from the Gulf Coast region.

The bill includes a change to the Stafford Act, requiring that 10 percent of immediate disaster recovery contracts, such as debris removal, distribution of supplies, and reconstruction are awarded to firms located in or near an area designated as a federal disaster area by the President. This will put more local people back to work and help a region's economic recovery after a disaster.

This legislation will increase access for small businesses seeking contracting opportunities but limited by their ability to get bonded. Expanding access to bonding will increase small business participation, but will also protect the Federal Government from significant cost overruns and lack of performance in a contract.

Mr. President, 43 percent of businesses that close following a disaster never reopen, and an additional 29 percent of businesses close down permanently within two years of a natural disaster. It's been seven months, but we still have a chance to make a difference and mitigate bankruptcies and foster the startup and growth of new small businesses to rebuild the Gulf region. I hope that my colleagues and the administration will give this bill consideration and not repeat the past months of obstruction that have hurt local small businesses and homeowners. It is inexcusable that the bipartisan bill we put forward with Senators SNOWE and VITTER in September has been stalled.

I thank my colleague Senator LANDRIEU for her leadership and look forward to traveling with her soon to Louisiana to visit with businesses and families that still need our help.

Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2483. A bill to establish a Law Enforcement Assistance Force in the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the contributions of retired law enforcement officers during major disasters; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, the hours immediately following a disaster are critical to rescue and recovery efforts. Local law enforcement is often overburdened and staff is spread thin. As we saw in New Orleans, a lack of police presence can result in chaos and disorder which can affect the ability of first responders to conduct rescue operations.

In the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, volunteer first responders from throughout the country went to New Orleans and Biloxi to assist

local law enforcement. Unfortunately, many of these volunteers encountered red tape that left them frustrated and idle rather than using their expertise to aid efforts.

Because there is a desire from retired police officers to offer their experience and expertise in times of crisis, today, along with my colleague Senator VITTER, I will be introducing the Law Enforcement Assistance Force Act to assist local law enforcement.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Force Act would allow a retired law enforcement officer, whose certifications are current, to apply to the Secretary of Homeland Security to serve in the force. These retired police officers would be detailed to Federal, State, or local government law enforcement agencies to assist in the event of a major disaster. They would work under the direct supervision of existing law enforcement agencies and would be deputized and certified to perform the duties of a law enforcement agent. The force would serve as temporary first responders to supplement local efforts in search and rescue efforts as well as in protecting public safety. These retired officers have the skills to save lives and we should empower them to do so.

At a time of emergency when we should be tapping into all available resources, we cannot ignore the expertise of retired law enforcement officers who still have the ability and willingness to help those in need. We should take advantage of the fact that retired officers possess a wealth of talent and experience in dealing with emergency situations. Their assistance can save lives and contribute greatly to our communities.

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 2486. A bill to ensure that adequate actions are taken to detect, prevent, and minimize the consequences of chemical releases that result from terrorist attacks and other criminal activity that may cause substantial harm to public health and safety and the environment; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Chemical Security and Safety Act, a bill to protect our communities and citizens from terrorism. This measure is cosponsored by Senators OBAMA, KERRY, MENENDEZ, DURBIN, and BIDEN.

All of our States have a significant number of industrial facilities that manufacture or use chemicals. And we are all concerned about the potential of terrorist attacks on these facilities, which could threaten millions of lives.

I have advocated stronger security measures for chemical facilities for years. We needed better security at our chemical facilities even before 9/11—and that need is even more urgent today. Richard Falkenrath, a former

top presidential advisor on homeland security, has said, "I am aware of no other category of potential terrorist targets that presents as great a danger" as chemical facilities.

There are about 15,000 chemical manufacturers and storage facilities nationwide, including about 110 in heavily populated areas. The greatest area of vulnerability is in South Kearney, NJ, where 12 million people live in proximity to the Kuehne Chemical plant. A chemical catastrophe at this facility could endanger the life and health of people caught in the path of the prevailing winds.

The State of New Jersey has taken strong action to protect its citizens from this threat. Last year, New Jersey required that chemical facilities adopt a practice known as inherently safer technology. That means exactly what it says—if products can be manufactured using safer chemicals, then factories must do so.

But last week, the Bush administration sent a signal that it wants to override the right of States to require inherently safer technology. Basically, the administration wants to trust chemical facilities to protect the American people.

This approach is wrong, and it is a timid response to a dangerous threat. Trusting large corporations to do the right thing didn't work with Enron—and it won't protect the American people from a chemical catastrophe.

The Chemical Security and Safety Act offers real protection from a chemical catastrophe. It will require every chemical facility in the Nation to adopt inherently safer technology. It will protect the rights of States to enact tough chemical security standards to protect their citizens. It will improve physical security at chemical plants, with a requirement for stronger perimeter barriers. And it will establish whistleblower protections for employees who expose security risks at chemical facilities, and guarantee that workers have a role in securing the safety of facilities.

This is a strong, comprehensive approach. Some might say it goes too far. But as someone whose State lost 700 people on 9/11, I don't think we can ever go too far in protecting the American people from a terrorist attack on a chemical facility.

We have waited long enough. We need to take action now to protect the American people from a chemical catastrophe. I hope all of my colleagues will support the Chemical Security and Safety Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Chemical Security and Safety Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2486

*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 "Chemical Security and Safety Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Government Accountability Office, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Congressional Research Service, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry believe that the possibility of terrorist and criminal attacks on chemical plants poses a serious threat to public health and safety and the environment;

(2) there are significant opportunities to prevent harmful consequences of criminal attacks on chemical plants by employing inherently safer technologies in the manufacture and use of chemicals;

(3) inherently safer technologies may offer industry substantial savings by reducing the need for site security, secondary containment, buffer zones, mitigation, evacuation plans, regulatory compliance, and liability insurance; and

(4) owners and operators of chemical plants have a general duty to design, operate, and maintain safe facilities to prevent criminal activity that may result in harm to public health or safety or the environment.

**SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—The term “classified information” has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.).

(3) **COMMITTEE.**—The term “Committee” means a committee established under section 7(a).

(4) **COMMITTEE-ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.**—The term “committee-eligible employee” means an employee who—

(A) is not an independent contractor, subcontractor, or consultant;

(B) is not employed by an off-site company affiliated with the owner or operator of the relevant stationary source; and

(C) does not have supervisory or managerial responsibilities at the relevant stationary source.

(5) **COMMITTEE-ELIGIBLE STATIONARY SOURCE.**—The term “committee-eligible stationary source” means a stationary source that has 15 or more full-time equivalent employees.

(6) **CRIMINAL RELEASE.**—The term “criminal release” means—

(A) a release of a substance of concern from a stationary source into the environment that is caused, in whole or in part, by a criminal act, including an act of terrorism; and

(B) a release into the environment of a substance of concern that has been removed from a stationary source, in whole or in part, by a criminal act, including an act of terrorism.

(7) **DESIGN, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF SAFE FACILITIES.**—The term “design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities” means, with respect to the facilities at a stationary source, the practices of preventing or reducing the possibility of releasing a substance of concern—

(A) through use of inherently safer technology, to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) through secondary containment, control, or mitigation equipment, to the maximum extent practicable;

(C) by—

(i) making the facilities impregnable to intruders, to the maximum extent practicable; and

(ii) improving site security and employee training, to the maximum extent practicable;

(D) through the use of buffer zones between the stationary source and surrounding populations (including buffer zones between the stationary source and residences, schools, hospitals, senior centers, shopping centers and malls, sports and entertainment arenas, public roads and transportation routes, and other population centers);

(E) through increased coordination with State and local emergency officials, law enforcement agencies, and first responders, to the maximum extent practicable; and

(F) through outreach to the surrounding community, to the maximum extent practicable.

(8) **EMPLOYEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “employee” means any individual employed by the owner or operator of a stationary source that produces, processes, handles, or stores a substance of concern.

(B) **TRAINING.**—For purposes of section 8, the term “employee” includes any employee of a construction or maintenance contractor working at a stationary source that produces, processes, handles, or stores a substance of concern.

(9) **EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE.**—The term “employee representative” means a duly recognized collective bargaining representative at a stationary source.

(10) **EMPLOYER.**—The term “employer” includes—

(A) an employee of any employer, agent, contractor, or subcontractor subject to the provisions of this Act or engaged in the production, storage, security or transportation of a harmful chemical; and

(B) an employee, agent, contractor, or subcontractor of the Department of Homeland Security or any other Federal, State, or local government agency with responsibility for enforcing any provision of this Act.

(11) **FIRST RESPONDER.**—The term “first responder” includes Federal, State, and local emergency public safety, law enforcement, emergency response, and emergency medical (including hospital emergency facilities) agencies and authorities.

(12) **OUTREACH TO THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY.**—The term “outreach to the surrounding community” includes education of residents near a stationary source regarding—

(A) emergency procedures in the case of a terrorist attack;

(B) evacuation procedures, routes, and travel times; and

(C) what actions to take to minimize exposure to and physical harm caused by substances of concern.

(13) **OWNER OR OPERATOR.**—The term “owner or operator of a stationary source” means any person who owns, leases, controls, or supervises a stationary source.

(14) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(15) **STATIONARY SOURCE.**—The term “stationary source” has the meaning given the term in section 112(r)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(2)) and includes any chemical facility designated by the Secretary under section 5(d) of this Act.

(16) **SUBSTANCE OF CONCERN.**—The term “substance of concern” means any substance listed under section 112(r)(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(3)) in a threshold quantity or any other substance designated by the Secretary under section 5(d) of this Act in a threshold quantity.

(17) **THRESHOLD QUANTITY.**—The term “threshold quantity” means, with respect to a substance, the quantity established for the substance—

(A) under section 112(r)(5) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(5)); or

(B) by the Secretary under section 5(d) of this Act.

(18) **USE OF INHERENTLY SAFER TECHNOLOGY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “use of inherently safer technology” means use of a technology, product, raw material, or practice that, as compared to the technology, products, raw materials, or practices currently in use—

(i) significantly reduces or eliminates the possibility of the release of a substance of concern; and

(ii) significantly reduces or eliminates the hazards to public health and safety and the environment associated with the release or potential release of a substance described in clause (i).

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “use of inherently safer technology” includes chemical substitution, process redesign, product reformulation, and procedural and technological modification so as to—

(i) use less hazardous or benign substances;

(ii) use a smaller quantity of a substance of concern;

(iii) moderate pressures or temperatures;

(iv) reduce the likelihood and potential consequences of human error;

(v) improve inventory control and chemical use efficiency; and

(vi) reduce or eliminate storage, transportation, handling, disposal, and discharge of substances of concern.

**SEC. 4. PREVENTION OF CRIMINAL RELEASES.**

(a) **GENERAL DUTY.**—Each owner and each operator of a stationary source that produces, processes, handles, or stores any substance of concern has a general duty, in the same manner and to the same extent as the duty imposed under section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)), to—

(1) identify hazards that may result from a criminal release using appropriate hazard assessment techniques;

(2) ensure the design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities by taking such actions as are necessary to prevent criminal releases; and

(3) eliminate or significantly reduce the consequences of any criminal release that does occur.

(b) **WORKER PARTICIPATION.**—In carrying out its general duty to identify hazards under subsection (a), the owner or operator of a stationary source shall involve the employees of the stationary source in each aspect of ensuring the design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities.

**SEC. 5. DESIGNATION AND REGULATION OF HIGH PRIORITY CATEGORIES BY THE SECRETARY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator and State and local government agencies responsible for planning for and responding to criminal releases and providing emergency health care, shall promulgate regulations to designate certain stationary sources and substances of concern as high priority categories, based on the severity of the threat posed by a criminal release from the stationary sources.

(b) **FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In designating high priority categories under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall consider—

(A) the severity of the harm that could be caused by a criminal release;

(B) the proximity to population centers;

(C) the threats to national security;

(D) the threats to critical infrastructure;

(E) threshold quantities of substances of concern that pose a serious threat; and

(F) such other safety or security factors as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines to be appropriate.

(2) **INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION.**—In designating high priority categories under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider each stationary source individually and shall not summarily exclude any type of stationary source that would otherwise be considered a high priority under paragraph (1).

(3) **INITIAL DESIGNATION.**—In designating high priority categories for the first time under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that not fewer than 3,000 stationary sources are within a high priority category.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH PRIORITY CATEGORIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the United States Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, and the State and local government agencies described in subsection (a), shall promulgate regulations to require each owner or operator of a stationary source that is within a high priority category designated under subsection (a), in consultation with local law enforcement, first responders, employees, and employee representatives, to take adequate actions (including the design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities) to detect, prevent, and eliminate or significantly reduce the consequences of terrorist attacks and other criminal releases that may cause harm to public health or safety.

(2) **SOURCE REPORTS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date on which regulations are promulgated under paragraph (1), each owner or operator of a stationary source that is within a high priority category designated under subsection (a) shall submit a report to the Secretary that includes—

(A) an assessment of the vulnerability of the stationary source to a terrorist attack or other criminal release;

(B) an assessment of the hazards that may result from a criminal release of a substance of concern using appropriate hazard assessment techniques;

(C) a prevention, preparedness, and response plan that incorporates the results of the vulnerability and hazard assessments under subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(D) a statement as to how the prevention, preparedness, and response plan meets the requirements of the regulations established under paragraph (1);

(E) a statement as to how the prevention, preparedness, and response plan meets the general duty requirements under section 4(a);

(F) a discussion of the consideration of the elements of design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities, including the practicability of implementing each element;

(G) a statement describing how and when employees and employee representatives (if any) were consulted in considering the design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities and in preparing the report under this paragraph.

(d) **ADDITION OF SUBSTANCES OF CONCERN OR STATIONARY SOURCES.**—For the purpose of designating high priority categories under subsection (a) or any subsequent revision of the regulations promulgated under subsection (c)(1), the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may designate—

(1) any additional substance that, in a specified threshold quantity, poses a serious threat as a substance of concern; or

(2) any chemical facility as a stationary source.

(e) **REVIEW AND REVISION OF REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 5 years after the dates of promulgation of regulations under each of

subsections (a) and (c)(1), and not less often than every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall review the regulations and make any necessary revisions.

#### SEC. 6. REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall review each report submitted under section 5(c)(2) to determine whether the stationary source covered by the report is in compliance with regulations promulgated under section 5(c)(1).

(b) **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall certify each determination under subsection (a) in writing.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—A certification under paragraph (1) indicating the stationary source is in compliance with the regulations under section 5(c)(1) shall include a checklist indicating the consideration by such stationary source of the use of each element of design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities.

(c) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—

(1) **HIGHEST PRIORITY STATIONARY SOURCES.**—Not later than 6 months after the date on which reports are required to be submitted under section 5(c)(2), the Secretary shall complete the review and certification of the 600 highest priority stationary sources designated under section 5(a).

(2) **OTHER HIGH PRIORITY STATIONARY SOURCES.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which reports are required to be submitted under section 5(c)(2), the Secretary shall complete the review and certification of all reports submitted under that section.

(d) **COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “determination” means a determination by the Secretary that, with respect to a report submitted under section 5(c)(2)—

(A) the report does not comply with regulations promulgated under section 5(c)(1);

(B) a threat exists that is beyond the scope of the plan submitted with the report; or

(C) the implementation of the plan submitted with the report is insufficient.

(2) **DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.**—If the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator, makes a determination, the Secretary shall—

(A) notify the stationary source of the determination; and

(B) in coordination with the Administrator and the United States Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, provide advice and technical assistance to bring the stationary source into compliance.

(e) **RECERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of submission of a report under section 5(c)(2), and not less often than every 2 years thereafter, the owner or operator of the stationary source covered by the report, shall—

(1) review the adequacy of the report;

(2) certify to the Secretary that the stationary source has completed the review; and

(3) as appropriate, submit to the Secretary any changes to the assessments or plan in the report.

#### SEC. 7. SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of promulgation of regulations under section 5(a), the owner or operator of a committee-eligible stationary source shall establish a safety and security committee for that stationary source.

(b) **COMMITTEE COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A Committee shall be composed of committee-eligible employees and managerial employees.

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(A) **NUMBER OF MEMBERS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall pro-

mulgate regulations establishing the number of members of a Committee that are required.

(ii) **CONTENTS.**—The regulations promulgated under clause (i) shall—

(I) establish a number of members of a Committee that is directly proportional to the number of employees at a committee-eligible stationary source; and

(II) permit the number of members of a Committee to be increased above that established by regulation by mutual agreement between committee-eligible employees and managerial employees.

(B) **RATIO.**—The number of committee-eligible employees serving as members of a Committee shall be equal to or greater than the number of managerial employees serving as members.

(C) **ALTERNATES.**—An alternate member of a Committee may be designated if a member of a Committee is temporarily unavailable.

(D) **PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT.**—All members of a Committee shall be employed at the committee-eligible stationary source for which the Committee was established.

(3) **SELECTION OF COMMITTEE-ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE MEMBERS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—At a committee-eligible stationary source that has an employee representative, the employee representative shall select the committee-eligible employee members of the Committee.

(B) **NO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—At a committee-eligible stationary source that does not have an employee representative, the owner or operator of the committee-eligible stationary source shall actively solicit volunteers from among committee-eligible employees who may potentially be exposed to a substance of concern.

(ii) **INSUFFICIENT VOLUNTEERS.**—If there is not a sufficient number of volunteers under clause (i), the owner or operator of the committee-eligible stationary source shall select additional committee-eligible employees to serve as members of the Committee.

(4) **CO-CHAIRPERSONS.**—A member of a Committee who is a committee-eligible employee and a member of a Committee who is a managerial employee shall serve as co-chairpersons of the Committee.

(c) **LISTS OF MEMBERS.**—The owner or operator of a committee-eligible stationary source shall prominently post at the stationary source a current list of all members of the Committee of the stationary source that includes the name and work location of each member and whether each member is a committee-eligible employee or a managerial employee.

(d) **MEETINGS; QUORUMS; ACTION.**—

(1) **MEETINGS.**—A Committee shall meet not less frequently than once per month at a time, date, and location agreed to by the Committee.

(2) **QUORUM.**—A majority of members of a Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Committee business.

(3) **ACTION.**—Any action by a Committee shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of the members present.

(e) **AUTHORITY.**—A Committee shall—

(1) identify, discuss, and make recommendations to the owner or operator of the committee-eligible stationary source concerning potential hazards and risks relevant to security, safety, and health and potential responses to those hazards and risks;

(2) survey the facility of the committee-eligible stationary source for potential security, safety, and health vulnerabilities;

(3) establish a schedule to conduct, not less frequently than once per month, a survey described in paragraph (2) of all or part of the committee-eligible stationary source;

(4) as soon as is practicable, assist in the investigation of an accident, criminal release, fire, explosion, or an incident in which there was a significant risk of an accident, criminal release, fire, or explosion; and

(5) participate in the development, review, or revision of any vulnerability assessment, hazard assessment, or prevention, preparedness, and response plan.

(f) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN WRITING.**—Any recommendations made by a Committee shall be made in writing.

(2) **REVIEW.**—At each meeting, a Committee shall review the status of any recommendation made by the Committee that the Committee has not determined to be resolved.

(3) **NONUNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATIONS.**—If a recommendation of a Committee is not unanimous, the owner or operator of the committee-eligible stationary source shall document the differing views of the members of the Committee and maintain records regarding any such recommendation.

(g) **EXISTING COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A safety and health, environmental, or similar committee established at a committee-eligible stationary source before the date specified in subsection (a) that meets the requirements of this section may be designated as the Committee for the committee-eligible stationary source under a written agreement between the owner or operator of the committee-eligible stationary source and the employee representative of the committee-eligible stationary source.

(2) **NO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE.**—If there is no employee representative at a committee-eligible stationary source, the owner or operator of a stationary source may designate a safety and health, environmental or similar committee described in paragraph (1) as the Committee for the committee-eligible stationary source.

**SEC. 8. EMPLOYEE TRAINING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The owner or operator of a stationary source shall annually provide each employee with 4 hours of training—

(1) regarding the requirements of this Act, as applicable to the stationary source;

(2) identifying and discussing substances of concern that pose a risk to the community and first responders;

(3) discussing the prevention, preparedness, and response plan for the stationary source, including off-site consequence impacts;

(4) identifying opportunities to reduce or eliminate the vulnerability of a stationary source to a criminal release of a substance of concern through the use of the elements of design, operation, and maintenance of safe facilities; and

(5) discussing appropriate emergency response procedures.

(b) **NONDUPLICATION.**—Training provided under this section shall be in addition to any training required to be provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source under any other Federal or State law.

(c) **DOCUMENTATION.**—The owner or operator of a stationary source that is within a high priority category designated under section 5(a) shall—

(1) submit an annual written certification to the Secretary stating that the owner or operator has met the requirements for employee training under this section; and

(2) maintain a list of all employees who have received training under this section.

**SEC. 9. INSPECTIONS, MONITORING, ENTRY, AND RECORDKEEPING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of determining whether any owner or operator of a stationary source is in compliance with this Act or is properly carrying out any provision of this Act, the Secretary and the Adminis-

trator (or a designee of the Secretary or the Administrator) may take any action that the Administrator is authorized to take under paragraphs (7) and (9) of section 112(r) and section 114 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r) and 7414).

(b) **PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary and the Administrator shall establish a program to conduct regular inspections of stationary sources, and shall prioritize inspection of stationary sources that are within a high priority category designated under section 5(a).

(2) **TYPES OF INSPECTION.**—The program established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) include inspections without notice and inspections with notice; and

(B) require that not fewer than 25 percent of inspections under the program shall be without notice.

(c) **RECEIPT OF NOTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When providing notice to the owner or operator of a stationary source of an inspection or investigation under this Act, the Secretary or the Administrator (or a designee of the Secretary or the Administrator) shall instruct the owner or operator of the stationary source to, immediately upon receipt of the notification—

(A) post a notice, or a copy of any notice provided by the Secretary or the Administrator (or a designee of the Secretary or the Administrator), indicating that there will be an inspection or investigation, which shall be conspicuously displayed in the area of the stationary source subject to the inspection or investigation; and

(B) provide a copy of the notice posted under subparagraph (A) to an employee representative at the stationary source, if any.

(2) **EXPLANATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary or the Administrator (or a designee of the Secretary or the Administrator) provides a written explanation of the purpose, scope, procedures, progress, or outcome of an inspection or investigation under this Act to the owner or operator of a stationary source, any employee of that stationary source shall be entitled to view a copy of the written explanation.

(B) **INSTRUCTIONS.**—The Secretary or the Administrator (or a designee of the Secretary or the Administrator) shall instruct the owner or operator of a stationary source receiving a written explanation described in subparagraph (A) to, not later than 24 hours after receiving the written explanation—

(i) conspicuously display the written explanation in the area subject to the inspection or investigation; and

(ii) provide a copy of the written explanation to an employee representative at the stationary source, if any.

(d) **PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **PARTICIPATION BY EMPLOYEES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An official conducting an inspection or investigation of a stationary source under this Act shall instruct the owner or operator of the stationary source to afford the opportunity to participate in the inspection or investigation, and to accompany the official during the inspection or investigation to—

(i) an employee who works in, or is familiar with, the portion of the facility being inspected or investigated; and

(ii) an employee representative of the employees of the stationary source, if applicable.

(B) **ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), an official described in subparagraph (A) may, if the official determines that doing so will aid in the inspection or investigation by the official, permit any additional employee representative of the em-

ployees of the stationary source or any additional employee to accompany the official, including permitting a different employee, employee representative, or representative of the owner or operator of the stationary source to accompany the official during different phases of the inspection or investigation.

(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—Clause (i) shall not apply to portions of an inspection or investigation in which an official described in subparagraph (A) is exclusively examining written records.

(C) **MEETINGS.**—If the official described in subparagraph (A) conducts a meeting with the management of a stationary source to explain the purpose, scope, procedures, progress, or outcome of an inspection or investigation under this Act, the official shall instruct the owner or operator of the stationary source to invite to the meeting any employee and employee representative that participated in the inspection or investigation. If the official determines it is necessary, the official shall arrange and conduct a separate meeting with any employee and employee representative that participated in the inspection or investigation.

(2) **EXCLUSION OF INDIVIDUALS.**—An official conducting an inspection or investigation of a stationary source under this Act may prohibit any individual whose conduct interferes with a fair and orderly inspection or investigation from accompanying the official on the inspection or investigation.

(3) **INTERVIEWS.**—An official conducting an inspection or investigation of a stationary source under this Act may—

(A) interview any person at the stationary source that the official determines is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act; and

(B) conduct any interview under subparagraph (A) outside the presence of the owner or operator, manager, or other personnel of the stationary source, if determined to be appropriate by the official.

(4) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—In the case of a stationary source that contains classified information, only persons who are authorized to have access to such information may accompany an official conducting an inspection or investigation of a stationary source under this Act in areas of the stationary source in which such information is located.

(e) **RECORDKEEPING.**—The owner or operator of a stationary source that is required to submit a report under section 5(c)(2) shall maintain on the premises of the stationary source a current copy of the report for the stationary source and any such report previously submitted.

**SEC. 10. ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) **COMPLIANCE ORDERS.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, after the date that is 30 days after the date described in subparagraph (B), a stationary source is not in compliance with this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may issue an order directing compliance by the owner or operator of the stationary source.

(B) **DATE.**—The date described in this subparagraph is—

(i) the date on which the Secretary provides notice to a stationary source that the stationary source is not in compliance with this Act; or

(ii) if the failure to comply with this Act relates to a report submitted under section 5(c)(2), the later of the date on which the Secretary first provides assistance, or a stationary source receives notice, under section 6(d)(2).

(2) **NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.**—An order under paragraph (1) may be issued only after notice and opportunity for a hearing.

## (b) PENALTIES.—

(1) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any owner or operator of a stationary source that is within a high priority category designated under section 5(a) that violates, or fails to comply with, any order under subsection (a) may, in an action brought in a United States district court, be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$50,000 for each day in which the violation occurs or the failure to comply continues.

(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Any owner or operator of a stationary source that is within a high priority category designated under section 5(a) that knowingly violates, or fails to comply with, any order under subsection (a) shall—

(A) in the case of a first violation or failure to comply, be fined not less than \$5,000 nor more than \$50,000 per day of violation or failure to comply, imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both; and

(B) in the case of a subsequent violation or failure to comply, be fined not less than \$10,000 nor more than \$50,000 per day of violation or failure to comply, imprisoned for not more than 4 years, or both.

## (3) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES.—

(A) PENALTY ORDERS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may impose an administrative penalty order of not more than \$50,000 per day, and not more than a maximum of \$2,000,000 per year, for failure to comply with an order or directive issued by the Secretary under subsection (a).

(B) NOTICE AND HEARING.—Before issuing an order described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the person against which the penalty is to be assessed—

(i) written notice of the proposed order; and

(ii) the opportunity to request, not later than 30 days after the date on which the notice is received by the person, a hearing on the proposed order.

## (c) ABATEMENT ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, in consultation with local law enforcement officials, determines that the threat of a terrorist attack exists that warrants additional measures to prevent or reduce the possibility of releasing a substance of concern at 1 or more stationary sources, the Secretary shall notify each such stationary source of the elevated threat.

(2) INSUFFICIENT RESPONSE.—If the Secretary determines that a stationary source has not taken appropriate action in response to a notification under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the stationary source, the Administrator, and the Attorney General that actions taken by the stationary source in response to the notification are insufficient.

## (3) RELIEF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary makes a notification under paragraph (2), the Secretary or the Attorney General may secure such relief as is necessary to abate a threat described in paragraph (1), including an order directing the stationary source to cease operation and such other orders as are necessary to protect public health or welfare.

(B) JURISDICTION.—The United States district court for the district in which a threat described in paragraph (1) occurs shall have jurisdiction to grant such relief as the Secretary or Attorney General requests under subparagraph (A).

**SEC. 11. PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.**

(a) DISCLOSURE EXEMPTION.—Except with respect to certifications under section 6(b), orders issued under section 10(a), and best practices established under section 13(4), all documents provided to the Secretary under this Act, and all information that describes a specific vulnerability at a specific sta-

tionary source derived from those documents, shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no State or local government agency shall be required to disclose any documents provided by a stationary source under this Act, or any information that describes a specific vulnerability at a specific stationary source derived from those documents, except with respect to certifications under section 6(b), orders issued under section 10(a), and best practices established under section 13(4).

## (c) DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOCOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall develop such protocols as are necessary to protect the documents described in subsection (a), including the reports submitted under section 5(c)(2) and the information contained in those reports, from unauthorized disclosure.

(2) DEADLINE.—As soon as is practicable, but not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the development of protocols under paragraph (1) and shall ensure that the protocols are in effect before the date on which the Administrator receives any report under this Act.

(d) OTHER OBLIGATIONS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the handling, treatment, or disclosure of information obtained from a stationary source under any other law;

(2) any obligation of the owner or operator of a stationary source to submit or make available information to a Federal, State, or local government agency under, or otherwise to comply with, any other law; or

(3) the public disclosure of information derived from documents or information described in subsection (a), so long as the information disclosed—

(A) would not divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets in accordance with the purposes of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code;

(B) does not identify any particular stationary source; and

(C) is not reasonably likely to increase the probability or consequences of a criminal release.

**SEC. 12. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal agencies and State and local government officials (including local law enforcement and first responders), shall promulgate regulations requiring stationary sources within high priority categories to participate in emergency preparedness exercises, including “table top” exercises, training, drills (including evacuation drills), and other activities determined to be appropriate by the Secretary and Administrator.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary and Administrator shall structure the emergency preparedness exercises under subsection (a), including the contents and frequency of the exercises, based on the threat posed to the public by a criminal release at a stationary source.

**SEC. 13. ASSISTANCE TO STATIONARY SOURCES.**

The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish an information clearinghouse to assist stationary sources in complying with this Act that includes scalable best practices for—

(1) using methodologies for the assessment of vulnerabilities, threats, and inherently safer technology;

(2) developing prevention preparedness and response plans;

(3) coordinating with local law enforcement, first responders, and duly recognized collective bargaining representatives at stationary sources, or, in the absence of such a representative, other appropriate personnel;

(4) implementing inherently safer technologies, including descriptions of—

(A) combinations of covered sources and substances of concern for which the inherently safer technologies could be appropriate;

(B) the scope of current use and availability of the technologies;

(C) the costs and cost savings resulting from inherently safer technologies;

(D) technological transfer and business practices that enable or encourage inherently safer technologies; and

(E) such other information as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

**SEC. 14. PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS.**

(a) DISCRIMINATION AGAINST EMPLOYEE.—No employer may discharge any employee or otherwise discriminate against any employee with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because the employee (or any person acting pursuant to a request of the employee)—

(1) notified the employer, the Department of Homeland Security, or any other appropriate agency of Federal, State, or local government of an alleged violation of this Act or of a threat to the health or safety of the public relating to chemical security or the improper release of any harmful chemical;

(2) refused to engage in any practice made unlawful by this Act, if the employee has identified the alleged illegality to the employer;

(3) testified before Congress or at any Federal or State proceeding regarding any provision of this Act or of a threat to the health or safety of the public relating to chemical security or the improper release of any harmful chemical;

(4) commenced, caused to be commenced, or intends to commence or cause to be commenced a proceeding under this Act, or a proceeding for the administration or enforcement of any requirement imposed under this Act;

(5) testified or intends to testify in any proceeding described in paragraph (4); or

(6) assisted or participated or intends to assist or participate in any manner in a proceeding described in paragraph (4) or in any other action to carry out the purposes of this Act.

## (b) COMPLAINT, FILING, AND NOTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (g), any employee who believes that such employee has been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of subsection (a) may, not later than 180 days after the date on which the violation occurred, file (or have any person file on behalf of such employee) a complaint with the Secretary of Labor alleging such discharge or discrimination. Upon receipt of such a complaint, the Secretary of Labor shall notify the Secretary and the person named in the complaint of the filing of the complaint.

## (2) INVESTIGATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a complaint under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall conduct an investigation of the violation alleged in the complaint.

(B) COMPLETION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Labor receives a complaint under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall—

(i) complete the investigation under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) notify the complainant (and any person acting on behalf of the complainant) and the

person alleged to have committed the violation, in writing, of the results of the investigation.

(C) ORDER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of Labor receives a complaint under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall issue an order that provides the relief prescribed by paragraph (3) or denies the complaint.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply to a proceeding on a complaint described in clause (i) that is terminated by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of a settlement entered into by the Secretary of Labor and the person alleged to have committed the violation of this section. The Secretary of Labor may not enter into a settlement terminating a proceeding on a complaint without the participation and consent of the complainant.

(iii) PROCEDURE.—An order of the Secretary of Labor under this subparagraph shall be made on the record after notice and opportunity for public hearing. Upon the conclusion of the hearing and the issuance of a recommended decision that the complaint has merit, the Secretary of Labor shall issue a preliminary order providing the relief prescribed in paragraph (3), but may not order compensatory damages, pending a final order.

(3) RELIEF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of Labor determines that a violation of subsection (a) alleged in a complaint under paragraph (1) of this subsection has occurred, the Secretary of Labor shall order the person who committed the violation to—

(i) take affirmative action to abate the violation; and

(ii) reinstate the complainant to the former position of such complainant, together with the compensation (including back pay), terms, conditions, and privileges of the employment of such complainant.

(B) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—If the Secretary of Labor determines that a violation of subsection (a) alleged in a complaint under paragraph (1) of this subsection has occurred, the Secretary of Labor may order the person who committed the violation to provide compensatory damages to the complainant.

(C) COSTS AND EXPENSES.—If an order is issued under this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor, at the request of the complainant, shall assess against the person against whom the order is issued a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all costs and expenses (including attorneys' and expert witness fees) reasonably incurred by the complainant for, or in connection with, the bringing of the complaint upon which the order was issued, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

(D) REQUIRED FINDING.—The Secretary of Labor may determine that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred only if the complainant has demonstrated that any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) was a contributing factor in the unfavorable personnel action alleged in the complaint.

(c) DISMISSAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall dismiss a complaint filed under subsection (b)(1), and shall not conduct the investigation required under subsection (b)(2), if the complainant has failed to make a prima facie showing that any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) was a contributing factor in the unfavorable personnel action alleged in the complaint.

(2) OTHER BASIS FOR ACTION.—Notwithstanding a finding by the Secretary of Labor that the complainant has made the showing

required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall dismiss a complaint filed under subsection (b)(1), and shall not conduct the investigation required under subsection (b)(2), if the employer demonstrates, by clear and convincing evidence, that the employer would have taken the same unfavorable personnel action in the absence of the conduct described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) DISTRICT COURT REVIEW.—If, by the date that is 1 year after the date on which a complaint was filed under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final decision regarding the complaint and there is no showing that the delay is due to the bad faith of the complainant, the complainant may bring an action at law or equity for de novo review in an appropriate United States district court, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

(e) REVIEW BY COURT OF APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person adversely affected or aggrieved by an order issued under subsection (b) or (c) may obtain review of the order in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the violation alleged in the complaint occurred.

(2) TIMING.—A petition for review under paragraph (1) shall be filed not later than 60 days after the date on which the order described in paragraph (1) is issued.

(3) PROCEDURES.—The procedures under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code shall apply to any review under this subsection.

(4) STAYS.—Unless ordered by the court, the commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not operate as a stay of the order of the Secretary of Labor.

(5) EXCLUSIVITY.—An order of the Secretary of Labor with respect to which review could have been obtained under paragraph (1) shall not be the subject of judicial review in any criminal or other civil proceeding.

(f) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a person has failed to comply with an order issued under subsection (b)(2)(C), the Secretary of Labor may file a civil action in the United States district court for the district in which the violation occurred to enforce the order.

(B) SCOPE OF RELIEF.—In an action brought under this paragraph, the United States district court may grant all appropriate relief, including injunctive relief, compensatory and exemplary damages.

(2) OTHER ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than the date that is 90 days after an order was issued under subsection (b)(2)(C), any person on whose behalf the order was issued may commence a civil action against the person to whom the order was issued in any appropriate United States district court to require compliance with the order.

(B) JURISDICTION.—The United States district court shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce an order described in subparagraph (A).

(C) SCOPE OF RELIEF.—In an action brought under this paragraph, the United States district court may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees).

(3) MANDAMUS.—Any nondiscretionary duty imposed under this section shall be enforceable in a mandamus proceeding under section 1361 of title 28, United States Code.

(g) DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS.—Subsection (b)(1) shall not apply with respect to any employee who, acting without direction from the employer of such employee, deliberately causes a violation of any requirement of this Act.

(h) NONPREEMPTION.—Nothing in this section expands, preempts, diminishes, or other-

wise affects any right otherwise available to an employee under Federal, State, or local law or any collective bargaining agreement to redress the discharge of such employee or other discriminatory action taken by the employer against such employee.

(i) WHISTLEBLOWER INFORMATION.—

(1) DHS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall establish and publicize information regarding mechanisms (including a hotline and a website) through which any person (including an employee, individual residing near a stationary source, first responder, and local official) may report an alleged violation of this Act, a threat to the health or safety of the public relating to chemical security or the improper release of any harmful chemical, or other such information.

(2) POSTING REQUIREMENT.—The provisions of this section shall be prominently posted in any place of employment to which this Act applies.

(j) INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not delay taking appropriate action with respect to an allegation of a substantial safety hazard on the basis of—

(A) the filing of a complaint under subsection (b)(1) arising from the allegation; or

(B) any investigation by the Secretary of Labor, or other action, under this subsection in response to a complaint under subsection (b)(1).

(2) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—A determination by the Secretary of Labor under this section that a violation of subsection (a) has not occurred shall not be considered by the Secretary in determining whether a substantial safety hazard exists.

**SEC. 15. REGULATIONS.**

(a) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING LAW.—In promulgating regulations and establishing enforcement procedures under this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall, to the extent practicable and to the extent such requirements meet or exceed the requirements of this Act, minimize duplication of the requirements for risk assessments and response plans under chapter 701 of title 46, United States Code (commonly known as "the Maritime Transportation Security Act"), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), and other Federal law.

(b) PROMULGATION OF ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS.—In addition to any regulations required under this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

**SEC. 16. NO EFFECT ON REQUIREMENTS UNDER OTHER LAW OR AGREEMENTS.**

Nothing in this Act affects any duty or other requirement imposed under any other Federal, State, or local law or any collective bargaining agreement.

**SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and the Administrator such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, to remain available until expended.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator LAUTENBERG, who has been a leader on chemical plant security for more than 20 years. He first introduced chemical safety legislation in 1985 and is an expert on the issue. I am proud to join him in introducing this bill.

The dangers that chemical plants present to our homeland security have been well documented. Industrial chemicals, such as chlorine, ammonia, phosgene, methyl bromide, hydrochloric and various other acids are routinely stored near cities in multi-ton

quantities. These chemicals are extremely hazardous and identical to those used as weapons during the First World War.

Today, there are 111 facilities in the country where a catastrophic chemical release could threaten more than 1 million people. These plants represent some of the most attractive targets for terrorists looking to cause widespread death and destruction.

Despite this, security at our chemical plants is voluntary—left to the individual plant owners. While many chemical plant owners have taken steps to beef up security, too many have not. In Illinois, there have been recent reports by ABC-7 in Chicago of chemical plants with dilapidated fences, insufficient guard forces, and unprotected tanks of hazardous chemicals. These plants are basically stationary weapons of mass destruction. Their security is light, their facilities are easily entered, and their contents are deadly.

Nearly five years after September 11, the Federal Government has done virtually nothing to secure chemical plants. It is one of the great failures of this administration that needs to be addressed this year.

The Lautenberg-Obama bill is a huge step forward. It protects our communities in a responsible, but balanced way. There are features of this bill that should be a part of any chemical security legislation passed by this Congress.

Our legislation is risk-based. While all chemical facilities would have to take a number of concrete steps to improve security, only the highest-risk facilities would be subject to bill's strictest scrutiny and regulation by the Department of Homeland Security. These high-priority facilities would have to perform vulnerability assessments, develop prevention and response plans, submit to unscheduled inspections, and perform practice drills.

Our legislation is strict, but fair. Our bill replaces volunteer security standards with clearly defined Federal duties and regulations. While plant owners would not be able to substitute their own security standards, they would be able to come up with security plans that are tailored to each facility. And while the bill includes tough penalties for noncompliant facilities including strict fines and the threat of shutting down plants, it also minimizes duplicative requirements under other Federal laws.

The Lautenberg-Obama bill also protects state and local rights to establish security standards that match their local needs. States like New Jersey have been leaders in chemical security, and we do not want to cut these efforts off at the knees. The legislation also gives employees a seat at the table, by creating employee security committees, ensuring that employees are part of the security planning process, establishing security training requirements, and establishing tough whistleblower protections.

Our bill also includes all the methods to reduce risk. Our legislation requires security forces, perimeter defenses, hazard mitigation and emergency response. These are the "guns, gates and guards" that prevent terrorists from attacking plants and minimize the impact of an attack. But there are other ways to reduce risk that need to be part of the equation. Specifically, by employing safer technologies, we can reduce the attractiveness of chemical plants as a target.

This concept, known as Inherently Safer Technology, involves methods such as changing the flow of chemical processes to avoid dangerous chemical byproducts, reducing the pressures or temperatures of chemical reactions to minimize the risk of explosions, reducing inventories of dangerous chemicals and replacing dangerous chemicals with benign ones. Each one of these methods reduces the danger that chemical plants pose to our communities and makes them less appealing targets for terrorists.

The concept of IST was created thirty years ago by chemical industry insiders, and it has been embraced at different times by the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the Environmental Protection Agency, foreign governments and states like New Jersey. Even the chemical industry itself has embraced IST, and many facilities across the country have already employed safer technologies.

Unfortunately, the chemical industry has been lobbying nonstop on this bill. They do not want IST, they do not want protection of state laws and they do not want strict regulations. So far, because the industry wields so much influence in Washington, it's been getting its way. For example, the Department of Homeland Security initially embraced the concept of Inherently Safer Technology in a 2004 draft chemical security plan, only to reverse itself after heavy industry lobbying in 2006. Secretary Chertoff's announcement last week, in front of an audience of chemical industry executives, very closely tracked the industry's talking points.

This is wrong. We cannot allow chemical industry lobbyists to dictate the terms of this debate. We cannot allow our security to be hijacked by corporate interests.

Senator LAUTENBERG and I will fight for strong legislation to pass the Senate. We believe that we can work with chemical plants so that new safety regulations are implemented in a way that is flexible enough for the industry yet stringent enough to protect the American people. I urge my colleagues to come together to pass meaningful security legislation this year.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—EX-PRESSING THE CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE SENATE TO THE JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS (JROTC), AND COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF THAT VITAL PROGRAM AS IT CARRIES OUT ITS MISSION OF INSTILLING THE VALUES OF CITIZENSHIP AND SERVICE IN THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF THE YOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. ENSIGN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 415

Whereas, since its inception in 1913, the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps has successfully functioned for over 90 years;

Whereas the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps has provided citizenship training, discipline, stability, and patriotic values to the youth of the United States throughout the Nation;

Whereas millions of students have benefited from the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

Whereas, in 2005, there were over 500,000 students enrolled in Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs in approximately 3,400 secondary schools; and

Whereas the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is taught by a dedicated cadre of retired officers and staff non-commissioned officers of the Armed Forces who love the United States and who are working to secure its future: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) expresses appreciation to the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps for—

(A) the leadership training that the program provides to the youth of the United States; and

(B) the outstanding results that the program has achieved;

(2) commends the professionalism and dedication displayed daily by the retired members of the United States Armed Forces who serve as instructors in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

(3) proudly honors the modern-day members of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who represent a promising group of young men and women who continue to strive to achieve their full potential.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3191. Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes.

SA 3192. Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, *supra*.

SA 3193. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. FRIST, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, *supra*.

SA 3194. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3195. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3196. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3197. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3198. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3199. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3200. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3201. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3202. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3203. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3204. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3205. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3206. Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3207. Mr. CORNYN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3206 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) to the amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3208. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3209. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3210. Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 sub-

mitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3211. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3212. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3213. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3191.** Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEATHS AT UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER.**

(a) COLLECTION OF STATISTICS.—The Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall collect statistics relating to deaths occurring at the border between the United States and Mexico, including—

- (1) the causes of the deaths; and
- (2) the total number of deaths.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Secretary a report that—

- (1) analyzes trends with respect to the statistics collected under subsection (a) during the preceding year; and
- (2) recommends actions to reduce the deaths described in subsection (a).

**SA 3192.** Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Reference to the Immigration and Nationality Act.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Severability.

**TITLE I—BORDER ENFORCEMENT**

**Subtitle A—Assets for Controlling United States Borders**

- Sec. 101. Enforcement personnel.
- Sec. 102. Technological assets.
- Sec. 103. Infrastructure.
- Sec. 104. Border patrol checkpoints.

- Sec. 105. Ports of entry.
- Sec. 106. Construction of strategic border fencing and vehicle barriers.

**Subtitle B—Border Security Plans, Strategies, and Reports**

- Sec. 111. Surveillance plan.
- Sec. 112. National Strategy for Border Security.
- Sec. 113. Reports on improving the exchange of information on North American security.
- Sec. 114. Improving the security of Mexico’s southern border.
- Sec. 115. Combating human smuggling.

**Subtitle C—Other Border Security Initiatives**

- Sec. 121. Biometric data enhancements.
- Sec. 122. Secure communication.
- Sec. 123. Border patrol training capacity review.
- Sec. 124. US-VISIT System.
- Sec. 125. Document fraud detection.
- Sec. 126. Improved document integrity.
- Sec. 127. Cancellation of visas.
- Sec. 128. Biometric entry-exit system.
- Sec. 129. Border study.
- Sec. 130. Secure border initiative financial accountability.
- Sec. 131. Mandatory detention for aliens apprehended at or between ports of entry.
- Sec. 132. Evasion of inspection or violation of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements.

**Subtitle D—Border Tunnel Prevention Act**

- Sec. 141. Short title.
- Sec. 142. Construction of border tunnel or passage.
- Sec. 143. Directive to the United States Sentencing Commission.

**TITLE II—INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT**

- Sec. 201. Removal and denial of benefits to terrorist aliens.
- Sec. 202. Detention and removal of aliens ordered removed.
- Sec. 203. Aggravated felony.
- Sec. 204. Terrorist bars.
- Sec. 205. Increased criminal penalties related to gang violence, removal, and alien smuggling.
- Sec. 206. Illegal entry.
- Sec. 207. Illegal reentry.
- Sec. 208. Reform of passport, visa, and immigration fraud offenses.
- Sec. 209. Inadmissibility and removal for passport and immigration fraud offenses.
- Sec. 210. Incarceration of criminal aliens.
- Sec. 211. Encouraging aliens to depart voluntarily.
- Sec. 212. Deterring aliens ordered removed from remaining in the United States unlawfully.
- Sec. 213. Prohibition of the sale of firearms to, or the possession of firearms by certain aliens.
- Sec. 214. Uniform statute of limitations for certain immigration, naturalization, and peonage offenses.
- Sec. 215. Diplomatic security service.
- Sec. 216. Field agent allocation and background checks.
- Sec. 217. Construction.
- Sec. 218. State criminal alien assistance program.
- Sec. 219. Transportation and processing of illegal aliens apprehended by State and local law enforcement officers.
- Sec. 220. Reducing illegal immigration and alien smuggling on tribal lands.
- Sec. 221. Alternatives to detention.
- Sec. 222. Conforming amendment.
- Sec. 223. Reporting requirements.
- Sec. 224. State and local enforcement of Federal immigration laws.



- Sec. 225. Removal of drunk drivers.  
 Sec. 226. Medical services in underserved areas.  
 Sec. 227. Expedited removal.  
 Sec. 228. Protecting immigrants from convicted sex offenders.  
 Sec. 229. Law enforcement authority of States and political subdivisions and transfer to Federal custody.  
 Sec. 230. Laundering of monetary instruments.  
 Sec. 231. Listing of immigration violators in the National Crime Information Center database.  
 Sec. 232. Cooperative enforcement programs.  
 Sec. 233. Increase of Federal detention space and the utilization of facilities identified for closures as a result of the Defense Base Closure Realignment Act of 1990.  
 Sec. 234. Determination of immigration status of individuals charged with Federal offenses.

#### TITLE III—UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS

- Sec. 301. Unlawful employment of aliens.  
 Sec. 302. Employer Compliance Fund.  
 Sec. 303. Additional worksite enforcement and fraud detection agents.  
 Sec. 304. Clarification of ineligibility for misrepresentation.

#### TITLE IV—NONIMMIGRANT AND IMMIGRANT VISA REFORM

##### Subtitle A—Temporary Guest Workers

- Sec. 401. Immigration impact study.  
 Sec. 402. Nonimmigrant temporary worker.  
 Sec. 403. Admission of nonimmigrant temporary guest workers.  
 Sec. 404. Employer obligations.  
 Sec. 405. Alien employment management system.  
 Sec. 406. Rulemaking; effective date.  
 Sec. 407. Recruitment of United States workers.  
 Sec. 408. Temporary guest worker visa program task force.  
 Sec. 409. Requirements for participating countries.  
 Sec. 410. S visas.  
 Sec. 411. L visa limitations.  
 Sec. 412. Authorization of appropriations.  
 Subtitle B—Immigration Injunction Reform  
 Sec. 421. Short title.  
 Sec. 422. Appropriate remedies for immigration legislation.  
 Sec. 423. Effective date.

##### TITLE V—BACKLOG REDUCTION

- Sec. 501. Elimination of existing backlogs.  
 Sec. 502. Country limits.  
 Sec. 503. Allocation of immigrant visas.  
 Sec. 504. Relief for minor children.  
 Sec. 505. Shortage occupations.  
 Sec. 506. Relief for widows and orphans.  
 Sec. 507. Student visas.  
 Sec. 508. Visas for individuals with advanced degrees.

#### TITLE VI—WORK AUTHORIZATION AND LEGALIZATION OF UNDOCUMENTED INDIVIDUALS

##### Subtitle A—Conditional Nonimmigrant Workers

- Sec. 601. 218D conditional nonimmigrants.  
 Sec. 602. Adjustment of status for section 218D conditional nonimmigrants.  
 Sec. 603. Aliens not subject to direct numerical limitations.  
 Sec. 604. Employer protections.  
 Sec. 605. Limitation on adjustment of status for aliens granted conditional nonimmigrant work authorization.  
 Sec. 606. Authorization of appropriations.  
 Subtitle B—Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security  
 Sec. 611. Short title.  
 Sec. 612. Definitions.

#### CHAPTER 1—PILOT PROGRAM FOR EARNED STATUS ADJUSTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

- Sec. 613. Agricultural workers.  
 Sec. 614. Correction of Social Security records.

#### CHAPTER 2—REFORM OF H-2A WORKER PROGRAM

- Sec. 615. Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

#### CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 616. Determination and use of user fees.  
 Sec. 617. Regulations.  
 Sec. 618. Report to Congress.  
 Sec. 619. Effective date.

##### Subtitle C—DREAM Act

- Sec. 621. Short title.  
 Sec. 622. Definitions.  
 Sec. 623. Restoration of State option to determine residency for purposes of higher education benefits.  
 Sec. 624. Cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.  
 Sec. 625. Conditional permanent resident status.  
 Sec. 626. Retroactive benefits.  
 Sec. 627. Exclusive jurisdiction.  
 Sec. 628. Penalties for false statements in application.  
 Sec. 629. Confidentiality of information.  
 Sec. 630. Expedited processing of applications; prohibition on fees.  
 Sec. 631. Higher Education assistance.  
 Sec. 632. GAO report.

##### Subtitle D—Grant Programs to Assist Nonimmigrant Workers

- Sec. 641. Grants to support public education and community training.  
 Sec. 642. Funding for the Office of Citizenship.  
 Sec. 643. Civics integration grant program.

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCE TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

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 a section or other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

#### SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid for any reason, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of such to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected by such holding.

#### TITLE I—BORDER ENFORCEMENT

##### Subtitle A—Assets for Controlling United States Borders

#### SEC. 101. ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

(a) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—

(1) PORT OF ENTRY INSPECTORS.—In each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011, the Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, increase by not less than 500 the number of positions for full-time active duty port of entry inspectors and provide appropriate training, equipment, and support to such additional inspectors.

(2) INVESTIGATIVE PERSONNEL.—

(A) IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATORS.—Section 5203 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3734) is amended by striking “800” and inserting “1000”.

(B) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—In addition to the positions authorized under section 5203 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, as amended by subparagraph (A), during each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011, the Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, increase by not less than 200 the number of positions for personnel within the Department assigned to investigate alien smuggling.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) PORT OF ENTRY INSPECTORS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

(2) BORDER PATROL AGENTS.—Section 5202 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (118 Stat. 3734) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 5202. INCREASE IN FULL-TIME BORDER PATROL AGENTS.**

“(a) ANNUAL INCREASES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, increase the number of positions for full-time active-duty border patrol agents within the Department of Homeland Security (above the number of such positions for which funds were appropriated for the preceding fiscal year), by—

- “(1) 2,000 in fiscal year 2006;
- “(2) 2,400 in fiscal year 2007;
- “(3) 2,400 in fiscal year 2008;
- “(4) 2,400 in fiscal year 2009;
- “(5) 2,400 in fiscal year 2010; and
- “(6) 2,400 in fiscal year 2011;

“(b) NORTHERN BORDER.—In each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2011, in addition to the border patrol agents assigned along the northern border of the United States during the previous fiscal year, the Secretary shall assign a number of border patrol agents equal to not less than 20 percent of the net increase in border patrol agents during each such fiscal year.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.”.

#### SEC. 102. TECHNOLOGICAL ASSETS.

(a) ACQUISITION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall procure additional unmanned aerial vehicles, cameras, poles, sensors, and other technologies necessary to achieve operational control of the international borders of the United States and to establish a security perimeter known as a “virtual fence” along such international borders to provide a barrier to illegal immigration.

(b) INCREASED AVAILABILITY OF EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a plan to use authorities provided to the Secretary of Defense under chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the availability and use of Department of Defense equipment, including unmanned aerial vehicles, tethered aerostat radars, and other surveillance equipment, to assist the Secretary in carrying out surveillance activities conducted at or near the international land borders of the United States to prevent illegal immigration.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) a description of the current use of Department of Defense equipment to assist the Secretary in carrying out surveillance of the international land borders of the United States and assessment of the risks to citizens of the United States and foreign policy interests associated with the use of such equipment;

(2) the plan developed under subsection (b) to increase the use of Department of Defense equipment to assist such surveillance activities; and

(3) a description of the types of equipment and other support to be provided by the Secretary of Defense under such plan during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the submission of the report.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out subsection (a).

(e) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as altering or amending the prohibition on the use of any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus under section 1385 of title 18, United States Code.

#### **SEC. 103. INFRASTRUCTURE.**

(a) **CONSTRUCTION OF BORDER CONTROL FACILITIES.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall construct all-weather roads and acquire additional vehicle barriers and facilities necessary to achieve operational control of the international borders of the United States.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out subsection (a).

#### **SEC. 104. BORDER PATROL CHECKPOINTS.**

The Secretary may maintain temporary or permanent checkpoints on roadways in border patrol sectors that are located in proximity to the international border between the United States and Mexico.

#### **SEC. 105. PORTS OF ENTRY.**

The Secretary is authorized to—

(1) construct additional ports of entry along the international land borders of the United States, at locations to be determined by the Secretary; and

(2) make necessary improvements to the ports of entry in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 106. CONSTRUCTION OF STRATEGIC BORDER FENCING AND VEHICLE BARRIERS.**

(a) **TUCSON SECTOR.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) replace all aged, deteriorating, or damaged primary fencing in the Tucson Sector located proximate to population centers in Douglas, Nogales, Naco, and Lukeville, Arizona with double- or triple-layered fencing running parallel to the international border between the United States and Mexico;

(2) extend the double- or triple-layered fencing for a distance of not less than 2 miles beyond urban areas, except that the double- or triple-layered fence shall extend west of Naco, Arizona, for a distance of 10 miles; and

(3) construct not less than 150 miles of vehicle barriers and all-weather roads in the Tucson Sector running parallel to the international border between the United States and Mexico in areas that are known transit points for illegal cross-border traffic.

(b) **YUMA SECTOR.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) replace all aged, deteriorating, or damaged primary fencing in the Yuma Sector located proximate to population centers in Yuma, Somerton, and San Luis, Arizona with double- or triple-layered fencing running parallel to the international border between the United States and Mexico;

(2) extend the double- or triple-layered fencing for a distance of not less than 2 miles beyond urban areas in the Yuma Sector.

(3) construct not less than 50 miles of vehicle barriers and all-weather roads in the Yuma Sector running parallel to the international border between the United States and Mexico in areas that are known transit points for illegal cross-border traffic.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall immediately commence construction of the fencing, barriers, and roads described in subsections (a) and (b), and shall complete such construction not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that describes the progress that has been made in constructing the fencing, barriers, and roads described in subsections (a) and (b).

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

#### **Subtitle B—Border Security Plans, Strategies, and Reports**

#### **SEC. 111. SURVEILLANCE PLAN.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.**—The Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of existing technologies employed on the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(2) A description of the compatibility of new surveillance technologies with surveillance technologies in use by the Secretary on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) A description of how the Commissioner of the United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department is working, or is expected to work, with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department to identify and test surveillance technology.

(4) A description of the specific surveillance technology to be deployed.

(5) Identification of any obstacles that may impede such deployment.

(6) A detailed estimate of all costs associated with such deployment and with continued maintenance of such technologies.

(7) A description of how the Secretary is working with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on safety and airspace control issues associated with the use of unmanned aerial vehicles.

(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the plan required by this section.

#### **SEC. 112. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR BORDER SECURITY.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall develop a National Strategy for Border Security that describes actions to be carried out to achieve operational control over all ports of entry into the United States and the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The National Strategy for Border Security shall include the following:

(1) The implementation schedule for the comprehensive plan for systematic surveillance described in section 111.

(2) An assessment of the threat posed by terrorists and terrorist groups that may try

to infiltrate the United States at locations along the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(3) A risk assessment for all United States ports of entry and all portions of the international land and maritime borders of the United States that includes a description of activities being undertaken—

(A) to prevent the entry of terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband into the United States; and

(B) to protect critical infrastructure at or near such ports of entry or borders.

(4) An assessment of the legal requirements that prevent achieving and maintaining operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(5) An assessment of the most appropriate, practical, and cost-effective means of defending the international land and maritime borders of the United States against threats to security and illegal transit, including intelligence capacities, technology, equipment, personnel, and training needed to address security vulnerabilities.

(6) An assessment of staffing needs for all border security functions, taking into account threat and vulnerability information pertaining to the borders and the impact of new security programs, policies, and technologies.

(7) A description of the border security roles and missions of Federal, State, regional, local, and tribal authorities, and recommendations regarding actions the Secretary can carry out to improve coordination with such authorities to enable border security and enforcement activities to be carried out in a more efficient and effective manner.

(8) An assessment of existing efforts and technologies used for border security and the effect of the use of such efforts and technologies on civil rights, personal property rights, privacy rights, and civil liberties, including an assessment of efforts to take into account asylum seekers, trafficking victims, unaccompanied minor aliens, and other vulnerable populations.

(9) A prioritized list of research and development objectives to enhance the security of the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(10) A description of ways to ensure that the free flow of travel and commerce is not diminished by efforts, activities, and programs aimed at securing the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(11) An assessment of additional detention facilities and beds that are needed to detain unlawful aliens apprehended at United States ports of entry or along the international land borders of the United States.

(12) A description of the performance metrics to be used to ensure accountability by the bureaus of the Department in implementing such Strategy.

(13) A schedule for the implementation of the security measures described in such Strategy, including a prioritization of security measures, realistic deadlines for addressing the security and enforcement needs, an estimate of the resources needed to carry out such measures, and a description of how such resources should be allocated.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing the National Strategy for Border Security, the Secretary shall consult with representatives of—

(1) State, local, and tribal authorities with responsibility for locations along the international land and maritime borders of the United States; and

(2) appropriate private sector entities, non-governmental organizations, and affected

communities that have expertise in areas related to border security.

(d) **COORDINATION.**—The National Strategy for Border Security shall be consistent with the National Strategy for Maritime Security developed pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 13, dated December 21, 2004.

(e) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **STRATEGY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the National Strategy for Border Security.

(2) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall submit to Congress any update of such Strategy that the Secretary determines is necessary, not later than 30 days after such update is developed.

(f) **IMMEDIATE ACTION.**—Nothing in this section or section 111 may be construed to relieve the Secretary of the responsibility to take all actions necessary and appropriate to achieve and maintain operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States.

**SEC. 113. REPORTS ON IMPROVING THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON NORTH AMERICAN SECURITY.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to Congress a report on improving the exchange of information related to the security of North America.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall contain a description of the following:

(1) **SECURITY CLEARANCES AND DOCUMENT INTEGRITY.**—The progress made toward the development of common enrollment, security, technical, and biometric standards for the issuance, authentication, validation, and repudiation of secure documents, including—

(A) technical and biometric standards based on best practices and consistent with international standards for the issuance, authentication, validation, and repudiation of travel documents, including—

- (i) passports;
- (ii) visas; and
- (iii) permanent resident cards;

(B) working with Canada and Mexico to encourage foreign governments to enact laws to combat alien smuggling and trafficking, and laws to forbid the use and manufacture of fraudulent travel documents and to promote information sharing;

(C) applying the necessary pressures and support to ensure that other countries meet proper travel document standards and are committed to travel document verification before the citizens of such countries travel internationally, including travel by such citizens to the United States; and

(D) providing technical assistance for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with visa and travel documents.

(2) **IMMIGRATION AND VISA MANAGEMENT.**—The progress of efforts to share information regarding high-risk individuals who may attempt to enter Canada, Mexico, or the United States, including the progress made—

(A) in implementing the Statement of Mutual Understanding on Information Sharing, signed by Canada and the United States in February 2003; and

(B) in identifying trends related to immigration fraud, including asylum and document fraud, and to analyze such trends.

(3) **VISA POLICY COORDINATION AND IMMIGRATION SECURITY.**—The progress made by Canada, Mexico, and the United States to enhance the security of North America by co-

operating on visa policy and identifying best practices regarding immigration security, including the progress made—

(A) in enhancing consultation among officials who issue visas at the consulates or embassies of Canada, Mexico, or the United States throughout the world to share information, trends, and best practices on visa flows;

(B) in comparing the procedures and policies of Canada and the United States related to visitor visa processing, including—

- (i) application process;
- (ii) interview policy;
- (iii) general screening procedures;
- (iv) visa validity;
- (v) quality control measures; and
- (vi) access to appeal or review;

(C) in exploring methods for Canada, Mexico, and the United States to waive visa requirements for nationals and citizens of the same foreign countries;

(D) in providing technical assistance for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with immigration violators;

(E) in developing and implementing an immigration security strategy for North America that works toward the development of a common security perimeter by enhancing technical assistance for programs and systems to support advance automated reporting and risk targeting of international passengers;

(F) in sharing information on lost and stolen passports on a real-time basis among immigration or law enforcement officials of Canada, Mexico, and the United States; and

(G) in collecting 10 fingerprints from each individual who applies for a visa.

(4) **NORTH AMERICAN VISITOR OVERSTAY PROGRAM.**—The progress made by Canada and the United States in implementing parallel entry-exit tracking systems that, while respecting the privacy laws of both countries, share information regarding third country nationals who have overstayed their period of authorized admission in either Canada or the United States.

(5) **TERRORIST WATCH LISTS.**—The progress made in enhancing the capacity of the United States to combat terrorism through the coordination of counterterrorism efforts, including the progress made—

(A) in developing and implementing bilateral agreements between Canada and the United States and between Mexico and the United States to govern the sharing of terrorist watch list data and to comprehensively enumerate the uses of such data by the governments of each country;

(B) in establishing appropriate linkages among Canada, Mexico, and the United States Terrorist Screening Center; and

(C) in exploring with foreign governments the establishment of a multilateral watch list mechanism that would facilitate direct coordination between the country that identifies an individual as an individual included on a watch list, and the country that owns such list, including procedures that satisfy the security concerns and are consistent with the privacy and other laws of each participating country.

(6) **MONEY LAUNDERING, CURRENCY SMUGGLING, AND ALIEN SMUGGLING.**—The progress made in improving information sharing and law enforcement cooperation in combating organized crime, including the progress made—

(A) in combating currency smuggling, money laundering, alien smuggling, and trafficking in alcohol, firearms, and explosives;

(B) in implementing the agreement between Canada and the United States known as the Firearms Trafficking Action Plan;

(C) in determining the feasibility of formulating a firearms trafficking action plan between Mexico and the United States;

(D) in developing a joint threat assessment on organized crime between Canada and the United States;

(E) in determining the feasibility of formulating a joint threat assessment on organized crime between Mexico and the United States;

(F) in developing mechanisms to exchange information on findings, seizures, and capture of individuals transporting undeclared currency; and

(G) in developing and implementing a plan to combat the transnational threat of illegal drug trafficking.

(7) **LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION.**—The progress made in enhancing law enforcement cooperation among Canada, Mexico, and the United States through enhanced technical assistance for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with known and suspected criminals or terrorists, including exploring the formation of law enforcement teams that include personnel from the United States and Mexico, and appropriate procedures for such teams.

**SEC. 114. IMPROVING THE SECURITY OF MEXICO'S SOUTHERN BORDER.**

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary, shall work to cooperate with the head of Foreign Affairs Canada and the appropriate officials of the Government of Mexico to establish a program—

(1) to assess the specific needs of Guatemala and Belize in maintaining the security of the international borders of such countries;

(2) to use the assessment made under paragraph (1) to determine the financial and technical support needed by Guatemala and Belize from Canada, Mexico, and the United States to meet such needs;

(3) to provide technical assistance to Guatemala and Belize to promote issuance of secure passports and travel documents by such countries; and

(4) to encourage Guatemala and Belize—

(A) to control alien smuggling and trafficking;

(B) to prevent the use and manufacture of fraudulent travel documents; and

(C) to share relevant information with Mexico, Canada, and the United States.

(b) **BORDER SECURITY FOR BELIZE, GUATEMALA, AND MEXICO.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall work to cooperate—

(1) with the appropriate officials of the Government of Guatemala and the Government of Belize to provide law enforcement assistance to Guatemala and Belize that specifically addresses immigration issues to increase the ability of the Government of Guatemala to dismantle human smuggling organizations and gain additional control over the international border between Guatemala and Belize; and

(2) with the appropriate officials of the Government of Belize, the Government of Guatemala, the Government of Mexico, and the governments of neighboring contiguous countries to establish a program to provide needed equipment, technical assistance, and vehicles to manage, regulate, and patrol the international borders between Mexico and Guatemala and between Mexico and Belize.

(c) **TRACKING CENTRAL AMERICAN GANGS.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall work to cooperate with the appropriate officials of the Government of Mexico, the Government of Guatemala, the Government of Belize, and the governments of other Central American countries—

(1) to assess the direct and indirect impact on the United States and Central America of deporting violent criminal aliens;

(2) to establish a program and database to track individuals involved in Central American gang activities;

(3) to develop a mechanism that is acceptable to the governments of Belize, Guatemala, Mexico, the United States, and other appropriate countries to notify such a government if an individual suspected of gang activity will be deported to that country prior to the deportation and to provide support for the reintegration of such deportees into that country; and

(4) to develop an agreement to share all relevant information related to individuals connected with Central American gangs.

(d) **LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.**—Any funds made available to carry out this section shall be subject to the limitations contained in section 551 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-102; 119 Stat. 2218).

#### **SEC. 115. COMBATING HUMAN SMUGGLING.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.**—The Secretary shall develop and implement a plan to improve coordination between the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection of the Department and any other Federal, State, local, or tribal authorities, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to improve coordination efforts to combat human smuggling.

(b) **CONTENT.**—In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the interoperability of databases utilized to prevent human smuggling;

(2) adequate and effective personnel training;

(3) methods and programs to effectively target networks that engage in such smuggling;

(4) effective utilization of—

(A) visas for victims of trafficking and other crimes; and

(B) investigatory techniques, equipment, and procedures that prevent, detect, and prosecute international money laundering and other operations that are utilized in smuggling;

(5) joint measures, with the Secretary of State, to enhance intelligence sharing and cooperation with foreign governments whose citizens are preyed on by human smugglers; and

(6) other measures that the Secretary considers appropriate to combating human smuggling.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after implementing the plan described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on such plan, including any recommendations for legislative action to improve efforts to combating human smuggling.

(d) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to provide additional authority to any State or local entity to enforce Federal immigration laws.

#### **Subtitle C—Other Border Security Initiatives**

##### **SEC. 121. BIOMETRIC DATA ENHANCEMENTS.**

Not later than October 1, 2007, the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation with the Attorney General, enhance connectivity between the Automated Biometric Fingerprint Identification System (IDENT) of the Department and the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure more expeditious data searches; and

(2) in consultation with the Secretary of State, collect all fingerprints from each

alien required to provide fingerprints during the alien's initial enrollment in the integrated entry and exit data system described in section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1365a).

##### **SEC. 122. SECURE COMMUNICATION.**

The Secretary shall, as expeditiously as practicable, develop and implement a plan to improve the use of satellite communications and other technologies to ensure clear and secure 2-way communication capabilities—

(1) among all Border Patrol agents conducting operations between ports of entry;

(2) between Border Patrol agents and their respective Border Patrol stations;

(3) between Border Patrol agents and residents in remote areas along the international land borders of the United States; and

(4) between all appropriate border security agencies of the Department and State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

##### **SEC. 123. BORDER PATROL TRAINING CAPACITY REVIEW.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the basic training provided to Border Patrol agents by the Secretary to ensure that such training is provided as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible.

(b) **COMPONENTS OF REVIEW.**—The review under subsection (a) shall include the following components:

(1) An evaluation of the length and content of the basic training curriculum provided to new Border Patrol agents by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including a description of how such curriculum has changed since September 11, 2001, and an evaluation of language and cultural diversity training programs provided within such curriculum.

(2) A review and a detailed breakdown of the costs incurred by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to train 1 new Border Patrol agent.

(3) A comparison, based on the review and breakdown under paragraph (2), of the costs, effectiveness, scope, and quality, including geographic characteristics, with other similar training programs provided by State and local agencies, nonprofit organizations, universities, and the private sector.

(4) An evaluation of whether utilizing comparable non-Federal training programs, proficiency testing, and long-distance learning programs may affect—

(A) the cost-effectiveness of increasing the number of Border Patrol agents trained per year;

(B) the per agent costs of basic training; and

(C) the scope and quality of basic training needed to fulfill the mission and duties of a Border Patrol agent.

##### **SEC. 124. US-VISIT SYSTEM.**

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to Congress a schedule for—

(1) equipping all land border ports of entry of the United States with the U.S.-Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) system implemented under section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1365a);

(2) developing and deploying at such ports of entry the exit component of the US-VISIT system; and

(3) making interoperable all immigration screening systems operated by the Secretary.

##### **SEC. 125. DOCUMENT FRAUD DETECTION.**

(a) **TRAINING.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall provide all Customs and Border Protection officers with training in identifying and detecting fraudulent travel documents. Such training shall be developed in consultation with the head of the Forensic Document Laboratory of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(b) **FORENSIC DOCUMENT LABORATORY.**—The Secretary shall provide all Customs and Border Protection officers with access to the Forensic Document Laboratory.

(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT FOR ASSESSMENT.**—The Inspector General of the Department shall conduct an independent assessment of the accuracy and reliability of the Forensic Document Laboratory.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall submit to Congress the findings of the assessment required by paragraph (1).

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

##### **SEC. 126. IMPROVED DOCUMENT INTEGRITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 303 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1732) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in the heading, by striking “entry and exit documents” and inserting “travel and entry documents and evidence of status”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking “Not later than October 26, 2004, the” and inserting “The”; and

(B) by striking “visas and” both places it appears and inserting “visas, evidence of status, and”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **OTHER DOCUMENTS.**—Not later than October 26, 2007, every document, other than an interim document, issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security, which may be used as evidence of an alien's status as an immigrant, nonimmigrant, parolee, asylee, or refugee, shall be machine-readable and tamper-resistant, and shall incorporate a biometric identifier to allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to verify electronically the identity and status of the alien.”.

##### **SEC. 127. CANCELLATION OF VISAS.**

Section 222(g) (8 U.S.C. 1202(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(B) by inserting “and any other non-immigrant visa issued by the United States that is in the possession of the alien” after “such visa”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “(other than the visa described in paragraph (1)) issued in a consular office located in the country of the alien's nationality” and inserting “(other than a visa described in paragraph (1)) issued in a consular office located in the country of the alien's nationality or foreign residence”.

##### **SEC. 128. BIOMETRIC ENTRY-EXIT SYSTEM.**

(a) **COLLECTION OF BIOMETRIC DATA FROM ALIENS DEPARTING THE UNITED STATES.**—Section 215 (8 U.S.C. 1185) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (g);

(2) by moving subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), to the end; and

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

“(c) The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to require aliens departing the United States to provide biometric data and other information relating to their immigration status.”.

(b) INSPECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION.—Section 235(d) (8 U.S.C. 1225(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT BIOMETRIC DATA.—In conducting inspections under subsection (b), immigration officers are authorized to collect biometric data from—

“(A) any applicant for admission or alien seeking to transit through the United States; or

“(B) any lawful permanent resident who is entering the United States and who is not regarded as seeking admission pursuant to section 101(a)(13)(C).”.

(c) COLLECTION OF BIOMETRIC DATA FROM ALIEN CREWMEN.—Section 252 (8 U.S.C. 1282) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) An immigration officer is authorized to collect biometric data from an alien crewman seeking permission to land temporarily in the United States.”.

(d) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212 (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) WITHOLDERS OF BIOMETRIC DATA.—Any alien who knowingly fails to comply with a lawful request for biometric data under section 215(c) or 235(d) is inadmissible.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall determine whether a ground for inadmissibility exists with respect to an alien described in subparagraph (C) of subsection (a)(7) and may waive the application of such subparagraph for an individual alien or a class of aliens, at the discretion of the Secretary.”.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 7208 of the 9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b) is amended—

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

“(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—In fully implementing the automated biometric entry and exit data system under this section, the Secretary is not required to comply with the requirements of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Administrative Procedure Act) or any other law relating to rulemaking, information collection, or publication in the Federal Register.”; and

(2) in subsection (1)—

(A) by striking “There are authorized” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION AT ALL LAND BORDER PORTS OF ENTRY.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 to implement the automated biometric entry and exit data system at all land border ports of entry.”.

#### SEC. 129. BORDER STUDY.

(a) SOUTHERN BORDER STUDY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall conduct a study on the construction of a system of physical barriers along the southern international land and maritime border of the United States. The study shall include—

(1) an assessment of the necessity of constructing such a system, including the identification of areas of high priority for the construction of such a system determined after consideration of factors including the amount of narcotics trafficking and the number of illegal immigrants apprehended in such areas;

(2) an assessment of the feasibility of constructing such a system;

(3) an assessment of the international, national, and regional environmental impact of such a system, including the impact on zoning, global climate change, ozone depletion, biodiversity loss, and transboundary pollution;

(4) an assessment of the necessity for ports of entry along such a system;

(5) an assessment of the impact such a system would have on international trade, commerce, and tourism;

(6) an assessment of the effect of such a system on private property rights including issues of eminent domain and riparian rights;

(7) an estimate of the costs associated with building a barrier system, including costs associated with excavation, construction, and maintenance;

(8) an assessment of the effect of such a system on Indian reservations and units of the National Park System; and

(9) an assessment of the necessity of constructing such a system after the implementation of provisions of this Act relating to guest workers, visa reform, and interior and worksite enforcement, and the likely effect of such provisions on undocumented immigration and the flow of illegal immigrants across the international border of the United States;

(10) an assessment of the impact of such a system on diplomatic relations between the United States and Mexico, Central America, and South America, including the likely impact of such a system on existing and potential areas of bilateral and multilateral cooperative enforcement efforts;

(11) an assessment of the impact of such a system on the quality of life within border communities in the United States and Mexico, including its impact on noise and light pollution, housing, transportation, security, and environmental health;

(12) an assessment of the likelihood that such a system would lead to increased violations of the human rights, health, safety, or civil rights of individuals in the region near the southern international border of the United States, regardless of the immigration status of such individuals;

(13) an assessment of the effect such a system would have on violence near the southern international border of the United States; and

(14) an assessment of the effect of such a system on the vulnerability of the United States to infiltration by terrorists or other agents intending to inflict direct harm on the United States.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study described in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 130. SECURE BORDER INITIATIVE FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department shall review each contract action relating to the Secure Border Initiative having a value of more than \$20,000,000, to determine whether each such action fully complies with applicable cost requirements, performance objectives, program milestones, inclusion of small, minority, and women-owned business, and time lines. The Inspector General shall complete a review under this subsection with respect to each contract action—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the initiation of the action; and

(2) upon the conclusion of the performance of the contract.

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) ACTION.—If the Inspector General becomes aware of any improper conduct or wrongdoing in the course of conducting a contract review under subsection (a), the Inspector General shall, as expeditiously as practicable, refer information relating to such improper conduct or wrongdoing to the Secretary, or to another appropriate official of the Department, who shall determine whether to temporarily suspend the contractor from further participation in the Secure Border Initiative.

(2) REPORT.—Upon the completion of each review described in subsection (a), the Inspector General shall submit to the Secretary a report containing the findings of the review, including findings regarding—

(A) cost overruns;

(B) significant delays in contract execution;

(C) lack of rigorous departmental contract management;

(D) insufficient departmental financial oversight;

(E) bundling that limits the ability of small businesses to compete; or

(F) other high risk business practices.

(c) REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the receipt of each report required under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit a report, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, that describes—

(A) the findings of the report received from the Inspector General; and

(B) the steps the Secretary has taken, or plans to take, to address the problems identified in such report.

(2) CONTRACTS WITH FOREIGN COMPANIES.—Not later than 60 days after the initiation of each contract action with a company whose headquarters is not based in the United States, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, regarding the Secure Border Initiative.

(d) REPORTS ON UNITED STATES PORTS.—Not later than 30 days after receiving information regarding a proposed purchase of a contract to manage the operations of a United States port by a foreign entity, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall submit a report to Congress that describes—

(1) the proposed purchase;

(2) any security concerns related to the proposed purchase; and

(3) the manner in which such security concerns have been addressed.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts that are otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Office, to enable the Office to carry out this section—

(1) for fiscal year 2007, not less than 5 percent of the overall budget of the Office for such fiscal year;

(2) for fiscal year 2008, not less than 6 percent of the overall budget of the Office for such fiscal year; and

(3) for fiscal year 2009, not less than 7 percent of the overall budget of the Office for such fiscal year.

#### SEC. 131. MANDATORY DETENTION FOR ALIENS APPREHENDED AT OR BETWEEN PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on October 1, 2007, an alien (other than a national of Mexico) who is attempting to illegally enter the

United States and who is apprehended at a United States port of entry or along the international land and maritime border of the United States shall be detained until removed or a final decision granting admission has been determined, unless the alien—

(1) is permitted to withdraw an application for admission under section 235(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(a)(4)) and immediately departs from the United States pursuant to such section; or

(2) is paroled into the United States by the Secretary for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit in accordance with section 212(d)(5)(A) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)(A)).

(b) REQUIREMENTS DURING INTERIM PERIOD.—Beginning 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and before October 1, 2007, an alien described in subsection (a) may be released with a notice to appear only if—

(1) the Secretary determines, after conducting all appropriate background and security checks on the alien, that the alien does not pose a national security risk; and

(2) the alien provides a bond of not less than \$5,000.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) ASYLUM AND REMOVAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the right of an alien to apply for asylum or for relief or deferral of removal based on a fear of persecution.

(2) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—The mandatory detention requirement in subsection (a) does not apply to any alien who is a native or citizen of a country in the Western Hemisphere with whose government the United States does not have full diplomatic relations.

(3) DISCRETION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary, in the Secretary's sole unreviewable discretion, to determine whether an alien described in clause (ii) of section 235(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be detained or released after a finding of a credible fear of persecution (as defined in clause (v) of such section).

**SEC. 132. EVASION OF INSPECTION OR VIOLATION OF ARRIVAL, REPORTING, ENTRY, OR CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 554. Evasion of inspection or during violation of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements**

“(a) PROHIBITION.—A person shall be punished as described in subsection (b) if such person attempts to elude or eludes customs, immigration, or agriculture inspection or fails to stop at the command of an officer or employee of the United States charged with enforcing the immigration, customs, or other laws of the United States at a port of entry or customs or immigration checkpoint;

“(b) PENALTIES.—A person who commits an offense described in subsection (a) shall be—

“(1) fined under this title;

“(2)(A) imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or both;

“(B) imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both, if in commission of this violation, attempts to inflict or inflicts bodily injury (as defined in section 1365(g) of this title); or

“(C) imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, if death results, and may be sentenced to death; or

“(3) both fined and imprisoned under this subsection.

“(c) CONSPIRACY.—If 2 or more persons conspire to commit an offense described in sub-

section (a), and 1 or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punishable as a principal, except that the sentence of death may not be imposed.

“(d) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—For the purposes of seizure and forfeiture under applicable law, in the case of use of a vehicle or other conveyance in the commission of this offense, or in the case of disregarding or disobeying the lawful authority or command of any officer or employee of the United States under section 111(b) of this title, such conduct shall constitute prima facie evidence of smuggling aliens or merchandise.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end:

“554. Evasion of inspection or during violation of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements.”.

(c) FAILURE TO OBEY BORDER ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) FAILURE TO OBEY LAWFUL ORDERS OF BORDER ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Whoever willfully disregards or disobeys the lawful authority or command of any officer or employee of the United States charged with enforcing the immigration, customs, or other laws of the United States while engaged in, or on account of, the performance of official duties shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.”.

**Subtitle D—Border Tunnel Prevention Act**

**SEC. 141. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “Border Tunnel Prevention Act”.

**SEC. 142. CONSTRUCTION OF BORDER TUNNEL OR PASSAGE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 554. Border tunnels and passages**

“(a) Any person who knowingly constructs or finances the construction of a tunnel or subterranean passage that crosses the international border between the United States and another country, other than a lawfully authorized tunnel or passage known to the Secretary of Homeland Security and subject to inspection by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not more than 20 years.

“(b) Any person who knows or recklessly disregards the construction or use of a tunnel or passage described in subsection (a) on land that the person owns or controls shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not more than 10 years.

“(c) Any person who uses a tunnel or passage described in subsection (a) to unlawfully smuggle an alien, goods (in violation of section 545), controlled substances, weapons of mass destruction (including biological weapons), or a member of a terrorist organization (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi))) shall be subject to a maximum term of imprisonment that is twice the maximum term of imprisonment that would have otherwise been applicable had the unlawful activity not made use of such a tunnel or passage.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Sec. 554. Border tunnels and passages.”.

(c) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—Section 982(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “554,” before “1425.”.

**SEC. 143. DIRECTIVE TO THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate or amend sentencing guidelines to provide for increased penalties for persons convicted of offenses described in section 554 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 132.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall—

(1) ensure that the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary reflect the serious nature of the offenses described in section 554 of title 18, United States Code, and the need for aggressive and appropriate law enforcement action to prevent such offenses;

(2) provide adequate base offense levels for offenses under such section;

(3) account for any aggravating or mitigating circumstances that might justify exceptions, including—

(A) the use of a tunnel or passage described in subsection (a) of such section to facilitate other felonies; and

(B) the circumstances for which the sentencing guidelines currently provide applicable sentencing enhancements;

(4) ensure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives, other sentencing guidelines, and statutes;

(5) make any necessary and conforming changes to the sentencing guidelines and policy statements; and

(6) ensure that the sentencing guidelines adequately meet the purposes of sentencing set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

**TITLE II—INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 201. REMOVAL AND DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO TERRORIST ALIENS.**

(a) ASYLUM.—Section 208(b)(2)(A)(v) (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)(v)) is amended by striking “or (VI)” and inserting “(V), (VI), (VII), or (VIII)”.

(b) CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL.—Section 240A(c)(4) (8 U.S.C. 1229b(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking “inadmissible under” and inserting “described in”; and

(2) by striking “deportable under” and inserting “described in”.

(c) VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE.—Section 240(b)(1)(C) (8 U.S.C. 1229c(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking “deportable under section 237(a)(2)(A)(iii) or section 237(a)(4)” and inserting “described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or (4) of section 237(a)”.

(d) RESTRICTION ON REMOVAL.—Section 241(b)(3)(B) (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (iv) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(3) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) the alien is described in section 237(a)(4)(B) (other than an alien described in section 212(a)(3)(B)(i)(IV) if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that there are not reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States).”; and

(4) in the undesignated paragraph, by striking “For purposes of clause (iv), an alien who is described in section 237(a)(4)(B) shall be considered to be an alien with respect to whom there are reasonable grounds for regarding as a danger to the security of the United States.”.

(e) RECORD OF ADMISSION.—Section 249 (8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 249. RECORD OF ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 1972.**

“A record of lawful admission for permanent residence may be made, in the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security and under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, for any alien, as of the date of the approval of the alien’s application or, if entry occurred before July 1, 1924, as of the date of such entry if no such record is otherwise available, if the alien establishes that the alien—

“(1) is not described in section 212(a)(3)(E) or in section 212(a) (insofar as it relates to criminals, procurers, other immoral persons, subversives, violators of the narcotics laws, or smugglers of aliens);

“(2) entered the United States before January 1, 1972;

“(3) has resided in the United States continuously since such entry;

“(4) is a person of good moral character;

“(5) is not ineligible for citizenship; and

“(6) is not described in section 237(a)(4)(B).”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to any act or condition constituting a ground for inadmissibility, excludability, or removal occurring or existing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 202. DETENTION AND REMOVAL OF ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 241(a) (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “Attorney General” the first place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(B) by striking “Attorney General” any other place it appears and inserting “Secretary”;

(C) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) If a court, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or an immigration judge orders a stay of the removal of the alien, the expiration date of the stay of removal.”.

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

“(C) EXTENSION OF PERIOD.—The removal period shall be extended beyond a period of 90 days and the alien may remain in detention during such extended period if the alien fails or refuses to—

“(i) make all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order; or

“(ii) fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including failing to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure, or conspiring or acting to prevent the alien’s removal.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) TOLLING OF PERIOD.—If, at the time described in subparagraph (B), the alien is not in the custody of the Secretary under the authority of this Act, the removal period shall not begin until the alien is taken into such custody. If the Secretary lawfully transfers custody of the alien during the removal period to another Federal agency or to a State or local government agency in connection with the official duties of such agency, the removal period shall be tolled, and shall recommence on the date on which the alien is returned to the custody of the Secretary.”;

(D) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: “If a court, the Board of Im-

migration Appeals, or an immigration judge orders a stay of removal of an alien who is subject to an administrative final order of removal, the Secretary, in the exercise of discretion, may detain the alien during the pendency of such stay of removal.”;

(E) in paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) to obey reasonable restrictions on the alien’s conduct or activities, or to perform affirmative acts, that the Secretary prescribes for the alien—

“(i) to prevent the alien from absconding;

“(ii) for the protection of the community;

or

“(iii) for other purposes related to the enforcement of the immigration laws.”;

(F) in paragraph (6), by striking “removal period and, if released,” and inserting “removal period, in the discretion of the Secretary, without any limitations other than those specified in this section, until the alien is removed. If an alien is released, the alien”;

(G) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (10); and

(H) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) PAROLE.—If an alien detained pursuant to paragraph (6) is an applicant for admission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the Secretary’s discretion, may parole the alien under section 212(d)(5) and may provide, notwithstanding section 212(d)(5), that the alien shall not be returned to custody unless either the alien violates the conditions of the alien’s parole or the alien’s removal becomes reasonably foreseeable, provided that in no circumstance shall such alien be considered admitted.

“(8) ADDITIONAL RULES FOR DETENTION OR RELEASE OF ALIENS.—The following procedures shall apply to an alien detained under this section:

“(A) DETENTION REVIEW PROCESS FOR ALIENS WHO HAVE EFFECTED AN ENTRY AND FULLY COOPERATE WITH REMOVAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an administrative review process to determine whether an alien described in subparagraph (B) should be detained or released after the removal period in accordance with this paragraph.

“(B) ALIEN DESCRIBED.—An alien is described in this subparagraph if the alien—

“(i) has effected an entry into the United States;

“(ii) has made all reasonable efforts to comply with the alien’s removal order;

“(iii) has cooperated fully with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and to carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary for the alien’s departure; and

“(iv) has not conspired or acted to prevent removal.

“(C) EVIDENCE.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

“(i) shall consider any evidence submitted by the alien;

“(ii) may consider any other evidence, including—

“(I) any information or assistance provided by the Department of State or other Federal agency; and

“(II) any other information available to the Secretary pertaining to the ability to remove the alien.

“(D) AUTHORITY TO DETAIN FOR 90 DAYS BEYOND REMOVAL PERIOD.—The Secretary, in the exercise of the Secretary’s discretion and without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain an alien for 90 days beyond the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)).

“(E) AUTHORITY TO DETAIN FOR ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—The Secretary, in the exercise of

the Secretary’s discretion and without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain an alien beyond the 90-day period authorized under subparagraph (D) until the alien is removed, if the Secretary—

“(i) determines that there is a significant likelihood that the alien will be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future; or

“(ii) certifies in writing—

“(I) in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, that the alien has a highly contagious disease that poses a threat to public safety;

“(II) after receipt of a written recommendation from the Secretary of State, that the release of the alien would likely have serious adverse foreign policy consequences for the United States;

“(III) based on information available to the Secretary (including classified, sensitive, or national security information, and regardless of the grounds upon which the alien was ordered removed), that there is reason to believe that the release of the alien would threaten the national security of the United States;

“(IV) that—

“(aa) the release of the alien would threaten the safety of the community or any person, and conditions of release cannot reasonably be expected to ensure the safety of the community or any person; and

“(bb) the alien—

“(AA) has been convicted of 1 or more aggravated felonies (as defined in section 101(a)(43)(A)), or of 1 or more attempts or conspiracies to commit any such aggravated felonies for an aggregate term of imprisonment of at least 5 years; or

“(BB) has committed a crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code, but not including a purely political offense) and, because of a mental condition or personality disorder and behavior associated with that condition or disorder, is likely to engage in acts of violence in the future; or

“(V) that—

“(aa) the release of the alien would threaten the safety of the community or any person, notwithstanding conditions of release designed to ensure the safety of the community or any person; and

“(bb) the alien has been convicted of 1 or more aggravated felonies (as defined in section 101(a)(43)) for which the alien was sentenced to an aggregate term of imprisonment of not less than 1 year.

“(F) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS.—The Secretary, without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain an alien pending a determination under subparagraph (E)(ii), if the Secretary has initiated the administrative review process identified in subparagraph (A) not later than 30 days after the expiration of the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)).

“(G) RENEWAL AND DELEGATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a certification under subparagraph (E)(ii) every 6 months, without limitation, after providing the alien with an opportunity to request reconsideration of the certification and to submit documents or other evidence in support of that request. If the Secretary does not renew such certification, the Secretary shall release the alien, pursuant to subparagraph (H).

“(ii) DELEGATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may not delegate the authority to make or renew a certification described in subclause (II), (III), or (V) of subparagraph (E)(ii) to any

employee reporting to the Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

“(iii) HEARING.—The Secretary may request that the Attorney General, or a designee of the Attorney General, provide for a hearing to make the determination described in subparagraph (E)(ii)(IV)(bb)(BB).

“(H) RELEASE ON CONDITIONS.—If it is determined that an alien should be released from detention, the Secretary may, in the Secretary’s discretion, impose conditions on release in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(I) REDETENTION.—The Secretary, without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain any alien subject to a final removal order who has previously been released from custody if—

“(i) the alien fails to comply with the conditions of release;

“(ii) the alien fails to continue to satisfy the conditions described in subparagraph (B); or

“(iii) upon reconsideration, the Secretary determines that the alien can be detained under subparagraph (E).

“(J) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph and paragraphs (6) and (7) shall apply to any alien returned to custody under subparagraph (I) as if the removal period terminated on the day of the redetention.

“(K) DETENTION REVIEW PROCESS FOR ALIENS WHO HAVE EFFECTED AN ENTRY AND FAIL TO COOPERATE WITH REMOVAL.—The Secretary shall detain an alien until the alien makes all reasonable efforts to comply with a removal order and to cooperate fully with the Secretary’s efforts, if the alien—

“(i) has effected an entry into the United States; and

“(ii)(I) and the alien faces a significant likelihood that the alien will be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future, or would have been removed if the alien had not—

“(aa) failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to comply with a removal order;

“(bb) failed or refused to fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including the failure to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure; or

“(cc) conspired or acted to prevent removal; or

“(II) the Secretary makes a certification as specified in subparagraph (E), or the renewal of a certification specified in subparagraph (G).

“(L) DETENTION REVIEW PROCESS FOR ALIENS WHO HAVE NOT EFFECTED AN ENTRY.—Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, the Secretary shall follow the guidelines established in section 241.4 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, when detaining aliens who have not effected an entry. The Secretary may decide to apply the review process outlined in this paragraph.

“(9) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Without regard to the place of confinement, judicial review of any action or decision made pursuant to paragraph (6), (7), or (8) shall be available exclusively in a habeas corpus proceeding instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and only if the alien has exhausted all administrative remedies (statutory and nonstatutory) available to the alien as of right.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)—

(A) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) shall apply to—

(i) any alien subject to a final administrative removal, deportation, or exclusion order that was issued before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) any act or condition occurring or existing before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CRIMINAL DETENTION OF ALIENS.—Section 3142 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(B) by inserting “(1)” before “If, after a hearing”;

(C) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”; and

(D) by adding after subparagraph (C), as redesignated, the following:

“(2) Subject to rebuttal by the person, it shall be presumed that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that the person—

“(A) is an alien; and

“(B)(i) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

“(ii) is the subject of a final order of removal; or

“(iii) has committed a felony offense under section 911, 922(g)(5), 1015, 1028, 1425, or 1426 of this title, chapter 75 or 77 of this title, or section 243, 274, 275, 276, 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253, 1324, 1325, 1326, 2327, and 1328).”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the person’s immigration status; and”.

#### SEC. 203. AGGRAVATED FELONY.

(a) DEFINITION OF AGGRAVATED FELONY.—Section 101(a)(43) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The term ‘aggravated felony’ means—” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law (except for the provision providing an effective date for section 203 of the Comprehensive Reform Act of 2006), the term ‘aggravated felony’ applies to an offense described in this paragraph, whether in violation of Federal or State law and to such an offense in violation of the law of a foreign country, for which the term of imprisonment was completed within the previous 15 years, even if the length of the term of imprisonment is based on recidivist or other enhancements and regardless of whether the conviction was entered before, on, or after September 30, 1996, and means—”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “murder, rape, or sexual abuse of a minor;” and inserting “murder, rape, or sexual abuse of a minor, whether or not the minority of the victim is established by evidence contained in the record of conviction or by evidence extrinsic to the record of conviction;”;

(3) in subparagraph (N), by striking “paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of”;

(4) in subparagraph (O), by striking “section 275(a) or 276 committed by an alien who was previously deported on the basis of a conviction for an offense described in another subparagraph of this paragraph” and inserting “section 275 or 276 for which the term of imprisonment is at least 1 year”;

(5) in subparagraph (U), by striking “an attempt or conspiracy to commit an offense described in this paragraph” and inserting “aiding or abetting an offense described in this paragraph, or soliciting, counseling, procuring, commanding, or inducing another, attempting, or conspiring to commit such an offense”;

(6) by striking the undesignated matter following subparagraph (U).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to any act that occurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION OF IIRAIRA AMENDMENTS.—The amendments to section 101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act made by section 321 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-627) shall continue to apply, whether the conviction was entered before, on, or after September 30, 1996.

#### SEC. 204. TERRORIST BARS.

(a) DEFINITION OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER.—Section 101(f) (8 U.S.C. 1101(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) an alien described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4), as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security or Attorney General based upon any relevant information or evidence, including classified, sensitive, or national security information;”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “(as defined in subsection (a)(43))” and inserting the following: “, regardless of whether the crime was defined as an aggravated felony under subsection (a)(43) at the time of the conviction, unless—

“(A) the person completed the term of imprisonment and sentence not later than 10 years before the date of application; and

“(B) the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this paragraph; or”;

(3) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (9), by striking “a finding that for other reasons such person is or was not of good moral character” and inserting the following: “a discretionary finding for other reasons that such a person is or was not of good moral character. In determining an applicant’s moral character, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General may take into consideration the applicant’s conduct and acts at any time and are not limited to the period during which good moral character is required.”

(b) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—Section 204(b) (8 U.S.C. 1154(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A petition may not be approved under this section if there is any administrative or judicial proceeding (whether civil or criminal) pending against the petitioner that could directly or indirectly result in the petitioner’s denaturalization or the loss of the petitioner’s lawful permanent resident status.”

(c) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 216(e) (8 U.S.C. 1186a(e)) is amended by inserting “if the alien has had the conditional basis removed pursuant to this section” before the period at the end.

(2) CERTAIN ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.—Section 216A(e) (8 U.S.C. 1186b(e)) is amended by inserting “if the alien has had the conditional basis removed pursuant to this section” before the period at the end.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NATURALIZATION APPLICATIONS.—Section 310(c) (8 U.S.C. 1421(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, not later than 120 days after the Secretary of Homeland Security’s final determination,” after “may”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Except that in any proceeding, other than a proceeding under section 340, the court shall review for substantial evidence the administrative record and findings of the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding whether an



alien is a person of good moral character, understands and is attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, or is well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. The petitioner shall have the burden of showing that the Secretary's denial of the application was contrary to law."

(e) PERSONS ENDANGERING NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) PERSONS ENDANGERING THE NATIONAL SECURITY.—A person may not be naturalized if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines, based upon any relevant information or evidence, including classified, sensitive, or national security information, that the person was once an alien described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4)."

(f) CONCURRENT NATURALIZATION AND REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—Section 318 (8 U.S.C. 1429) is amended by striking "the Attorney General if" and all that follows and inserting: "the Secretary of Homeland Security or any court if there is pending against the applicant any removal proceeding or other proceeding to determine the applicant's inadmissibility or deportability, or to determine whether the applicant's lawful permanent resident status should be rescinded, regardless of when such proceeding was commenced. The findings of the Attorney General in terminating removal proceedings or canceling the removal of an alien under this Act shall not be deemed binding in any way upon the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the question of whether such person has established eligibility for naturalization in accordance with this title."

(g) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION.—Section 336(b) (8 U.S.C. 1447(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REQUEST FOR HEARING BEFORE DISTRICT COURT.—If there is a failure to render a final administrative decision under section 335 before the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security completes all examinations and interviews required under such section, the applicant may apply to the district court for the district in which the applicant resides for a hearing on the matter. The Secretary shall notify the applicant when such examinations and interviews have been completed. Such district court shall only have jurisdiction to review the basis for delay and remand the matter, with appropriate instructions, to the Secretary for the Secretary's determination on the application."

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply to any act that occurred on or after such date of enactment.

**SEC. 205. INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES RELATED TO GANG VIOLENCE, REMOVAL, AND ALIEN SMUGGLING.**

(a) CRIMINAL STREET GANGS.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (J); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) MEMBERS OF CRIMINAL STREET GANGS.—Unless the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this subparagraph, any alien who a consular officer, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security knows or has reason to believe—

"(i) is, or has been, a member of a criminal street gang (as defined in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code); or

"(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal street gang, knowing or having rea-

son to know that such activities promoted, furthered, aided, or supported the illegal activity of the criminal gang, is inadmissible."

(2) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) MEMBERS OF CRIMINAL STREET GANGS.—Unless the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General waives the application of this subparagraph, any alien who the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

"(i) is, or at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal street gang (as defined in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code); or

"(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal street gang, knowing or having reason to know that such activities promoted, furthered, aided, or supported the illegal activity of the criminal gang, is deportable."

(3) TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—Section 244 (8 U.S.C. 1254a) is amended—

(A) by striking "Attorney General" each place it appears and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security";

(B) in subsection (b)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security may, for any reason (including national security), terminate or modify any designation under this section. Such termination or modification is effective upon publication in the Federal Register, or after such time as the Secretary may designate in the Federal Register.";

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking "a period of 12 or 18 months" and inserting "any other period not to exceed 18 months";

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "The amount of any such fee shall not exceed \$50.";

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking ", or" at the end;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) the alien is, or at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal street gang (as defined in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code)."; and

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3); and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary of Homeland Security may detain an alien provided temporary protected status under this section whenever appropriate under any other provision of law."

(b) PENALTIES RELATED TO REMOVAL.—Section 243 (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "'212(a) or'" after "section"; and

(B) in the matter following subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking "or imprisoned not more than four years" and inserting "and imprisoned for not less than 6 months or more than 5 years"; and

(ii) by striking ", or both";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "not more than \$1000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both" and inserting "under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for not less than 6 months or more than 5 years (or for not more than 10 years if the alien is a member of any of the classes described in

paragraphs (1)(E), (2), (3), and (4) of section 237(a)."; and

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

"(d) DENYING VISAS TO NATIONALS OF COUNTRY DENYING OR DELAYING ACCEPTING ALIEN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, after making a determination that the government of a foreign country has denied or unreasonably delayed accepting an alien who is a citizen, subject, national, or resident of that country after the alien has been ordered removed, and after consultation with the Secretary of State, may instruct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to any citizen, subject, national, or resident of that country until the country accepts the alien that was ordered removed."

(c) ALIEN SMUGGLING AND RELATED OFFENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 274 (8 U.S.C. 1324), is amended to read as follows:

**"SEC. 274. ALIEN SMUGGLING AND RELATED OFFENSES.**

**"(a) CRIMINAL OFFENSES AND PENALTIES.—**

**"(1) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—**Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person shall be punished as provided under paragraph (2), if the person—

**"(A)** facilitates, encourages, directs, or induces a person to come to or enter the United States, or to cross the border to the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien who lacks lawful authority to come to, enter, or cross the border to the United States;

**"(B)** facilitates, encourages, directs, or induces a person to come to or enter the United States, or to cross the border to the United States, at a place other than a designated port of entry or place other than as designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien and regardless of whether such alien has official permission or lawful authority to be in the United States;

**"(C)** transports, moves, harbors, conceals, or shields from detection a person outside of the United States knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien in unlawful transit from 1 country to another or on the high seas, under circumstances in which the alien is seeking to enter the United States without official permission or legal authority;

**"(D)** encourages or induces a person to reside in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien who lacks lawful authority to reside in the United States;

**"(E)** transports or moves a person in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien who lacks lawful authority to enter or be in the United States, if the transportation or movement will further the alien's illegal entry into or illegal presence in the United States;

**"(F)** harbors, conceals, or shields from detection a person in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such person is an alien who lacks lawful authority to be in the United States; or

**"(G)** conspires or attempts to commit any of the acts described in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

**"(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—**A person who violates any provision under paragraph (1)—

**"(A)** except as provided in subparagraphs (C) through (G), if the offense was not committed for commercial advantage, profit, or private financial gain, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both;

**"(B)** except as provided in subparagraphs (C) through (G), if the offense was committed

for commercial advantage, profit, or private financial gain—

“(i) if the violation is the offender’s first violation under this subparagraph, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both; or

“(ii) if the violation is the offender’s second or subsequent violation of this subparagraph, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned for not less than 3 years or more than 20 years, or both;

“(C) if the offense furthered or aided the commission of any other offense against the United States or any State that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned for not less than 5 years or more than 20 years, or both;

“(D) shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not less than 5 years or more than 20 years, or both, if the offense created a substantial and foreseeable risk of death, a substantial and foreseeable risk of serious bodily injury (as defined in section 2119(2) of title 18, United States Code), or inhumane conditions to another person, including—

“(i) transporting the person in an engine compartment, storage compartment, or other confined space;

“(ii) transporting the person at an excessive speed or in excess of the rated capacity of the means of transportation; or

“(iii) transporting the person in, harboring the person in, or otherwise subjecting the person to crowded or dangerous conditions;

“(E) if the offense caused serious bodily injury (as defined in section 2119(2) of title 18, United States Code) to any person, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned for not less than 7 years or more than 30 years, or both;

“(F) shall be fined under such title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years or more than 30 years if the offense involved an alien who the offender knew or had reason to believe was—

“(i) engaged in terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)); or

“(ii) intending to engage in terrorist activity;

“(G) if the offense caused or resulted in the death of any person, shall be punished by death or imprisoned for a term of years not less than 10 years and up to life, and fined under title 18, United States Code.

“(3) LIMITATION.—It is not a violation of subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (1)—

“(A) for a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States, or the agents or officers of such denomination or organization, to encourage, invite, call, allow, or enable an alien who is present in the United States to perform the vocation of a minister or missionary for the denomination or organization in the United States as a volunteer who is not compensated as an employee, notwithstanding the provision of room, board, travel, medical assistance, and other basic living expenses, provided the minister or missionary has been a member of the denomination for at least 1 year; or

“(B) for an individual or organization, not previously convicted of a violation of this section, to provide an alien who is present in the United States with humanitarian assistance, including medical care, housing, counseling, victim services, and food, or to transport the alien to a location where such assistance can be rendered.

“(4) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—There is extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction over the offenses described in this subsection.

“(b) EMPLOYMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS.—

“(1) CRIMINAL OFFENSE AND PENALTIES.—Any person who, during any 12-month period, knowingly employs 10 or more individuals with actual knowledge or in reckless disregard of the fact that the individuals are aliens described in paragraph (2), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—An alien described in this paragraph is an alien who—

“(A) is an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 274A(h)(3));

“(B) is present in the United States without lawful authority; and

“(C) has been brought into the United States in violation of this subsection.

“(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any real or personal property used to commit or facilitate the commission of a violation of this section, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

“(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(3) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE IN DETERMINATIONS OF VIOLATIONS.—In determining whether a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, prima facie evidence that an alien involved in the alleged violation lacks lawful authority to come to, enter, reside in, remain in, or be in the United States or that such alien had come to, entered, resided in, remained in, or been present in the United States in violation of law shall include—

“(A) any order, finding, or determination concerning the alien’s status or lack of status made by a Federal judge or administrative adjudicator (including an immigration judge or immigration officer) during any judicial or administrative proceeding authorized under Federal immigration law;

“(B) official records of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, or the Department of State concerning the alien’s status or lack of status; and

“(C) testimony by an immigration officer having personal knowledge of the facts concerning the alien’s status or lack of status.

“(d) AUTHORITY TO ARREST.—No officer or person shall have authority to make any arrests for a violation of any provision of this section except—

“(1) officers and employees designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, either individually or as a member of a class; and

“(2) other officers responsible for the enforcement of Federal criminal laws.

“(e) ADMISSIBILITY OF VIDEOTAPED WITNESS TESTIMONY.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Rules of Evidence, the videotaped or otherwise audiovisually preserved deposition of a witness to a violation of subsection (a) who has been deported or otherwise expelled from the United States, or is otherwise unavailable to testify, may be admitted into evidence in an action brought for that violation if—

“(1) the witness was available for cross examination at the deposition by the party, if any, opposing admission of the testimony; and

“(2) the deposition otherwise complies with the Federal Rules of Evidence.

“(f) OUTREACH PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, shall—

“(A) develop and implement an outreach program to educate people in and out of the United States about the penalties for bringing in and harboring aliens in violation of this section; and

“(B) establish the American Local and Interior Enforcement Needs (ALIEN) Task Force to identify and respond to the use of Federal, State, and local transportation infrastructure to further the trafficking of unlawful aliens within the United States.

“(2) FIELD OFFICES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, after consulting with State and local government officials, shall establish such field offices as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums are necessary for the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this subsection.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CROSSED THE BORDER INTO THE UNITED STATES.—An alien is deemed to have crossed the border into the United States regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.

“(2) LAWFUL AUTHORITY.—The term ‘lawful authority’ means permission, authorization, or license that is expressly provided for in the immigration laws of the United States or accompanying regulations. The term does not include any such authority secured by fraud or otherwise obtained in violation of law or authority sought, but not approved. No alien shall be deemed to have lawful authority to come to, enter, reside in, remain in, or be in the United States if such coming to, entry, residence, remaining, or presence was, is, or would be in violation of law.

“(3) PROCEEDS.—The term ‘proceeds’ includes any property or interest in property obtained or retained as a consequence of an act or omission in violation of this section.

“(4) UNLAWFUL TRANSIT.—The term ‘unlawful transit’ means travel, movement, or temporary presence that violates the laws of any country in which the alien is present or any country from which the alien is traveling or moving.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents is amended by striking the item relating to section 274 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 274. Alien smuggling and related offenses.”

(d) PROHIBITING CARRYING OR USING A FIREARM DURING AND IN RELATION TO AN ALIEN SMUGGLING CRIME.—Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “any crime of violence”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “such crime of violence”;

(C) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘alien smuggling crime’ means any felony punishable under section 274(a), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a), 1327, and 1328).”

SEC. 206. ILLEGAL ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 275 (8 U.S.C. 1325) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 275. ILLEGAL ENTRY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—An alien shall be subject to the penalties set forth in paragraph (2) if the alien—

“(A) knowingly enters or crosses the border into the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

“(B) knowingly eludes examination or inspection by an immigration officer (including failing to stop at the command of such officer), or a customs or agriculture inspection at a port of entry; or

“(C) knowingly enters or crosses the border to the United States by means of a knowingly false or misleading representation or the knowing concealment of a material fact (including such representation or concealment in the context of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements of the customs law, immigration laws, agriculture laws, or shipping laws).

“(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Any alien who violates any provision under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall, for the first violation, be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both;

“(B) shall, for a second or subsequent violation, or following an order of voluntary departure, be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both;

“(C) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of 3 or more misdemeanors or for a felony, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

“(D) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of a felony for which the alien received a term of imprisonment of not less than 30 months, shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both; and

“(E) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of a felony for which the alien received a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, such alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both;e, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both; and

“(E) if the violation occurred after the alien had been convicted of a felony for which the alien received a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, such alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(3) PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—The prior convictions described in subparagraphs (C) through (E) of paragraph (2) are elements of the offenses described in that paragraph and the penalties in such subparagraphs shall apply only in cases in which the conviction or convictions that form the basis for the additional penalty are—

“(A) alleged in the indictment or information; and

“(B) proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant.

“(4) DURATION OF OFFENSE.—An offense under this subsection continues until the alien is discovered within the United States by an immigration officer.

“(5) ATTEMPT.—Whoever attempts to commit any offense under this section shall be punished in the same manner as for a completion of such offense.

“(b) IMPROPER TIME OR PLACE; CIVIL PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any alien who is apprehended while entering, attempting to enter, or knowingly crossing or attempting to cross the border to the United States at a time or place other than as designated by immigration officers shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any criminal or other civil penalties that may be imposed under any other provision of law, in an amount equal to—

“(A) not less than \$50 or more than \$250 for each such entry, crossing, attempted entry, or attempted crossing; or

“(B) twice the amount specified in paragraph (1) if the alien had previously been subject to a civil penalty under this subsection.

“(2) CROSSED THE BORDER DEFINED.—In this section, an alien is deemed to have crossed

the border if the act was voluntary, regardless of whether the alien was under observation at the time of the crossing.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents is amended by striking the item relating to section 275 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 275. Illegal entry.”

**SEC. 207. ILLEGAL REENTRY.**

Section 276 (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 276. REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN.**

“(a) REENTRY AFTER REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed, or who has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, and subsequently enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

“(b) REENTRY OF CRIMINAL OFFENDERS.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), if an alien described in that subsection—

“(1) was convicted for 3 or more misdemeanors or a felony before such removal or departure, the alien shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

“(2) was convicted for a felony before such removal or departure for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 30 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both;

“(3) was convicted for a felony before such removal or departure for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both;

“(4) was convicted for 3 felonies before such removal or departure, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; or

“(5) was convicted, before such removal or departure, for murder, rape, kidnaping, or a felony offense described in chapter 77 (relating to peonage and slavery) or 113B (relating to terrorism) of such title, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) REENTRY AFTER REPEATED REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(d) PROOF OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—The prior convictions described in subsection (b) are elements of the crimes described in that subsection, and the penalties in that subsection shall apply only in cases in which the conviction or convictions that form the basis for the additional penalty are—

“(1) alleged in the indictment or information; and

“(2) proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant.

“(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—It shall be an affirmative defense to a violation of this section that—

“(1) prior to the alleged violation, the alien had sought and received the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security to reapply for admission into the United States; or

“(2) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, the alien—

“(A) was not required to obtain such advance consent under the Immigration and Nationality Act or any prior Act; and

“(B) had complied with all other laws and regulations governing the alien's admission into the United States.

“(f) LIMITATION ON COLLATERAL ATTACK ON UNDERLYING REMOVAL ORDER.—In a criminal proceeding under this section, an alien may not challenge the validity of any prior removal order concerning the alien unless the alien demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that—

“(1) the alien exhausted all administrative remedies that may have been available to seek relief against the order;

“(2) the removal proceedings at which the order was issued improperly deprived the alien of the opportunity for judicial review; and

“(3) the entry of the order was fundamentally unfair.

“(g) REENTRY OF ALIEN REMOVED PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF TERM OF IMPRISONMENT.—Any alien removed pursuant to section 241(a)(4) who enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in, the United States shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence of imprisonment which was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates that the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to the alien's reentry. Such alien shall be subject to such other penalties relating to the reentry of removed aliens as may be available under this section or any other provision of law.

“(h) LIMITATION.—It is not aiding and abetting a violation of this section for an individual to provide an alien with emergency humanitarian assistance, including emergency medical care and food, or to transport the alien to a location where such assistance can be rendered without compensation or the expectation of compensation.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CROSSES THE BORDER.—The term ‘crosses the border’ applies if an alien acts voluntarily, regardless of whether the alien was under observation at the time of the crossing.

“(2) FELONY.—Term ‘felony’ means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

“(3) MISDEMEANOR.—The term ‘misdemeanor’ means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of not more than 1 year under the applicable laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

“(4) REMOVAL.—The term ‘removal’ includes any denial of admission, exclusion, deportation, or removal, or any agreement by which an alien stipulates or agrees to exclusion, deportation, or removal.

“(5) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.”

**SEC. 208. REFORM OF PASSPORT, VISA, AND IMMIGRATION FRAUD OFFENSES.**

(a) PASSPORT, VISA, AND IMMIGRATION FRAUD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**“CHAPTER 75—PASSPORT, VISA, AND IMMIGRATION FRAUD**

“Sec.

“1541. Trafficking in passports.

“1542. False statement in an application for a passport.

“1543. Forgery and unlawful production of a passport.

“1544. Misuse of a passport.

“1545. Schemes to defraud aliens.

“1546. Immigration and visa fraud.  
 “1547. Marriage fraud.  
 “1548. Attempts and conspiracies.  
 “1549. Alternative penalties for certain offenses.  
 “1550. Seizure and forfeiture.  
 “1551. Additional jurisdiction.  
 “1552. Additional venue.  
 “1553. Definitions.  
 “1554. Authorized law enforcement activities.  
 “1555. Exception for refugees and asylees.

**“§ 1541. Trafficking in passports**

“(a) MULTIPLE PASSPORTS.—Any person who, during any 3-year period, knowingly—

“(1) and without lawful authority produces, issues, or transfers 10 or more passports;

“(2) forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes 10 or more passports;

“(3) secures, possesses, uses, receives, buys, sells, or distributes 10 or more passports, knowing the passports to be forged, counterfeited, altered, falsely made, stolen, procured by fraud, or produced or issued without lawful authority; or

“(4) completes, mails, prepares, presents, signs, or submits 10 or more applications for a United States passport (including any supporting documentation), knowing the applications to contain any false statement or representation,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(b) PASSPORT MATERIALS.—Any person who knowingly and without lawful authority produces, counterfeits, secures, possesses, or uses any official paper, seal, hologram, image, text, symbol, stamp, engraving, plate, or other material used to make a passport shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

**“§ 1542. False statement in an application for a passport**

“Any person who knowingly—

“(1) makes any false statement or representation in an application for a United States passport (including any supporting documentation);

“(2) completes, mails, prepares, presents, signs, or submits an application for a United States passport (including any supporting documentation) knowing the application to contain any false statement or representation; or

“(3) causes or attempts to cause the production of a passport by means of any fraud or false application for a United States passport (including any supporting documentation), if such production occurs or would occur at a facility authorized by the Secretary of State for the production of passports,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

**“§ 1543. Forgery and unlawful production of a passport**

“(a) FORGERY.—Any person who—

“(1) knowingly forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any passport; or

“(2) knowingly transfers any passport knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, falsely made, stolen, or to have been produced or issued without lawful authority, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(b) UNLAWFUL PRODUCTION.—Any person who knowingly and without lawful authority—

“(1) produces, issues, authorizes, or verifies a passport in violation of the laws, regulations, or rules governing the issuance of the passport;

“(2) produces, issues, authorizes, or verifies a United States passport for or to any person not owing allegiance to the United States; or

“(3) transfers or furnishes a passport to a person for use when such person is not the person for whom the passport was issued or designed,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

**“§ 1544. Misuse of a passport**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who—

“(1) knowingly uses any passport issued or designed for the use of another;

“(2) knowingly uses any passport in violation of the conditions or restrictions therein contained, or in violation of the laws, regulations, or rules governing the issuance and use of the passport;

“(3) knowingly secures, possesses, uses, receives, buys, sells, or distributes any passport knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, falsely made, procured by fraud, or produced or issued without lawful authority; or

“(4) knowingly violates the terms and conditions of any safe conduct duly obtained and issued under the authority of the United States,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(b) ENTRY; FRAUD.—Any person who knowingly uses any passport, knowing the passport to be forged, counterfeited, altered, falsely made, procured by fraud, produced or issued without lawful authority, or issued or designed for the use of another—

“(1) to enter or to attempt to enter the United States; or

“(2) to defraud the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

**“§ 1545. Schemes to defraud aliens**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who knowingly executes a scheme or artifice, in connection with any matter that is authorized by or arises under Federal immigration laws, or any matter the offender claims or represents is authorized by or arises under Federal immigration laws—

“(1) to defraud any person, or

“(2) to obtain or receive from any person, by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, promises, money or anything else of value,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(b) MISREPRESENTATION.—Any person who knowingly and falsely represents himself to be an attorney in any matter arising under Federal immigration laws shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

**“§ 1546. Immigration and visa fraud**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who knowingly—

“(1) uses any immigration document issued or designed for the use of another;

“(2) forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any immigration document;

“(3) completes, mails, prepares, presents, signs, or submits any immigration document knowing it to contain any materially false statement or representation;

“(4) secures, possesses, uses, transfers, receives, buys, sells, or distributes any immigration document knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, falsely made, stolen, procured by fraud, or produced or issued without lawful authority;

“(5) adopts or uses a false or fictitious name to evade or to attempt to evade the immigration laws; or

“(6) transfers or furnishes an immigration document to a person without lawful authority for use if such person is not the person for whom the immigration document was issued or designed,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(b) MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS.—Any person who, during any 3-year period, knowingly—

“(1) and without lawful authority produces, issues, or transfers 10 or more immigration documents;

“(2) forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes 10 or more immigration documents;

“(3) secures, possesses, uses, buys, sells, or distributes 10 or more immigration documents, knowing the immigration documents to be forged, counterfeited, altered, stolen, falsely made, procured by fraud, or produced or issued without lawful authority; or

“(4) completes, mails, prepares, presents, signs, or submits 10 or more immigration documents knowing the documents to contain any materially false statement or representation,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) IMMIGRATION DOCUMENT MATERIALS.—

Any person who knowingly and without lawful authority produces, counterfeits, secures, possesses, or uses any official paper, seal, hologram, image, text, symbol, stamp, engraving, plate, or other material, used to make an immigration document shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

**“§ 1547. Marriage fraud**

“(a) EVASION OR MISREPRESENTATION.—Any person who—

“(1) knowingly enters into a marriage for the purpose of evading any provision of the immigration laws; or

“(2) knowingly misrepresents the existence or circumstances of a marriage—

“(A) in an application or document authorized by the immigration laws; or

“(B) during any immigration proceeding conducted by an administrative adjudicator (including an immigration officer or examiner, a consular officer, an immigration judge, or a member of the Board of Immigration Appeals),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) MULTIPLE MARRIAGES.—Any person who—

“(1) knowingly enters into 2 or more marriages for the purpose of evading any immigration law; or

“(2) knowingly arranges, supports, or facilitates 2 or more marriages designed or intended to evade any immigration law,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE.—Any person who knowingly establishes a commercial enterprise for the purpose of evading any provision of the immigration laws shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

“(d) DURATION OF OFFENSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An offense under subsection (a) or (b) continues until the fraudulent nature of the marriage or marriages is discovered by an immigration officer.

“(2) COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE.—An offense under subsection (c) continues until the fraudulent nature of commercial enterprise is discovered by an immigration officer or other law enforcement officer.

**“§ 1548. Attempts and conspiracies**

“Any person who attempts or conspires to violate any section of this chapter shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completed a violation of that section.

**“§ 1549. Alternative penalties for certain offenses**

“(a) TERRORISM.—Any person who violates any section of this chapter—

“(1) knowing that such violation will facilitate an act of international terrorism or

domestic terrorism (as those terms are defined in section 2331); or

“(2) with the intent to facilitate an act of international terrorism or domestic terrorism,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 25 years, or both.

“(b) OFFENSE AGAINST GOVERNMENT.—Any person who violates any section of this chapter—

“(1) knowing that such violation will facilitate the commission of any offense against the United States (other than an offense in this chapter) or against any State, which offense is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year; or

“(2) with the intent to facilitate the commission of any offense against the United States (other than an offense in this chapter) or against any State, which offense is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

#### “§ 1550. Seizure and forfeiture

“(a) FORFEITURE.—Any property, real or personal, used to commit or facilitate the commission of a violation of any section of this chapter, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

“(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Seizures and forfeitures under this section shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General.

#### “§ 1551. Additional jurisdiction

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who commits an offense under this chapter within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States shall be punished as provided under this chapter.

“(b) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—Any person who commits an offense under this chapter outside the United States shall be punished as provided under this chapter if—

“(1) the offense involves a United States immigration document (or any document purporting to be such a document) or any matter, right, or benefit arising under or authorized by Federal immigration laws;

“(2) the offense is in or affects foreign commerce;

“(3) the offense affects, jeopardizes, or poses a significant risk to the lawful administration of Federal immigration laws, or the national security of the United States;

“(4) the offense is committed to facilitate an act of international terrorism (as defined in section 2331) or a drug trafficking crime (as defined in section 929(a)(2)) that affects or would affect the national security of the United States;

“(5) the offender is a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22))) or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of such Act); or

“(6) the offender is a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States.

#### “§ 1552. Additional venue

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An offense under section 1542 may be prosecuted in—

“(1) any district in which the false statement or representation was made;

“(2) any district in which the passport application was prepared, submitted, mailed, received, processed, or adjudicated; or

“(3) in the case of an application prepared and adjudicated outside the United States, in the district in which the resultant passport was produced.

“(b) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section limits the venue otherwise available under sections 3237 and 3238.

#### “§ 1553. Definitions

“As used in this chapter:

“(1) The term ‘falsely make’ means to prepare or complete an immigration document with knowledge or in reckless disregard of the fact that the document—

“(A) contains a statement or representation that is false, fictitious, or fraudulent;

“(B) has no basis in fact or law; or

“(C) otherwise fails to state a fact which is material to the purpose for which the document was created, designed, or submitted.

“(2) The term a ‘false statement or representation’ includes a personation or an omission.

“(3) The term ‘felony’ means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

“(4) The term ‘immigration document’—

“(A) means—

“(i) any passport or visa; or

“(ii) any application, petition, affidavit, declaration, attestation, form, identification card, alien registration document, employment authorization document, border crossing card, certificate, permit, order, license, stamp, authorization, grant of authority, or other evidentiary document, arising under or authorized by the immigration laws of the United States; and

“(B) includes any document, photograph, or other piece of evidence attached to or submitted in support of an immigration document.

“(5) The term ‘immigration laws’ includes—

“(A) the laws described in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17));

“(B) the laws relating to the issuance and use of passports; and

“(C) the regulations prescribed under the authority of any law described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(6) The term ‘immigration proceeding’ includes an adjudication, interview, hearing, or review.

“(7) A person does not exercise ‘lawful authority’ if the person abuses or improperly exercises lawful authority the person otherwise holds.

“(8) The term ‘passport’ means a travel document attesting to the identity and nationality of the bearer that is issued under the authority of the Secretary of State, a foreign government, or an international organization; or any instrument purporting to be the same.

“(9) The term ‘produce’ means to make, prepare, assemble, issue, print, authenticate, or alter.

“(10) The term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

#### “§ 1554. Authorized law enforcement activities

“Nothing in this chapter shall prohibit any lawfully authorized investigative, protective, or intelligence activity of a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, or an intelligence agency of the United States, or any activity authorized under title V of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 933).

#### “§ 1555. Exception for refugees, asylees, and other vulnerable persons

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If a person believed to have violated section 1542, 1544, 1546, or 1548 while attempting to enter the United States, without delay, indicates an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or 241(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158 and 1231), or for relief under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (in accordance with section 208.17 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations), or under section 101(a)(15)(T), 101(a)(15)(U), 101(a)(27)(J), 101(a)(51), 216(c)(4)(C), 240A(b)(2), or 244(a)(3) (as in effect prior to March 31, 1997) of such Act, or a credible fear of persecution or torture—

“(1) the person shall be referred to an appropriate Federal immigration official to review such claim and make a determination if such claim is warranted;

“(2) if the Federal immigration official determines that the person qualifies for the claimed relief, the person shall not be considered to have violated any such section; and

“(3) if the Federal immigration official determines that the person does not qualify for the claimed relief, the person shall be referred to an appropriate Federal official for prosecution under this chapter.

“(b) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish, increase, or alter the obligations of refugees or the United States under article 31(1) of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1951 (as made applicable by the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York January 31, 1967 (19 UST 6223)).”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters in title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 75 and inserting the following:

#### “75. Passport, visa, and immigration fraud ..... 1541”.

(b) PROTECTION FOR LEGITIMATE REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS.—Section 208 (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROTECTION FOR LEGITIMATE REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall develop binding prosecution guidelines for federal prosecutors to ensure that any prosecution of an alien seeking entry into the United States by fraud is consistent with the written terms and limitations of Article 31(1) of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1951 (as made applicable by the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York January 31, 1967 (19 UST 6223)).”

#### SEC. 209. INADMISSIBILITY AND REMOVAL FOR PASSPORT AND IMMIGRATION FRAUD OFFENSES.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2)(A)(i) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “, or” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III) a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any provision of chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code.”

(b) REMOVAL.—Section 237(a)(3)(B)(iii) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(3)(B)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) of a violation of any provision of chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to proceedings pending on or after the date

of the enactment of this Act, with respect to conduct occurring on or after that date.

**SEC. 210. INCARCERATION OF CRIMINAL ALIENS.**

(a) **INSTITUTIONAL REMOVAL PROGRAM.**—

(1) **CONTINUATION.**—The Secretary shall continue to operate the Institutional Removal Program (referred to in this section as the “Program”) or shall develop and implement another program to—

(A) identify removable criminal aliens in Federal and State correctional facilities;

(B) ensure that such aliens are not released into the community; and

(C) remove such aliens from the United States after the completion of their sentences.

(2) **EXPANSION.**—The Secretary may extend the scope of the Program to all States.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION FOR DETENTION AFTER COMPLETION OF STATE OR LOCAL PRISON SENTENCE.**—Law enforcement officers of a State or political subdivision of a State may—

(1) hold an illegal alien for a period not to exceed 14 days after the completion of the alien’s State prison sentence to effectuate the transfer of the alien to Federal custody if the alien is removable or not lawfully present in the United States; or

(2) issue a detainer that would allow aliens who have served a State prison sentence to be detained by the State prison until authorized employees of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement can take the alien into custody.

(c) **TECHNOLOGY USAGE.**—Technology, such as videoconferencing, shall be used to the maximum extent practicable to make the Program available in remote locations. Mobile access to Federal databases of aliens, such as IDENT, and live scan technology shall be used to the maximum extent practicable to make these resources available to State and local law enforcement agencies in remote locations.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the participation of States in the Program and in any other program authorized under subsection (a).

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary in each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out the Program.

**SEC. 211. ENCOURAGING ALIENS TO DEPART VOLUNTARILY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 240B (8 U.S.C. 1229c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

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

“(1) **INSTEAD OF REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**—If an alien is not described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or (4) of section 237(a), the Secretary of Homeland Security may permit the alien to voluntarily depart the United States at the alien’s own expense under this subsection instead of being subject to proceedings under section 240.”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(D) by adding after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**—If an alien is not described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or (4) of section 237(a), the Attorney General may permit the alien to voluntarily depart the United States at the alien’s own expense under this subsection after the initiation of removal proceedings under section 240 and before the conclusion of such proceedings before an immigration judge.”;

(E) in paragraph (3), as redesignated—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) **INSTEAD OF REMOVAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (C), permission to voluntarily depart under paragraph (1) shall not be valid for any period in excess of 120 days. The Secretary may require an alien permitted to voluntarily depart under paragraph (1) to post a voluntary departure bond, to be surrendered upon proof that the alien has departed the United States within the time specified.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as paragraphs (C), (D), and (E), respectively;

(iii) by adding after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) **BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**—Permission to voluntarily depart under paragraph (2) shall not be valid for any period in excess of 60 days, and may be granted only after a finding that the alien has the means to depart the United States and intends to do so. An alien permitted to voluntarily depart under paragraph (2) shall post a voluntary departure bond, in an amount necessary to ensure that the alien will depart, to be surrendered upon proof that the alien has departed the United States within the time specified. An immigration judge may waive the requirement to post a voluntary departure bond in individual cases upon a finding that the alien has presented compelling evidence that the posting of a bond will pose a serious financial hardship and the alien has presented credible evidence that such a bond is unnecessary to guarantee timely departure.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraphs (C) and(D)(ii)” and inserting “subparagraphs (D) and (E)(ii)”;

(v) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (B)” each place that term appears and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(vi) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (B)” each place that term appears and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(F) in paragraph (4), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2)”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “a period exceeding 60 days” and inserting “any period in excess of 45 days”;

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

“(c) **CONDITIONS ON VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE.**—

“(1) **VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE AGREEMENT.**—Voluntary departure may only be granted as part of an affirmative agreement by the alien. A voluntary departure agreement under subsection (b) shall include a waiver of the right to any further motion, appeal, application, petition, or petition for review relating to removal or relief or protection from removal.

“(2) **CONCESSIONS BY THE SECRETARY.**—In connection with the alien’s agreement to depart voluntarily under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security may agree to a reduction in the period of inadmissibility under subparagraph (A) or (B)(i) of section 212(a)(9).

“(3) **ADVISALS.**—Agreements relating to voluntary departure granted during removal proceedings under section 240, or at the conclusion of such proceedings, shall be presented on the record before the immigration judge. The immigration judge shall advise the alien of the consequences of a voluntary departure agreement before accepting such agreement.

“(4) **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AGREEMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If an alien agrees to voluntary departure under this section and fails

to depart the United States within the time allowed for voluntary departure or fails to comply with any other terms of the agreement (including failure to timely post any required bond), the alien is—

“(i) ineligible for the benefits of the agreement;

“(ii) subject to the penalties described in subsection (d); and

“(iii) subject to an alternate order of removal if voluntary departure was granted under subsection (a)(2) or (b).

“(B) **EFFECT OF FILING TIMELY APPEAL.**—If, after agreeing to voluntary departure, the alien files a timely appeal of the immigration judge’s decision granting voluntary departure, the alien may pursue the appeal instead of the voluntary departure agreement. Such appeal operates to void the alien’s voluntary departure agreement and the consequences of such agreement, but precludes the alien from another grant of voluntary departure while the alien remains in the United States.

“(5) **VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE PERIOD NOT AFFECTED.**—Except as expressly agreed to by the Secretary in writing in the exercise of the Secretary’s discretion before the expiration of the period allowed for voluntary departure, no motion, appeal, application, petition, or petition for review shall affect, reinstate, enjoin, delay, stay, or toll the alien’s obligation to depart from the United States during the period agreed to by the alien and the Secretary.”;

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

“(d) **PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO DEPART.**—If an alien is permitted to voluntarily depart under this section and fails to voluntarily depart from the United States within the time period specified or otherwise violates the terms of a voluntary departure agreement, the alien will be subject to the following penalties:

“(1) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—The alien shall be liable for a civil penalty of \$3,000. The order allowing voluntary departure shall specify the amount of the penalty, which shall be acknowledged by the alien on the record. If the Secretary thereafter establishes that the alien failed to depart voluntarily within the time allowed, no further procedure will be necessary to establish the amount of the penalty, and the Secretary may collect the civil penalty at any time thereafter and by whatever means provided by law. An alien will be ineligible for any benefits under this chapter until this civil penalty is paid.

“(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR RELIEF.**—The alien shall be ineligible during the time the alien remains in the United States and for a period of 10 years after the alien’s departure for any further relief under this section and sections 240A, 245, 248, and 249. The order permitting the alien to depart voluntarily shall inform the alien of the penalties under this subsection.

“(3) **REOPENING.**—The alien shall be ineligible to reopen the final order of removal that took effect upon the alien’s failure to depart, or upon the alien’s other violations of the conditions for voluntary departure, during the period described in paragraph (2). This paragraph does not preclude a motion to reopen to seek withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) or protection against torture, if the motion—

“(A) presents material evidence of changed country conditions arising after the date of the order granting voluntary departure in the country to which the alien would be removed; and

“(B) makes a sufficient showing to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien is otherwise eligible for such protection.”; and

(5) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) PRIOR GRANT OF VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE.—An alien shall not be permitted to voluntarily depart under this section if the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General previously permitted the alien to depart voluntarily.

“(2) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary may promulgate regulations to limit eligibility or impose additional conditions for voluntary departure under subsection (a)(1) for any class of aliens. The Secretary or Attorney General may by regulation limit eligibility or impose additional conditions for voluntary departure under subsections (a)(2) or (b) of this section for any class or classes of aliens.”; and

(6) in subsection (f), by adding at the end the following: “Notwithstanding section 242(a)(2)(D) of this Act, sections 1361, 1651, and 2241 of title 28, United States Code, any other habeas corpus provision, and any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), no court shall have jurisdiction to affect, reinstate, enjoin, delay, stay, or toll the period allowed for voluntary departure under this section.”.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to provide for the imposition and collection of penalties for failure to depart under section 240B(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c(d)).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to all orders granting voluntary departure under section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c) made on or after the date that is 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(6) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any petition for review which is filed on or after such date.

**SEC. 212. DETERRING ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED FROM REMAINING IN THE UNITED STATES UNLAWFULLY.**

(a) INADMISSIBLE ALIENS.—Section 212(a)(9)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “seeks admission within 5 years of the date of such removal (or within 20 years)” and inserting “seeks admission not later than 5 years after the date of the alien’s removal (or not later than 20 years after the alien’s removal”); and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien’s departure or removal (or within 20 years of)” and inserting “seeks admission not later than 10 years after the date of the alien’s departure or removal (or not later than 20 years after”.

(b) BAR ON DISCRETIONARY RELIEF.—Section 274D (9 U.S.C. 324d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Commissioner” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless a timely motion to reopen is granted under section 240(c)(6), an alien described in subsection (a) shall be ineligible for any discretionary relief from removal (including cancellation of removal and adjustment of status) during the time the alien remains in the United States and for a period of 10 years after the alien’s departure from the United States.

“(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall preclude a motion to reopen to seek withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) or protection against torture, if the motion—

“(A) presents material evidence of changed country conditions arising after the date of the final order of removal in the country to which the alien would be removed; and

“(B) makes a sufficient showing to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien is otherwise eligible for such protection.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to aliens who are subject to a final order of removal entered on or after such date.

**SEC. 213. PROHIBITION OF THE SALE OF FIREARMS TO, OR THE POSSESSION OF FIREARMS BY CERTAIN ALIENS.**

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(y)(2)” and all that follows and inserting “(y), is in a nonimmigrant classification; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) has been paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5));”;

(2) in subsection (g)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(y)(2)” and all that follows and inserting “(y), is in a nonimmigrant classification; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) has been paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5));”.

(3) in subsection (y)—

(A) in the header, by striking “ADMITTED UNDER NONIMMIGRANT VISAS” and inserting “IN A NONIMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) the term ‘nonimmigrant classification’ includes all classes of nonimmigrant aliens described in section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), or otherwise described in the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of such Act).”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “has been lawfully admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa” and inserting “is in a nonimmigrant classification”; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “Any individual who has been admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa may receive a waiver from the requirements of subsection (g)(5)” and inserting “Any alien in a nonimmigrant classification may receive a waiver from the requirements of subsection (g)(5)(B)”.

**SEC. 214. UNIFORM STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND PEONAGE OFFENSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3291 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**“§ 3291. Immigration, naturalization, and peonage offenses**

“No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for a violation of any section of chapters 69 (relating to nationality and citizenship offenses), 75 (relating to passport, visa, and immigration offenses), or 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons), for an attempt or conspiracy to violate any such section, for a violation of any criminal provision under section 243, 266, 274, 275, 276, 277, or 278 of the Immigration

and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253, 1306, 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, and 1328), or for an attempt or conspiracy to violate any such section, unless the indictment is returned or the information filed not later than 10 years after the commission of the offense.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3291 and inserting the following:

“3291. Immigration, naturalization, and peonage offenses.”.

**SEC. 215. DIPLOMATIC SECURITY SERVICE.**

Section 2709(a)(1) of title 22, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) conduct investigations concerning—

“(A) illegal passport or visa issuance or use;

“(B) identity theft or document fraud affecting or relating to the programs, functions, and authorities of the Department of State;

“(C) violations of chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code; and

“(D) Federal offenses committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 7(9) of title 18, United States Code);”.

**SEC. 216. FIELD AGENT ALLOCATION AND BACKGROUND CHECKS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103 (8 U.S.C. 1103) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

“(f) MINIMUM NUMBER OF AGENTS IN STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall allocate to each State—

“(A) not fewer than 40 full-time active duty agents of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement to—

“(i) investigate immigration violations; and

“(ii) ensure the departure of all removable aliens; and

“(B) not fewer than 15 full-time active duty agents of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services to carry out immigration and naturalization adjudication functions.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) for any State with a population of less than 2,000,000, as most recently reported by the Bureau of the Census”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriate background and security checks, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be completed and assessed and any suspected or alleged fraud relating to the granting of any status (including the granting of adjustment of status), relief, protection from removal, or other benefit under this Act shall be investigated and resolved before the Secretary or the Attorney General may—

“(1) grant or order the grant of adjustment of status of an alien to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(2) grant or order the grant of any other status, relief, protection from removal, or other benefit under the immigration laws; or

“(3) issue any documentation evidencing or related to such grant by the Secretary, the Attorney General, or any court.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 217. CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title III (8 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**SEC. 362. CONSTRUCTION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act or in any other provision of law shall be construed to require the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, or any other authorized head of any Federal agency to grant any application, approve any petition, or grant or continue any status or benefit under the immigration laws by, to, or on behalf of—

“(1) any alien described in subparagraph (A)(i), (A)(iii), (B), or (F) of section 212(a)(3) or subparagraph (A)(i), (A)(iii), or (B) of section 237(a)(4);

“(2) any alien with respect to whom a criminal or other investigation or case is pending that is material to the alien’s inadmissibility, deportability, or eligibility for the status or benefit sought; or

“(3) any alien for whom all law enforcement checks, as deemed appropriate by such authorized official, have not been conducted and resolved.

“(b) DENIAL; WITHHOLDING.—An official described in subsection (a) may deny or withhold (with respect to an alien described in subsection (a)(1)) or withhold pending resolution of the investigation, case, or law enforcement checks (with respect to an alien described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a)) any such application, petition, status, or benefit on such basis.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 361 the following: “Sec. 362. Construction.”

**SEC. 218. STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PROCESSING CRIMINAL ILLEGAL ALIENS.—The Secretary shall reimburse States and units of local government for costs associated with processing undocumented criminal aliens through the criminal justice system, including—

- (1) indigent defense;
- (2) criminal prosecution;
- (3) autopsies;
- (4) translators and interpreters; and
- (5) courts costs.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) PROCESSING CRIMINAL ILLEGAL ALIENS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$400,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2012 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) COMPENSATION UPON REQUEST.—Section 241(i)(5) (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry this subsection—

- “(A) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007;
- “(B) \$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- “(C) \$850,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and
- “(D) \$950,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2012.”

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1365) is amended by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

**SEC. 219. TRANSPORTATION AND PROCESSING OF ILLEGAL ALIENS APPREHENDED BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient transportation and officers to take illegal aliens apprehended by State and local law enforcement officers into custody for processing at a detention facility operated by the Department.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 220. REDUCING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND ALIEN SMUGGLING ON TRIBAL LANDS.**

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may award grants to Indian tribes with lands adjacent to an international border of the United States that have been adversely affected by illegal immigration.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

- (1) law enforcement activities;
- (2) health care services;
- (3) environmental restoration; and
- (4) the preservation of cultural resources.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that—

- (1) describes the level of access of Border Patrol agents on tribal lands;
- (2) describes the extent to which enforcement of immigration laws may be improved by enhanced access to tribal lands;
- (3) contains a strategy for improving such access through cooperation with tribal authorities; and
- (4) identifies grants provided by the Department for Indian tribes, either directly or through State or local grants, relating to border security expenses.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 221. ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of—

- (1) the effectiveness of alternatives to detention, including electronic monitoring devices and intensive supervision programs, in ensuring alien appearance at court and compliance with removal orders;
- (2) the effectiveness of the Intensive Supervision Appearance Program and the costs and benefits of expanding that program to all States; and
- (3) other alternatives to detention, including—
  - (A) release on an order of recognizance;
  - (B) appearance bonds; and
  - (C) electronic monitoring devices.

**SEC. 222. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**

Section 101(a)(43)(P) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(P)) is amended—

- (1) by striking “(i) which either is falsely making, forging, counterfeiting, mutilating, or altering a passport or instrument in violation of section 1543 of title 18, United States Code, or is described in section 1546(a) of such title (relating to document fraud) and (ii)” and inserting “which is described in chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, and”; and
- (2) by inserting the following: “that is not described in section 1548 of such title (relating to increased penalties), and” after “first offense”.

**SEC. 223. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) CLARIFYING ADDRESS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 265 (8 U.S.C. 1305) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
  - (A) by striking “notify the Attorney General in writing” and inserting “submit written or electronic notification to the Secretary of Homeland Security, in a manner approved by the Secretary,”;
  - (B) by striking “the Attorney General may require by regulation” and inserting “the Secretary may require”; and
  - (C) by adding at the end the following: “If the alien is involved in proceedings before an immigration judge or in an administrative appeal of such proceedings, the alien shall submit to the Attorney General the alien’s

current address and a telephone number, if any, at which the alien may be contacted.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears and inserting “Secretary”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “given to such parent” and inserting “given by such parent”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) ADDRESS TO BE PROVIDED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary under paragraph (2), an address provided by an alien under this section shall be the alien’s current residential mailing address, and shall not be a post office box or other non-residential mailing address or the address of an attorney, representative, labor organization, or employer.

“(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may provide specific requirements with respect to—

- “(A) designated classes of aliens and special circumstances, including aliens who are employed at a remote location; and
- “(B) the reporting of address information by aliens who are incarcerated in a Federal, State, or local correctional facility.

“(3) DETENTION.—An alien who is being detained by the Secretary under this Act is not required to report the alien’s current address under this section during the time the alien remains in detention, but shall be required to notify the Secretary of the alien’s address under this section at the time of the alien’s release from detention.

“(e) USE OF MOST RECENT ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE ALIEN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide for the appropriate coordination and cross referencing of address information provided by an alien under this section with other information relating to the alien’s address under other Federal programs, including—

“(A) any information pertaining to the alien, which is submitted in any application, petition, or motion filed under this Act with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Labor;

“(B) any information available to the Attorney General with respect to an alien in a proceeding before an immigration judge or an administrative appeal or judicial review of such proceeding;

“(C) any information collected with respect to nonimmigrant foreign students or exchange program participants under section 641 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1372); and

“(D) any information collected from State or local correctional agencies pursuant to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

“(2) RELIANCE.—The Secretary may rely on the most recent address provided by the alien under this section or section 264 to send to the alien any notice, form, document, or other matter pertaining to Federal immigration laws, including service of a notice to appear. The Attorney General and the Secretary may rely on the most recent address provided by the alien under section 239(a)(1)(F) to contact the alien about pending removal proceedings.

“(3) OBLIGATION.—The alien’s provision of an address for any other purpose under the Federal immigration laws does not excuse the alien’s obligation to submit timely notice of the alien’s address to the Secretary under this section (or to the Attorney General under section 239(a)(1)(F) with respect to an alien in a proceeding before an immigration judge or an administrative appeal of such proceeding).”



(b) CONFORMING CHANGES WITH RESPECT TO REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter 7 of title II (8 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 262(c), by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in section 263(a), by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(3) in section 264—

(A) in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) by striking “Attorney General is authorized” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security and Attorney General are authorized”;

(ii) by striking “Attorney General or the Service” and inserting “Secretary or the Attorney General”.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 266 (8 U.S.C. 1306) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE OF ALIEN’S CURRENT ADDRESS.—

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Any alien or any parent or legal guardian in the United States of any minor alien who fails to notify the Secretary of Homeland Security of the alien’s current address in accordance with section 265 shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

“(2) EFFECT ON IMMIGRATION STATUS.—Any alien who violates section 265 (regardless of whether the alien is punished under paragraph (1)) and does not establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such failure was reasonably excusable or was not willful shall be taken into custody in connection with removal of the alien. If the alien has not been inspected or admitted, or if the alien has failed on more than 1 occasion to submit notice of the alien’s current address as required under section 265, the alien may be presumed to be a flight risk. The Secretary or the Attorney General, in considering any form of relief from removal which may be granted in the discretion of the Secretary or the Attorney General, may take into consideration the alien’s failure to comply with section 265 as a separate negative factor. If the alien failed to comply with the requirements of section 265 after becoming subject to a final order of removal, deportation, or exclusion, the alien’s failure shall be considered as a strongly negative factor with respect to any discretionary motion for reopening or reconsideration filed by the alien.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting “or a notice of current address” before “containing statements”;

(3) in subsections (c) and (d), by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to proceedings initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1)(A), (1)(B), (2) and (3) of subsection (a) are effective as if enacted on March 1, 2003.

#### SEC. 224. STATE AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 287(g) (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: “If such training is provided by a State or political subdivision of a State to an officer or employee of such State or po-

litical subdivision of a State, the cost of such training (including applicable overtime costs) shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “The cost of any equipment required to be purchased under such written agreement and necessary to perform the functions under this subsection shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

#### SEC. 225. REMOVAL OF DRUNK DRIVERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(43)(F) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(F)) is amended by inserting “, including a third drunk driving conviction, regardless of the States in which the convictions occurred or whether the offenses are classified as misdemeanors or felonies under State law,” after “offense”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to convictions entered before, on, or after such date.

#### SEC. 226. MEDICAL SERVICES IN UNDERSERVED AREAS.

Section 220(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) is amended by striking “and before June 1, 2006.”.

#### SEC. 227. EXPEDITED REMOVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 238 (8 U.S.C. 1228) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting “EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF CRIMINAL ALIENS”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking the subsection heading and inserting: “EXPEDITED REMOVAL FROM CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.—”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking the subsection heading and inserting: “REMOVAL OF CRIMINAL ALIENS.—”;

(4) in subsection (b), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may, in the case of an alien described in paragraph (2), determine the deportability of such alien and issue an order of removal pursuant to the procedures set forth in this subsection or section 240.

“(2) ALIENS DESCRIBED.—An alien is described in this paragraph if the alien—

“(A) has not been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; and

“(B) was convicted of any criminal offense described in subparagraph (A)(iii), (C), or (D) of section 237(a)(2).”;

(5) in the subsection (c) that relates to presumption of deportability, by striking “convicted of an aggravated felony” and inserting “described in subsection (b)(2)”;

(6) by redesignating the subsection (c) that relates to judicial removal as subsection (d); and

(7) in subsection (d)(5) (as so redesignated), by striking “, who is deportable under this Act.”.

(b) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ALIENS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii) (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security” each place it appears; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subclauses (I) and (II), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall apply clauses (i) and (ii) of this subparagraph to any alien (other than an alien described in subparagraph (F)) who

is not a national of a country contiguous to the United States, who has not been admitted or paroled into the United States, and who is apprehended within 100 miles of an international land border of the United States and within 14 days of entry.”.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Section 235(b)(1)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(F)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and who arrives by aircraft at a port of entry” and inserting “and—”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) who arrives by aircraft at a port of entry; or

“(ii) who is present in the United States and arrived in any manner at or between a port of entry.”.

(c) LIMIT ON INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Section 242(f)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1252(f)(2)) is amended by inserting “or stay, whether temporarily or otherwise,” after “enjoin”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to all aliens apprehended or convicted on or after such date.

#### SEC. 228. PROTECTING IMMIGRANTS FROM CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS.

(a) IMMIGRANTS.—Section 204(a)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “Any” and inserting “Except as provided in clause (vii), any”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

“(vii) Clause (i) shall not apply to a citizen of the United States who has been convicted of an offense described in subparagraph (A), (I), or (K) of section 101(a)(43), unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the Secretary’s sole and unreviewable discretion, determines that the citizen poses no risk to the alien with respect to whom a petition described in clause (i) is filed.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(A) by striking “Any alien” and inserting the following: “(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), any alien”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) Subclause (I) shall not apply in the case of an alien admitted for permanent residence who has been convicted of an offense described in subparagraph (A), (I), or (K) of section 101(a)(43), unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the Secretary’s sole and unreviewable discretion, determines that the alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence poses no risk to the alien with respect to whom a petition described in subclause (I) is filed.”.

(b) NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 101(a)(15)(K) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K)), is amended by inserting “(other than a citizen described in section 204(a)(1)(A)(vii))” after “citizen of the United States” each place that phrase appears.

#### SEC. 229. LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS AND TRANSFER TO FEDERAL CUSTODY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 240C the following new section:

#### “SEC. 240D. LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS AND TRANSFER OF ALIENS TO FEDERAL CUSTODY.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, law enforcement personnel of a State, or a political subdivision of a State, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody (including the transportation across State lines to detention centers) an alien for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the criminal provisions of the immigration

laws of the United States in the normal course of carrying out the law enforcement duties of such personnel. This State authority has never been displaced or preempted by a Federal law.

“(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require law enforcement personnel of a State or a political subdivision to assist in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

“(c) TRANSFER.—If the head of a law enforcement entity of a State (or, if appropriate, a political subdivision of the State) exercising authority with respect to the apprehension or arrest of an alien submits a request to the Secretary of Homeland Security that the alien be taken into Federal custody, the Secretary of Homeland Security—

“(1) shall—

“(A) deem the request to include the inquiry to verify immigration status described in section 642(c) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(c)), and expeditiously inform the requesting entity whether such individual is an alien lawfully admitted to the United States or is otherwise lawfully present in the United States; and

“(B) if the individual is an alien who is not lawfully admitted to the United States or otherwise is not lawfully present in the United States—

“(i) take the illegal alien into the custody of the Federal Government not later than 72 hours after—

“(I) the conclusion of the State charging process or dismissal process; or

“(II) the illegal alien is apprehended, if no State charging or dismissal process is required; or

“(ii) request that the relevant State or local law enforcement agency temporarily detain or transport the alien to a location for transfer to Federal custody; and

“(2) shall designate at least 1 Federal, State, or local prison or jail or a private contracted prison or detention facility within each State as the central facility for that State to transfer custody of aliens to the Department of Homeland Security.

“(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall reimburse a State, or a political subdivision of a State, for expenses, as verified by the Secretary, incurred by the State or political subdivision in the detention and transportation of an alien as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1).

“(2) COST COMPUTATION.—Compensation provided for costs incurred under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1) shall be—

“(A) the product of—

“(i) the average daily cost of incarceration of a prisoner in the relevant State, as determined by the chief executive officer of a State (or, as appropriate, a political subdivision of the State); multiplied by

“(ii) the number of days that the alien was in the custody of the State or political subdivision; plus

“(B) the cost of transporting the alien from the point of apprehension or arrest to the location of detention, and if the location of detention and of custody transfer are different, to the custody transfer point; plus

“(C) the cost of uncompensated emergency medical care provided to a detained alien during the period between the time of transmittal of the request described in subsection (c) and the time of transfer into Federal custody.

“(e) REQUIREMENT FOR APPROPRIATE SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that—

“(1) aliens incarcerated in a Federal facility pursuant to this section are held in fa-

cilities which provide an appropriate level of security; and

“(2) if practicable, aliens detained solely for civil violations of Federal immigration law are separated within a facility or facilities.

“(f) REQUIREMENT FOR SCHEDULE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a regular circuit and schedule for the prompt transportation of apprehended aliens from the custody of those States, and political subdivisions of States, which routinely submit requests described in subsection (c), into Federal custody.

“(g) AUTHORITY FOR CONTRACTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with appropriate State and local law enforcement and detention agencies to implement this section.

“(2) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—Prior to entering into a contract or cooperative agreement with a State or political subdivision of a State under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall determine whether the State, or if appropriate, the political subdivision in which the agencies are located, has in place any formal or informal policy that violates section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373). The Secretary shall not allocate any of the funds made available under this section to any State or political subdivision that has in place a policy that violates such section.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DETENTION AND TRANSPORTATION TO FEDERAL CUSTODY OF ALIENS NOT LAWFULLY PRESENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$850,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and each subsequent fiscal year for the detention and removal of aliens not lawfully present in the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et. seq.).

**SEC. 230. LAUNDERING OF MONETARY INSTRUMENTS.**

Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “section 1590 (relating to trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” after “section 1363 (relating to destruction of property within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction),”; and

(2) by inserting “section 274(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)) (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens),” after “section 590 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1590) (relating to aviation smuggling).”.

**SEC. 231. LISTING OF IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.**

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice the information that the Secretary has or maintains related to any alien—

(A) against whom a final order of removal has been issued;

(B) who enters into a voluntary departure agreement, or is granted voluntary departure by an immigration judge, whose period for departure has expired under subsection (a)(3) of section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c) (as amended by section 211(a)(1)(C)), subsection (b)(2) of such section 240B, or who has violated a condition of a voluntary departure agreement under such section 240B;

(C) whom a Federal immigration officer has confirmed to be unlawfully present in the United States; and

(D) whose visa has been revoked.

(2) REMOVAL OF INFORMATION.—The head of the National Crime Information Center should promptly remove any information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to an alien who is granted lawful authority to enter or remain legally in the United States.

(3) PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF ERRONEOUS INFORMATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the head of the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice, shall develop and implement a procedure by which an alien may petition the Secretary or head of the National Crime Information Center, as appropriate, to remove any erroneous information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien. Under such procedures, failure by the alien to receive notice of a violation of the immigration laws shall not constitute cause for removing information provided by the Secretary under paragraph (1) related to such alien, unless such information is erroneous. Notwithstanding the 180-day time period set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not provide the information required under paragraph (1) until the procedures required by this paragraph are developed and implemented.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.—Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records of violations of the immigration laws of the United States; and”.

**SEC. 232. COOPERATIVE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.**

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall negotiate and execute, where practicable, a cooperative enforcement agreement described in section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) with at least 1 law enforcement agency in each State, to train law enforcement officers in the detection and apprehension of individuals engaged in transporting, harboring, sheltering, or encouraging aliens in violation of section 274 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1324).

**SEC. 233. INCREASE OF FEDERAL DETENTION SPACE AND THE UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES IDENTIFIED FOR CLOSURES AS A RESULT OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990.**

(a) CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF DETENTION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct or acquire, in addition to existing facilities for the detention of aliens, 20 detention facilities in the United States that have the capacity to detain a combined total of not less than 10,000 individuals at any time for aliens detained pending removal or a decision on removal of such aliens from the United States.

(2) DETERMINATION OF LOCATION.—The location of any detention facility built or acquired in accordance with this subsection shall be determined with the concurrence of the Secretary by the senior officer responsible for Detention and Removal Operations in the Department. The detention facilities shall be located so as to enable the officers and employees of the Department to increase to the maximum extent practicable the annual rate and level of removals of illegal aliens from the United States.

(3) USE OF INSTALLATIONS UNDER BASE CLOSURE LAWS.—In acquiring detention facilities

under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the transfer of appropriate portions of military installations approved for closure or realignment under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) for use in accordance with paragraph (1).

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 241(g)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1231(g)(1)) is amended by striking “may expend” and inserting “shall expend”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

**SEC. 234. DETERMINATION OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF INDIVIDUALS CHARGED WITH FEDERAL OFFENSES.**

(a) RESPONSIBILITY OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the office of the United States Attorney that is prosecuting a criminal case in a Federal court—

(1) shall determine, not later than 30 days after filing the initial pleadings in the case, whether each defendant in the case is lawfully present in the United States (subject to subsequent legal proceedings to determine otherwise);

(2)(A) if the defendant is determined to be an alien lawfully present in the United States, shall notify the court in writing of the determination and the current status of the alien under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

(B) if the defendant is determined not to be lawfully present in the United States, shall notify the court in writing of the determination, the defendant's alien status, and, to the extent possible, the country of origin or legal residence of the defendant; and

(3) ensure that the information described in paragraph (2) is included in the case file and the criminal records system of the office of the United States attorney.

(b) GUIDELINES.—A determination made under subsection (a)(1) shall be made in accordance with guidelines of the Executive Office for Immigration Review of the Department of Justice.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FEDERAL COURTS.—

(1) MODIFICATIONS OF RECORDS AND CASE MANagements SYSTEMS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, all Federal courts that hear criminal cases, or appeals of criminal cases, shall modify their criminal records and case management systems, in accordance with guidelines which the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish, so as to enable accurate reporting of information described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) DATA ENTRIES.—Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal court described in paragraph (1) shall enter into its electronic records the information contained in each notification to the court under subsection (a)(2).

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to provide a basis for admitting evidence to a jury or releasing information to the public regarding an alien's immigration status.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall include, in the annual report filed with Congress under section 604 of title 28, United States Code—

(1) statistical information on criminal trials of aliens in the courts and criminal convictions of aliens in the lower courts and upheld on appeal, including the type of crime in each case and including information on the legal status of the aliens; and

(2) recommendations on whether additional court resources are needed to accom-

modate the volume of criminal cases brought against aliens in the Federal courts.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

**TITLE III—UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS**

**SEC. 301. UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 274A (8 U.S.C. 1324a) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 274A. UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.**

“(a) MAKING EMPLOYMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS UNLAWFUL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful for an employer—

“(A) to hire, or to recruit or refer for a fee, an alien for employment in the United States knowing, or with reason to know, that the alien is an unauthorized alien with respect to such employment; or

“(B) to hire, or to recruit or refer for a fee, for employment in the United States an individual unless such employer meets the requirements of subsections (c) and (d).

“(2) CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT.—It is unlawful for an employer, after lawfully hiring an alien for employment, to continue to employ the alien in the United States knowing or with reason to know that the alien is (or has become) an unauthorized alien with respect to such employment.

“(3) USE OF LABOR THROUGH CONTRACT.—In this section, an employer who uses a contract, subcontract, or exchange, entered into, renegotiated, or extended after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, to obtain the labor of an alien in the United States knowing, or with reason to know, that the alien is an unauthorized alien with respect to performing such labor, shall be considered to have hired the alien for employment in the United States in violation of paragraph (1)(A).

“(4) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION OF UNLAWFUL HIRING.—If the Secretary determines that an employer has hired more than 10 unauthorized aliens during a calendar year, a rebuttable presumption is created for the purpose of a civil enforcement proceeding, that the employer knew or had reason to know that such aliens were unauthorized.

“(5) DEFENSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an employer that establishes that the employer has complied in good faith with the requirements of subsections (c) and (d) has established an affirmative defense that the employer has not violated paragraph (1)(A) with respect to such hiring, recruiting, or referral.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Until the date that an employer is required to participate in the Electronic Employment Verification System under subsection (d) or is permitted to participate in such System on a voluntary basis, the employer may establish an affirmative defense under subparagraph (A) without a showing of compliance with subsection (d).

“(b) ORDER OF INTERNAL REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE CERTIFICATION.—If the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that an employer has failed to comply with this section, the Secretary is authorized, at any time, to require that the employer certify that the employer is in compliance with this section, or has instituted a program to come into compliance.

“(2) CONTENT OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date an employer receives a request for a certification under paragraph (1) the chief executive officer or

similar official of the employer shall certify under penalty of perjury that—

“(A) the employer is in compliance with the requirements of subsections (c) and (d); or

“(B) that the employer has instituted a program to come into compliance with such requirements.

“(3) EXTENSION.—The 60-day period referred to in paragraph (2), may be extended by the Secretary for good cause, at the request of the employer.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary is authorized to publish in the Federal Register standards or methods for certification and for specific record-keeping practices with respect to such certification, and procedures for the audit of any records related to such certification.

“(c) DOCUMENT VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—An employer hiring, or recruiting or referring for a fee, an individual for employment in the United States shall take all reasonable steps to verify that the individual is eligible for such employment. Such steps shall include meeting the requirements of subsection (d) and the following paragraphs:

“(1) ATTESTATION BY EMPLOYER.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The employer shall attest, under penalty of perjury and on a form prescribed by the Secretary, that the employer has verified the identity and eligibility for employment of the individual by examining—

“(I) a document described in subparagraph (B); or

“(II) a document described in subparagraph (C) and a document described in subparagraph (D).

“(ii) SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS.—An attestation required by clause (i) may be manifested by a handwritten or electronic signature.

“(iii) STANDARDS FOR EXAMINATION.—An employer has complied with the requirement of this paragraph with respect to examination of documentation if, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable person would conclude that the document examined is genuine and establishes the individual's identity and eligibility for employment in the United States.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY SYSTEM PARTICIPANTS.—A participant in the Electronic Employment Verification System established under subsection (d), regardless of whether such participation is voluntary or mandatory, shall be permitted to utilize any technology that is consistent with this section and with any regulation or guidance from the Secretary to streamline the procedures to comply with the attestation requirement, and to comply with the employment eligibility verification requirements contained in this section.

“(B) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING BOTH EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY AND IDENTITY.—A document described in this subparagraph is an individual's—

“(i) United States passport; or

“(ii) permanent resident card or other document designated by the Secretary, if the document—

“(I) contains a photograph of the individual and such other personal identifying information relating to the individual that the Secretary proscribes in regulations is sufficient for the purposes of this subparagraph;

“(II) is evidence of eligibility for employment in the United States; and

“(III) contains security features to make the document resistant to tampering, counterfeiting, and fraudulent use.

“(C) DOCUMENTS EVIDENCING EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY.—A document described in this subparagraph is an individual's—

“(i) social security account number card issued by the Commissioner of Social Security (other than a card which specifies on its face that the issuance of the card does not authorize employment in the United States); or

“(ii) any other documents evidencing eligibility of employment in the United States, if—

“(I) the Secretary has published a notice in the Federal Register stating that such document is acceptable for purposes of this subparagraph; and

“(II) contains security features to make the document resistant to tampering, counterfeiting, and fraudulent use.

“(D) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING IDENTITY OF INDIVIDUAL.—A document described in this subparagraph is an individual’s—

“(i) driver’s license or identity card issued by a State, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or an outlying possession of the United States that complies with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (division B of Public Law 109-13; 119 Stat. 302);

“(ii) driver’s license or identity card issued by a State, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or an outlying possession of the United States that is not in compliance with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005, if the license or identity card—

“(I) is not required by the Secretary to comply with such requirements; and

“(II) contains the individual’s photograph or information, including the individual’s name, date of birth, gender, and address; and

“(iii) identification card issued by a Federal agency or department, including a branch of the Armed Forces, or an agency, department, or entity of a State, or a Native American tribal document, provided that such card or document—

“(I) contains the individual’s photograph or information including the individual’s name, date of birth, gender, eye color, and address; and

“(II) contains security features to make the card resistant to tampering, counterfeiting, and fraudulent use; or

“(iv) in the case of an individual who is under 16 years of age who is unable to present a document described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii), a document of personal identity of such other type that—

“(I) the Secretary determines is a reliable means of identification; and

“(II) contains security features to make the document resistant to tampering, counterfeiting, and fraudulent use.

“(E) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—

“(i) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary finds that a document or class of documents described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) is not reliable to establish identity or eligibility for employment (as the case may be) or is being used fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary is authorized to prohibit, or impose conditions, on the use of such document or class of documents for purposes of this subsection.

“(ii) REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish notice of any findings under clause (i) in the Federal Register.

“(2) ATTESTATION OF EMPLOYEE.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The individual shall attest, under penalty of perjury on the form prescribed by the Secretary, that the individual is a national of the United States, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who is authorized under this Act or by the Secretary to be hired, recruited or referred for a fee, in the United States.

“(ii) SIGNATURE FOR EXAMINATION.—An attestation required by clause (i) may be manifested by a handwritten or electronic signature.

“(B) PENALTIES.—An individual who falsely represents that the individual is eligible for employment in the United States in an attestation required by subparagraph (A) shall, for each such violation, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, a term of imprisonment not to exceed 3 years, or both.

“(3) RETENTION OF ATTESTATION.—An employer shall retain a paper, microfiche, microfilm, or electronic version of an attestation submitted under paragraph (1) or (2) for an individual and make such attestations available for inspection by an officer of the Department of Homeland Security, any other person designated by the Secretary, the Special Counsel for Immigration-Related Unfair Employment Practices of the Department of Justice, or the Secretary of Labor during a period beginning on the date of the hiring, or recruiting or referring for a fee, of the individual and ending—

“(A) in the case of the recruiting or referral for a fee (without hiring) of an individual, 7 years after the date of the recruiting or referral; or

“(B) in the case of the hiring of an individual the later of—

“(i) 7 years after the date of such hiring;

“(ii) 1 year after the date the individual’s employment is terminated; or

“(iii) in the case of an employer or class of employers, a period that is less than the applicable period described in clause (i) or (ii) if the Secretary reduces such period for such employer or class of employers.

“(4) DOCUMENT RETENTION AND RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) RETENTION OF DOCUMENTS.—An employer shall retain, for the applicable period described in paragraph (3), the following documents:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the employer shall copy all documents presented by an individual pursuant to this subsection and shall retain paper, microfiche, microfilm, or electronic copies of such documents. Such copies shall reflect the signature of the employer and the individual and the date of receipt of such documents.

“(ii) USE OF RETAINED DOCUMENTS.—An employer shall use copies retained under clause (i) only for the purposes of complying with the requirements of this subsection, except as otherwise permitted under law.

“(B) RETENTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY CORRESPONDENCE.—The employer shall maintain records related to an individual of any no-match notice from the Commissioner of Social Security regarding the individual’s name or corresponding social security account number and the steps taken to resolve each issue described in the no-match notice.

“(C) RETENTION OF CLARIFICATION DOCUMENTS.—The employer shall maintain records of any actions and copies of any correspondence or action taken by the employer to clarify or resolve any issue that raises reasonable doubt as to the validity of the individual’s identity or eligibility for employment in the United States.

“(D) RETENTION OF OTHER RECORDS.—The Secretary may require that an employer retain copies of additional records related to the individual for the purposes of this section.

“(5) PENALTIES.—An employer that fails to comply with the requirement of this subsection shall be subject to the penalties described in subsection (e)(4)(B).

“(6) NO AUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize, directly or

indirectly, the issuance, use, or establishment of a national identification card.

“(d) ELECTRONIC EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION SYSTEM.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT FOR SYSTEM.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall implement an Electronic Employment Verification System (referred to in this subsection as the ‘System’) as described in this subsection.

“(2) MANAGEMENT OF SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, through the System—

“(i) provide a response to an inquiry made by an employer through the Internet or other electronic media or over a telephone line regarding an individual’s identity and eligibility for employment in the United States;

“(ii) establish a set of codes to be provided through the System to verify such identity and authorization; and

“(iii) maintain a record of each such inquiry and the information and codes provided in response to such inquiry.

“(B) INITIAL RESPONSE.—Not later than 3 days after an employer submits an inquiry to the System regarding an individual, the Secretary shall provide, through the System, to the employer—

“(i) if the System is able to confirm the individual’s identity and eligibility for employment in the United States, a confirmation notice, including the appropriate codes on such confirmation notice; or

“(ii) if the System is unable to confirm the individual’s identity or eligibility for employment in the United States, a tentative nonconfirmation notice, including the appropriate codes for such nonconfirmation notice.

“(C) VERIFICATION PROCESS IN CASE OF A TENTATIVE NONCONFIRMATION NOTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a tentative nonconfirmation notice is issued under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than 10 days after the date an individual submits information to contest such notice under paragraph (7)(C)(ii)(III), the Secretary, through the System, shall issue a final confirmation notice or a final nonconfirmation notice to the employer, including the appropriate codes for such notice.

“(ii) DEVELOPMENT OF PROCESS.—The Secretary shall consult with the Commissioner of Social Security to develop a verification process to be used to provide a final confirmation notice or a final nonconfirmation notice under clause (i).

“(D) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF SYSTEM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall design and operate the System—

“(i) to maximize reliability and ease of use by employers in a manner that protects and maintains the privacy and security of the information maintained in the System;

“(ii) to respond to each inquiry made by an employer; and

“(iii) to track and record any occurrence when the System is unable to receive such an inquiry;

“(iv) to include appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information;

“(v) to allow for monitoring of the use of the System and provide an audit capability; and

“(vi) to have reasonable safeguards, developed in consultation with the Attorney General, to prevent employers from engaging in unlawful discriminatory practices, based on national origin or citizenship status.

“(E) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall establish a reliable, secure method to provide through the

System, within the time periods required by subparagraphs (B) and (C)—

“(i) a determination of whether the name and social security account number provided in an inquiry by an employer match such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm the validity of the information provided;

“(ii) a determination of whether such social security account number was issued to the named individual;

“(iii) a determination of whether such social security account number is valid for employment in the United States; and

“(iv) a confirmation notice or a nonconfirmation notice under subparagraph (B) or (C), in a manner that ensures that other information maintained by the Commissioner is not disclosed or released to employers through the System.

“(F) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall establish a reliable, secure method to provide through the System, within the time periods required by subparagraphs (B) and (C)—

“(i) a determination of whether the name and alien identification or authorization number provided in an inquiry by an employer match such information maintained by the Secretary in order to confirm the validity of the information provided;

“(ii) a determination of whether such number was issued to the named individual;

“(iii) a determination of whether the individual is authorized to be employed in the United States; and

“(iv) any other related information that the Secretary may require.

“(G) UPDATING INFORMATION.—The Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary shall update the information maintained in the System in a manner that promotes maximum accuracy and shall provide a process for the prompt correction of erroneous information.

“(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION.—Except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), the Secretary shall require employers to participate in the System as follows:

“(A) CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—

“(i) REQUIRED PARTICIPATION.—As of the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall require any employer or class of employers to participate in the System, with respect to employees hired by the employer prior to, on, or after such date of enactment, if the Secretary determines, in the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion, such employer or class of employer is—

“(I) part of the critical infrastructure of the United States; or

“(II) directly related to the national security or homeland security of the United States.

“(ii) DISCRETIONARY PARTICIPATION.—As of the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary may require an additional employer or class of employers to participate in the System with respect to employees hired on or after such date if the Secretary designates such employer or class of employers, in the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion, as a critical employer based on immigration enforcement or homeland security needs.

“(B) LARGE EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall require an employer with 5,000 or more employees in the United States to participate in the System, with respect to all employees hired by the employer after the date the Secretary requires such participation.

“(C) MIDSIZED EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall require an employer with less than 5,000 employees and with 1,000 or more employees in the United States to participate in the System, with respect to all employees hired by the employer after the date the Secretary requires such participation.

“(D) SMALL EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall require all employers with less than 1,000 employees and with 250 or more employees in the United States to participate in the System, with respect to all employees hired by the employer after the date the Secretary requires such participation.

“(E) REMAINING EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall require all employers in the United States to participate in the System, with respect to all employees hired by an employer after the date the Secretary requires such participation.

“(F) REQUIREMENT TO PUBLISH.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the requirements for participation in the System as described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) prior to the effective date of such requirements.

“(4) OTHER PARTICIPATION IN SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the Secretary has the authority, in the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion—

“(A) to permit any employer that is not required to participate in the System under paragraph (3) to participate in the System on a voluntary basis; and

“(B) to require any employer that is required to participate in the System under paragraph (3) with respect to newly hired employees to participate in the System with respect to all employees hired by the employer prior to, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that the employer has engaged in violations of the immigration laws.

“(5) WAIVER.—The Secretary is authorized to waive or delay the participation requirements of paragraph (3) with respect to any employer or class of employers if the Secretary provides notice to Congress of such waiver prior to the date such waiver is granted.

“(6) CONSEQUENCE OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—If an employer is required to participate in the System and fails to comply with the requirements of the System with respect to an individual—

“(A) such failure shall be treated as a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section with respect to such individual; and

“(B) a rebuttable presumption is created that the employer has violated subsection (a)(1)(A) of this section, however such presumption may not apply to a prosecution under subsection (f)(1).

“(7) SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer that participates in the System, with respect to the hiring, or recruiting or referring for a fee, any individual for employment in the United States, shall—

“(i) obtain from the individual and record on the form designated by the Secretary—

“(I) the individual's social security account number; and

“(II) in the case of an individual who does not attest that the individual is a national of the United States under subsection (c)(2), such identification or authorization number that the Secretary shall require; and

“(ii) retain the original of such form and make such form available for inspection for the periods and in the manner described in subsection (c)(3).

“(B) SEEKING VERIFICATION.—The employer shall submit an inquiry through the System to seek confirmation of the individual's identity and eligibility for employment in the United States—

“(i) not later than 3 working days (or such other reasonable time as may be specified by the Secretary of Homeland Security) after the date of the hiring, or recruiting or referring for a fee, of the individual (as the case may be); or

“(ii) in the case of an employee hired prior to the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, at such time as the Secretary shall specify.

“(C) CONFIRMATION OR NONCONFIRMATION.—

“(i) CONFIRMATION UPON INITIAL INQUIRY.—If an employer receives a confirmation notice under paragraph (2)(B)(i) for an individual, the employer shall record, on the form specified by the Secretary, the appropriate code provided in such notice.

“(ii) NONCONFIRMATION AND VERIFICATION.—

“(I) NONCONFIRMATION.—If an employer receives a tentative nonconfirmation notice under paragraph (2)(B)(ii) for an individual, the employer shall inform such individual of the issuances of such notice in writing and the individual may contest such nonconfirmation notice.

“(II) NO CONTEST.—If the individual does not contest the tentative nonconfirmation notice under subclause (I) within 10 days of receiving notice from the individual's employer, the notice shall become final and the employer shall record on the form specified by the Secretary, the appropriate code provided in the nonconfirmation notice.

“(III) CONTEST.—If the individual contests the tentative nonconfirmation notice under subclause (I), the individual shall submit appropriate information to contest such notice to the System within 10 days of receiving notice from the individual's employer and shall utilize the verification process developed under paragraph (2)(C)(ii).

“(IV) EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF TENTATIVE NONCONFIRMATION.—A tentative nonconfirmation notice shall remain in effect until a final such notice becomes final under clause (II) or a final confirmation notice or final nonconfirmation notice is issued by the System.

“(V) PROHIBITION ON TERMINATION.—An employer may not terminate the employment of an individual based on a tentative nonconfirmation notice until such notice becomes final under clause (II) or a final nonconfirmation notice is issued for the individual by the System. Nothing in this clause shall apply to a termination of employment for any reason other than because of such a failure.

“(VI) RECORDING OF CONCLUSION ON FORM.—If a final confirmation or nonconfirmation is provided by the System regarding an individual, the employer shall record on the form designated by the Secretary the appropriate code that is provided under the System to indicate a confirmation or nonconfirmation of the identity and employment eligibility of the individual.

“(D) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—

“(i) TERMINATION OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.—If the employer has received a final nonconfirmation regarding an individual, the employer shall terminate the employment, recruitment, or referral of the individual. Such employer shall provide to the Secretary any information relating to the nonconfirmed individual that the Secretary determines would assist the Secretary in enforcing or administering the immigration laws. If the employer continues to employ,

recruit, or refer the individual after receiving final nonconfirmation, a rebuttable presumption is created that the employer has violated subsections (a)(1)(A) and (a)(2). Such presumption may not apply to a prosecution under subsection (f)(1).

“(8) PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.—No employer that participates in the System shall be liable under any law for any employment-related action taken with respect to an individual in good faith reliance on information provided by the System.

“(9) LIMITATION ON USE OF THE SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in this subsection shall be construed to permit or allow any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States to utilize any information, database, or other records used in the System for any purpose other than as provided for under this subsection.

“(10) MODIFICATION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, after notice is submitted to Congress and provided to the public in the Federal Register, is authorized to modify the requirements of this subsection, including requirements with respect to completion of forms, method of storage, attestations, copying of documents, signatures, methods of transmitting information, and other operational and technical aspects to improve the efficiency, accuracy, and security of the System.

“(11) FEES.—The Secretary is authorized to require any employer participating in the System to pay a fee or fees for such participation. The fees may be set at a level that will recover the full cost of providing the System to all participants. The fees shall be deposited and remain available as provided in subsection (m) and (n) of section 286 and the System is providing an immigration adjudication and naturalization service for purposes of section 286(n).

“(12) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the capacity, systems integrity, and accuracy of the System.

“(e) COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) COMPLAINTS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures—

“(A) for individuals and entities to file complaints regarding potential violations of subsection (a);

“(B) for the investigation of those complaints that the Secretary deems it appropriate to investigate; and

“(C) for the investigation of such other violations of subsection (a), as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

“(2) AUTHORITY IN INVESTIGATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting investigations and hearings under this subsection, officers and employees of the Department of Homeland Security—

“(i) shall have reasonable access to examine evidence of any employer being investigated; and

“(ii) if designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, may compel by subpoena the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence at any designated place in an investigation or case under this subsection.

“(B) FAILURE TO COOPERATE.—In case of refusal to obey a subpoena lawfully issued under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary may request that the Attorney General apply in an appropriate district court of the United States for an order requiring compliance with such subpoena, and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as contempt.

“(C) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—The Secretary of Labor shall have the investigative authority provided under section 11(a) of the

Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(a)) to ensure compliance with the provisions of this title, or any regulation or order issued under this title.

“(3) COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES.—

“(A) PREPENALTY NOTICE.—If the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that there has been a violation of a requirement of this section and determines that further proceedings related to such violation are warranted, the Secretary shall issue to the employer concerned a written notice of the Secretary's intention to issue a claim for a fine or other penalty. Such notice shall—

“(i) describe the violation;

“(ii) specify the laws and regulations allegedly violated;

“(iii) disclose the material facts which establish the alleged violation; and

“(iv) inform such employer that the employer shall have a reasonable opportunity to make representations as to why a claim for a monetary or other penalty should not be imposed.

“(B) REMISSION OR MITIGATION OF PENALTIES.—

“(i) PETITION BY EMPLOYER.—Whenever any employer receives written notice of a fine or other penalty in accordance with subparagraph (A), the employer may file within 30 days from receipt of such notice, with the Secretary a petition for the remission or mitigation of such fine or penalty, or a petition for termination of the proceedings. The petition may include any relevant evidence or proffer of evidence the employer wishes to present, and shall be filed and considered in accordance with procedures to be established by the Secretary.

“(ii) REVIEW BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary finds that such fine or other penalty was incurred erroneously, or finds the existence of such mitigating circumstances as to justify the remission or mitigation of such fine or penalty, the Secretary may remit or mitigate such fine or other penalty on the terms and conditions as the Secretary determines are reasonable and just, or order termination of any proceedings related to the notice. Such mitigating circumstances may include good faith compliance and participation in, or agreement to participate in, the System, if not otherwise required.

“(iii) APPLICABILITY.—This subparagraph may not apply to an employer that has or is engaged in a pattern or practice of violations of paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (2) of subsection (a) or of any other requirements of this section.

“(C) PENALTY CLAIM.—After considering evidence and representations offered by the employer pursuant to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall determine whether there was a violation and promptly issue a written final determination setting forth the findings of fact and conclusions of law on which the determination is based and the appropriate penalty.

“(4) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

“(A) HIRING OR CONTINUING TO EMPLOY UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS.—Any employer that violates any provision of paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of subsection (a) shall pay civil penalties as follows:

“(i) Pay a civil penalty of not less than \$500 and not more than \$4,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to each such violation.

“(ii) If the employer has previously been fined 1 time under this subparagraph, pay a civil penalty of not less than \$4,000 and not more than \$10,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to each such violation.

“(iii) If the employer has previously been fined more than 1 time under this subparagraph or has failed to comply with a previously issued and final order related to any such provision, pay a civil penalty of not less

than \$6,000 and not more than \$20,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to each such violation.

“(B) RECORD KEEPING OR VERIFICATION PRACTICES.—Any employer that violates or fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (b), (c), or (d), shall pay a civil penalty as follows:

“(i) Pay a civil penalty of not less than \$200 and not more than \$2,000 for each such violation.

“(ii) If the employer has previously been fined 1 time under this subparagraph, pay a civil penalty of not less than \$400 and not more than \$4,000 for each such violation.

“(iii) If the employer has previously been fined more than 1 time under this subparagraph or has failed to comply with a previously issued and final order related to such requirements, pay a civil penalty of \$6,000 for each such violation.

“(C) OTHER PENALTIES.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary may impose additional penalties for violations, including cease and desist orders, specially designed compliance plans to prevent further violations, suspended fines to take effect in the event of a further violation, and in appropriate cases, the civil penalty described in subsection (g)(2).

“(D) REDUCTION OF PENALTIES.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), the Secretary is authorized to reduce or mitigate penalties imposed upon employers, based upon factors including the employer's hiring volume, compliance history, good faith implementation of a compliance program, participation in a temporary worker program, and voluntary disclosure of violations of this subsection to the Secretary.

“(E) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—All penalties in this section may be adjusted every 4 years to account for inflation, as provided by law.

“(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—An employer adversely affected by a final determination may, within 45 days after the date the final determination is issued, file a petition in the Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit for review of the order. The filing of a petition as provided in this paragraph shall stay the Secretary's determination until entry of judgment by the court. The burden shall be on the employer to show that the final determination was not supported by substantial evidence. The Secretary is authorized to require that the petitioner provide, prior to filing for review, security for payment of fines and penalties through bond or other guarantee of payment acceptable to the Secretary.

“(6) ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS.—If an employer fails to comply with a final determination issued against that employer under this subsection, and the final determination is not subject to review as provided in paragraph (5), the Attorney General may file suit to enforce compliance with the final determination in any appropriate district court of the United States. In any such suit, the validity and appropriateness of the final determination shall not be subject to review.

“(f) CRIMINAL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIONS FOR PATTERN OR PRACTICE VIOLATIONS.—

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—An employer that engages in a pattern or practice of knowing violations of subsection (a)(1)(A) or (a)(2) shall be fined not more than \$20,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to whom such a violation occurs, imprisoned for not more than 6 months for the entire pattern or practice, or both.

“(2) ENJOINING OF PATTERN OR PRACTICE VIOLATIONS.—If the Secretary or the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that an employer is engaged in a pattern or practice of employment, recruitment, or referral in violation of paragraph (1)(A) or (2)

of subsection (a), the Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States requesting such relief, including a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order against the employer, as the Secretary deems necessary.

“(g) PROHIBITION OF INDEMNITY BONDS.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—It is unlawful for an employer, in the hiring, recruiting, or referring for a fee, of an individual, to require the individual to post a bond or security, to pay or agree to pay an amount, or otherwise to provide a financial guarantee or indemnity, against any potential liability arising under this section relating to such hiring, recruiting, or referring of the individual.

“(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any employer which is determined, after notice and opportunity for mitigation of the monetary penalty under subsection (e), to have violated paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each violation and to an administrative order requiring the return of any amounts received in violation of such paragraph to the employee or, if the employee cannot be located, to the Employer Compliance Fund established under section 286(w).

“(h) PROHIBITION ON AWARD OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) EMPLOYERS WITH NO CONTRACTS, GRANTS, OR AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an employer who does not hold a Federal contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is determined by the Secretary to be a repeat violator of this section or is convicted of a crime under this section, the employer shall be debarred from the receipt of a Federal contract, grant, or cooperative agreement for a period of 2 years. The Secretary or the Attorney General shall advise the Administrator of General Services of such a debarment, and the Administrator of General Services shall list the employer on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs for a period of 2 years.

“(B) WAIVER.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary and the Attorney General, may waive operation of this subsection or may limit the duration or scope of the debarment.

“(2) EMPLOYERS WITH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, OR AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer who holds a Federal contract, grant, or cooperative agreement and is determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be a repeat violator of this section or is convicted of a crime under this section, shall be debarred from the receipt of Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements for a period of 2 years.

“(B) NOTICE TO AGENCIES.—Prior to debarring the employer under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall advise any agency or department holding a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with the employer of the Government's intention to debar the employer from the receipt of new Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements for a period of 2 years.

“(C) WAIVER.—After consideration of the views of any agency or department that holds a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with the employer, the Secretary may, in lieu of debarring the employer from the receipt of new Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements for a period of 2 years, waive operation of this subsection, limit the duration or scope of the debarment, or may refer to an appropriate lead agency the decision of whether to debar the employer, for what duration, and under what scope in accordance with the procedures and

standards prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation. However, any proposed debarment predicated on an administrative determination of liability for civil penalty by the Secretary or the Attorney General shall not be reviewable in any debarment proceeding. The decision of whether to debar or take alternation shall not be judicially reviewed.

“(3) SUSPENSION.—Indictments for violations of this section or adequate evidence of actions that could form the basis for debarment under this subsection shall be considered a cause for suspension under the procedures and standards for suspension prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(i) MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.—

“(1) DOCUMENTATION.—In providing documentation or endorsement of authorization of aliens (other than aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence) eligible to be employed in the United States, the Secretary shall provide that any limitations with respect to the period or type of employment or employer shall be conspicuously stated on the documentation or endorsement.

“(2) PREEMPTION.—The provisions of this section preempt any State or local law—

“(A) imposing civil or criminal sanctions (other than through licensing and similar laws) upon those who employ, or recruit or refer for a fee for employment, unauthorized aliens; or

“(B) requiring, as a condition of conducting, continuing, or expanding a business, that a business entity—

“(i) provide, build, fund, or maintain a shelter, structure, or designated area for use by day laborers at or near its place of business; or

“(ii) take other steps that facilitate the employment of day laborers by others.

“(j) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Except as otherwise specified, civil penalties collected under this section shall be deposited by the Secretary into the Employer Compliance Fund established under section 286(w).

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EMPLOYER.—The term ‘employer’ means any person or entity, including any entity of the Government of the United States, hiring, recruiting, or referring an individual for employment in the United States.

“(2) NO-MATCH NOTICE.—The term ‘no-match notice’ means written notice from the Commissioner of Social Security to an employer reporting earnings on a Form W-2 that an employee name or corresponding social security account number fail to match records maintained by the Commissioner.

“(3) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(4) UNAUTHORIZED ALIEN.—The term ‘unauthorized alien’ means, with respect to the employment of an alien at a particular time, that the alien is not at that time either—

“(A) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

“(B) authorized to be so employed by this Act or by the Secretary.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Sections 401, 402, 403, 404, and 405 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a) are repealed.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection or in subsection (d) of section 274A, as amended by subsection (a), may be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to allow or continue to allow the participation of employers who participated in the basic pilot program under such sections

401, 402, 403, 404, and 405 in the Electronic Employment Verification System established pursuant to such subsection (d).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 302. EMPLOYER COMPLIANCE FUND.**

Section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(w) EMPLOYER COMPLIANCE FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury, a separate account, which shall be known as the ‘Employer Compliance Fund’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fund’).

“(2) DEPOSITS.—There shall be deposited as offsetting receipts into the Fund all civil monetary penalties collected by the Secretary of Homeland Security under section 274A.

“(3) PURPOSE.—Amounts refunded to the Secretary from the Fund shall be used for the purposes of enhancing and enforcing employer compliance with section 274A.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited into the Fund shall remain available until expended and shall be refunded out of the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, at least on a quarterly basis, to the Secretary of Homeland Security.”

**SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL WORKSITE ENFORCEMENT AND FRAUD DETECTION AGENTS.**

(a) WORKSITE ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, annually increase, by not less than 2,000, the number of positions for investigators dedicated to enforcing compliance with sections 274 and 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324, and 1324a) during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) FRAUD DETECTION.—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, increase by not less than 1,000 the number of positions for agents of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement dedicated to immigration fraud detection during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

**SEC. 304. CLARIFICATION OF INELIGIBILITY FOR MISREPRESENTATION.**

Section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)(I) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(ii)(I)), is amended by striking “citizen” and inserting “national”.

**TITLE IV—NONIMMIGRANT AND IMMIGRANT VISA REFORM**

**Subtitle A—Temporary Guest Workers**

**SEC. 401. IMMIGRATION IMPACT STUDY.**

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any regulation that would increase the number of aliens who are eligible for legal status may not take effect before 90 days after the date on which the Director of the Bureau of the Census submits a report to Congress under subsection (c).

(b) STUDY.—The Director of the Bureau of the Census, jointly with the Secretary, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall undertake a study examining the impacts of the current and proposed annual grants of

legal status, including immigrant and non-immigrant status, along with the current level of illegal immigration, on the infrastructure of and quality of life in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of the Census shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the study required by subsection (b), including the following information:

(1) An estimate of the total legal and illegal immigrant populations of the United States, as they relate to the total population.

(2) The projected impact of legal and illegal immigration on the size of the population of the United States over the next 50 years, which regions of the country are likely to experience the largest increases, which small towns and rural counties are likely to lose their character as a result of such growth, and how the proposed regulations would affect these projections.

(3) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on the natural environment, including the consumption of non-renewable resources, waste production and disposal, the emission of pollutants, and the loss of habitat and productive farmland, an estimate of the public expenditures required to maintain current standards in each of these areas, the degree to which current standards will deteriorate if such expenditures are not forthcoming, and the additional effects the proposed regulations would have.

(4) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on employment and wage rates, particularly in industries such as agriculture and services in which the foreign born are concentrated, an estimate of the associated public costs, and the additional effects the proposed regulations would have.

(5) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on the need for additions and improvements to the transportation infrastructure of the United States, an estimate of the public expenditures required to meet this need, the impact on Americans' mobility if such expenditures are not forthcoming, and the additional effect the proposed regulations would have.

(6) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on enrollment, class size, teacher-student ratios, and the quality of education in public schools, an estimate of the public expenditures required to maintain current median standards, the degree to which those standards will deteriorate if such expenditures are not forthcoming, and the additional effect the proposed regulations would have.

(7) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on home ownership rates, housing prices, and the demand for low-income and subsidized housing, the public expenditures required to maintain current median standards in these areas, the degree to which those standards will deteriorate if such expenditures are not forthcoming, and the additional effect the proposed regulations would have.

(8) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on access to quality health care and on the cost of health care and health insurance, an estimate of the public expenditures required to maintain current median standards, the degree to which those standards will deteriorate if such expenditures are not forthcoming, and the additional effect the proposed regulations would have.

(9) The impact of the current and projected foreign-born populations on the criminal justice system in the United States, an estimate of the associated public costs, and the

additional effect the proposed regulations would have.

**SEC. 402. NONIMMIGRANT TEMPORARY WORKER.**

(a) TEMPORARY WORKER CATEGORY.—Section 101(a)(15)(H) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)) is amended to read as follows:

“(H) an alien—

“(i)(b) subject to section 212(j)(2)—

“(aa) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services (other than services described in clause (ii)(a) or subparagraph (O) or (P)) in a specialty occupation described in section 214(i)(1) or as a fashion model;

“(bb) who meets the requirements for the occupation specified in section 214(i)(2) or, in the case of a fashion model, is of distinguished merit and ability; and

“(cc) with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Homeland Security that the intending employer has filed an application with the Secretary in accordance with section 212(n)(1);

“(b1)(aa) who is entitled to enter the United States under the provisions of an agreement listed in section 214(g)(8)(A);

“(bb) who is engaged in a specialty occupation described in section 214(i)(3); and

“(cc) with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State that the intending employer has filed an attestation with the Secretary of Labor in accordance with section 212(t)(1); or

“(c)(aa) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services as a registered nurse;

“(bb) who meets the qualifications described in section 212(m)(1); and

“(cc) with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Homeland Security that an unexpired attestation is on file and in effect under section 212(m)(2) for the facility (as defined in section 212(m)(6)) for which the alien will perform the services; or

“(i)(a) who—

“(aa) has a residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning; and

“(bb) is coming temporarily to the United States to perform agricultural labor or services (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), including agricultural labor (as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), agriculture (as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f))), and the pressing of apples for cider on a farm, of a temporary or seasonal nature;

“(b) who—

“(aa) has a residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning;

“(bb) is coming temporarily to the United States to perform nonagricultural work or services of a temporary or seasonal nature (if unemployed persons capable of performing such work or services cannot be found in the United States), excluding medical school graduates coming to the United States to perform services as members of the medical profession; or

“(c) who—

“(aa) has a residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning;

“(bb) is coming temporarily to the United States to perform temporary labor or services other than the labor or services described in clause (i)(b), (i)(c), (ii)(a), or (iii), or subparagraph (L), (O), (P), or (R) (if unemployed persons capable of performing such labor or services cannot be found in the United States); and

“(cc) meets the requirements of section 218A, including the filing of a petition under such section on behalf of the alien;

“(iii) who—

“(a) has a residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning; and

“(b) is coming temporarily to the United States as a trainee (other than to receive graduate medical education or training) in a training program that is not designed primarily to provide productive employment; or

“(iv) who—

“(a) is the spouse or a minor child of an alien described in clause (iii); and

“(b) is accompanying or following to join such alien.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to aliens, who, on such effective date, are outside of the United States.

**SEC. 403. ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANT TEMPORARY GUEST WORKERS.**

(a) TEMPORARY GUEST WORKERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title II (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 218 the following:

**“SEC. 218A. ADMISSION OF H-2C NON-IMMIGRANTS.**

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of State may grant a temporary visa to an H-2C nonimmigrant who demonstrates an intent to perform labor or services in the United States (other than the labor or services described in clause (i)(b) or (ii)(a) of section 101(a)(15)(H) or subparagraph (L), (O), (P), or (R)) of section 101(a)(15).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION.—An alien shall be eligible for H-2C nonimmigrant status if the alien meets the following requirements:

“(1) ELIGIBILITY TO WORK.—The alien shall establish that the alien is capable of performing the labor or services required for an occupation under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c).

“(2) EVIDENCE OF EMPLOYMENT.—The alien shall establish that the alien has received a job offer from an employer who has complied with the requirements of 218B.

“(3) FEE.—The alien shall pay a \$500 visa issuance fee in addition to the cost of processing and adjudicating such application. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect consular procedures for charging reciprocal fees.

“(4) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—The alien shall undergo a medical examination (including a determination of immunization status), at the alien's expense, that conforms to generally accepted standards of medical practice.

“(5) APPLICATION CONTENT AND WAIVER.—

“(A) APPLICATION FORM.—The alien shall submit to the Secretary a completed application, on a form designed by the Secretary of Homeland Security, including proof of evidence of the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(B) CONTENT.—In addition to any other information that the Secretary requires to determine an alien's eligibility for H-2C nonimmigrant status, the Secretary shall require an alien to provide information concerning the alien's—

“(i) physical and mental health;

“(ii) criminal history and gang membership;

“(iii) immigration history; and

“(iv) involvement with groups or individuals that have engaged in terrorism, genocide, persecution, or who seek the overthrow of the United States Government.

“(C) KNOWLEDGE.—The alien shall include with the application submitted under this paragraph a signed certification in which the alien certifies that—



“(i) the alien has read and understands all of the questions and statements on the application form;

“(ii) the alien certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the application, and any evidence submitted with it, are all true and correct; and

“(iii) the applicant authorizes the release of any information contained in the application and any attached evidence for law enforcement purposes.

“(c) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In determining an alien’s admissibility as an H-2C nonimmigrant—

“(A) paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (7), (9)(B), and (9)(C) of section 212(a) may be waived for conduct that occurred before the effective date of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006;

“(B) the Secretary of Homeland Security may not waive the application of—

“(i) subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (E), (G), (H), or (I) of section 212(a)(2) (relating to criminals);

“(ii) section 212(a)(3) (relating to security and related grounds); or

“(iii) subparagraph (A), (C) or (D) of section 212(a)(10) (relating to polygamists and child abductors); and

“(C) for conduct that occurred before the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of any provision of section 212(a) not listed in subparagraph (B) on behalf of an individual alien—

“(i) for humanitarian purposes;

“(ii) to ensure family unity; or

“(iii) if such a waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

“(2) RENEWAL OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION AND SUBSEQUENT ADMISSIONS.—An alien seeking renewal of authorized admission or subsequent admission as an H-2C nonimmigrant shall establish that the alien is not inadmissible under section 212(a).

“(d) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall not admit, and the Secretary of State shall not issue a visa to, an alien seeking H-2C nonimmigrant status unless all appropriate background checks have been completed.

“(e) INELIGIBLE TO CHANGE NONIMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION.—An H-2C nonimmigrant may not change nonimmigrant classification under section 248.

“(f) PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—

“(1) AUTHORIZED PERIOD AND RENEWAL.—The initial period of authorized admission as an H-2C nonimmigrant shall be 3 years, and the alien may seek 1 extension for an additional 3-year period.

“(2) INTERNATIONAL COMMUTERS.—An alien who resides outside the United States and commutes into the United States to work as an H-2C nonimmigrant, is not subject to the time limitations under paragraph (1).

“(3) LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the period of authorized admission of an H-2C nonimmigrant shall terminate if the alien is unemployed for 60 or more consecutive days.

“(B) RETURN TO FOREIGN RESIDENCE.—Any alien whose period of authorized admission terminates under subparagraph (A) shall be required to leave the United States.

“(C) PERIOD OF VISA VALIDITY.—Any alien, whose period of authorized admission terminates under subparagraph (A), who leaves the United States under subparagraph (B), may reenter the United States as an H-2C nonimmigrant to work for an employer, if the alien has complied with the requirements of subsections (b) and (f)(2). The Secretary may, in the Secretary’s sole and unreviewable discretion, reauthorize such alien for admission as an H-2C non-

immigrant without requiring the alien’s departure from the United States.

“(4) VISITS OUTSIDE UNITED STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, an H-2C nonimmigrant—

“(i) may travel outside of the United States; and

“(ii) may be readmitted without having to obtain a new visa if the period of authorized admission has not expired.

“(B) EFFECT ON PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—Time spent outside the United States under subparagraph (A) shall not extend the period of authorized admission in the United States.

“(5) BARS TO EXTENSION OR ADMISSION.—An alien may not be granted H-2C nonimmigrant status, or an extension of such status, if—

“(A) the alien has violated any material term or condition of such status granted previously, including failure to comply with the change of address reporting requirements under section 265;

“(B) the alien is inadmissible as a nonimmigrant; or

“(C) the granting of such status or extension of such status would allow the alien to exceed 6 years as an H-2C nonimmigrant, unless the alien has resided and been physically present outside the United States for at least 1 year after the expiration of such H-2C nonimmigrant status.

“(g) EVIDENCE OF NONIMMIGRANT STATUS.—Each H-2C nonimmigrant shall be issued documentary evidence of nonimmigrant status, which—

“(1) shall be machine-readable, tamper-resistant, and allow for biometric authentication;

“(2) shall be designed in consultation with the Forensic Document Laboratory of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(3) shall, during the alien’s authorized period of admission under subsection (f), serve as a valid entry document for the purpose of applying for admission to the United States—

“(A) instead of a passport and visa if the alien—

“(i) is a national of a foreign territory contiguous to the United States; and

“(ii) is applying for admission at a land border port of entry; and

“(B) in conjunction with a valid passport, if the alien is applying for admission at an air or sea port of entry;

“(4) may be accepted during the period of its validity by an employer as evidence of employment authorization and identity under section 274A(b)(1)(B); and

“(5) shall be issued to the H-2C nonimmigrant by the Secretary of Homeland Security promptly after the final adjudication of such alien’s application for H-2C nonimmigrant status.

“(h) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO DEPART.—If an H-2C nonimmigrant fails to depart the United States before the date which is 10 days after the date that the alien’s authorized period of admission as an H-2C nonimmigrant terminates, the H-2C nonimmigrant may not apply for or receive any immigration relief or benefit under this Act or any other law, except for relief under sections 208 and 241(b)(3) and relief under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, for an alien who indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution or torture.

“(i) PENALTY FOR ILLEGAL ENTRY OR OVERSTAY.—Any alien who enters, attempts to enter, or crosses the border after the date of the enactment of this section, and is phys-

ically present in the United States after such date in violation of this Act or of any other Federal law, may not receive, for a period of 10 years—

“(1) any relief under sections 240A and 240B; or

“(2) nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15).

“(j) PORTABILITY.—A nonimmigrant alien described in this section, who was previously issued a visa or otherwise provided H-2C nonimmigrant status, may accept a new offer of employment with a subsequent employer, if—

“(1) the employer complies with section 218B; and

“(2) the alien, after lawful admission to the United States, did not work without authorization.

“(k) CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—An H-2C nonimmigrant shall comply with the change of address reporting requirements under section 265 through either electronic or paper notification.

“(l) COLLECTION OF FEES.—All fees collected under this section shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with section 286(c).

“(m) ISSUANCE OF H-4 NONIMMIGRANT VISAS FOR SPOUSE AND CHILDREN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The alien spouse and children of an H-2C nonimmigrant (referred to in this section as ‘dependent aliens’) who are accompanying or following to join the H-2C nonimmigrant may be issued nonimmigrant visas under section 101(a)(15)(H)(iv).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION.—A dependent alien is eligible for nonimmigrant status under 101(a)(15)(H)(iv) if the dependent alien meets the following requirements:

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The dependent alien is admissible as a nonimmigrant and does not fall within a class of aliens ineligible for H-4A nonimmigrant status listed under subsection (c).

“(B) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—Before a nonimmigrant visa is issued to a dependent alien under this subsection, the dependent alien may be required to submit to a medical examination (including a determination of immunization status) at the alien’s expense, that conforms to generally accepted standards of medical practice.

“(C) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Before a nonimmigrant visa is issued to a dependent alien under this section, the consular officer shall conduct such background checks as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, considers appropriate.

“(n) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and sections 218B, 218C, and 218D:

“(1) AGGRIEVED PERSON.—The term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person adversely affected by an alleged violation of this section, including—

“(A) a worker whose job, wages, or working conditions are adversely affected by the violation; and

“(B) a representative for workers whose jobs, wages, or working conditions are adversely affected by the violation who brings a complaint on behalf of such worker.

“(2) AREA OF EMPLOYMENT.—The terms ‘area of employment’ and ‘area of intended employment’ mean the area within normal commuting distance of the worksite or physical location at which the work of the temporary worker is or will be performed. If such worksite or location is within a Metropolitan Statistical Area, any place within such area is deemed to be within the area of employment.

“(3) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘eligible individual’ means, with respect to employment, an individual who is not an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 274A) with respect to that employment.

“(4) EMPLOY; EMPLOYEE; EMPLOYER.—The terms ‘employ’, ‘employee’, and ‘employer’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

“(5) FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTOR.—The term ‘foreign labor contractor’ means any person who for any compensation or other valuable consideration paid or promised to be paid, performs any foreign labor contracting activity.

“(6) FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTING ACTIVITY.—The term ‘foreign labor contracting activity’ means recruiting, soliciting, hiring, employing, or furnishing, an individual who resides outside of the United States for employment in the United States as a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c).

“(7) H-2C NONIMMIGRANT.—The term ‘H-2C nonimmigrant’ means a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c).

“(8) SEPARATION FROM EMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘separation from employment’ means the worker’s loss of employment, other than through a discharge for inadequate performance, violation of workplace rules, cause, voluntary departure, voluntary retirement, or the expiration of a grant or contract. The term does not include any situation in which the worker is offered, as an alternative to such loss of employment, a similar employment opportunity with the same employer at equivalent or higher compensation and benefits than the position from which the employee was discharged, regardless of whether the employee accepts the offer. Nothing in this paragraph shall limit an employee’s rights under a collective bargaining agreement or other employment contract.

“(9) UNITED STATES WORKER.—The term ‘United States worker’ means an employee who is—

“(A) a citizen or national of the United States; or

“(B) an alien who is—

“(i) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(ii) admitted as a refugee under section 207;

“(iii) granted asylum under section 208; or

“(iv) otherwise authorized, under this Act or by the Secretary of Homeland Security, to be employed in the United States.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218 the following:

“Sec. 218A. Admission of temporary H-2C workers.”.

(b) CREATION OF STATE IMPACT ASSISTANCE ACCOUNT.—Section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(x) STATE IMPACT ASSISTANCE ACCOUNT.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account, which shall be known as the ‘State Impact Aid Account’. Notwithstanding any other provision under this Act, there shall be deposited as offsetting receipts into the account all family supplemental visa and family supplemental extension of status fees collected under sections 218A and 218B.”.

#### SEC. 404. EMPLOYER OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 218A, as added by section 403, the following:

##### “SEC. 218B. EMPLOYER OBLIGATIONS.

“(a) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each employer who employs an H-2C nonimmigrant shall—

“(1) file a petition in accordance with subsection (b); and

“(2) pay the appropriate fee, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

“(b) PETITION.—A petition to hire an H-2C nonimmigrant under this section shall in-

clude an attestation by the employer of the following:

“(1) PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—The employment of an H-2C nonimmigrant—

“(A) will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed; and

“(B) did not and will not cause the separation from employment of a United States worker employed by the employer within the 180-day period beginning 90 days before the date on which the petition is filed.

“(2) WAGES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The H-2C nonimmigrant will be paid not less than the greater of—

“(i) the actual wage level paid by the employer to all other individuals with similar experience and qualifications for the specific employment in question; or

“(ii) the prevailing wage level for the occupational classification in the area of employment, taking into account experience and skill levels of employees.

“(B) CALCULATION.—The wage levels under subparagraph (A) shall be calculated based on the best information available at the time of the filing of the application.

“(C) PREVAILING WAGE LEVEL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the prevailing wage level shall be determined in accordance with this subparagraph. If the job opportunity is covered by a collective bargaining agreement between a union and the employer, the prevailing wage shall be the wage rate set forth in the collective bargaining agreement. If the job opportunity is not covered by such an agreement, and it is in an occupation that is covered by a wage determination under a provision of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, or the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the prevailing wage level shall be the appropriate statutory wage.

“(3) WORKING CONDITIONS.—All workers in the occupation at the place of employment at which the H-2C nonimmigrant will be employed will be provided the working conditions and benefits that are normal to workers similarly employed in the area of intended employment.

“(4) LABOR DISPUTE.—There is not a strike, lockout, or work stoppage in the course of a labor dispute in the occupation at the place of employment at which the H-2C nonimmigrant will be employed. If such strike, lockout, or work stoppage occurs following submission of the petition, the employer will provide notification in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor.

“(5) PROVISION OF INSURANCE.—If the position for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought is not covered by the State workers’ compensation law, the employer will provide, at no cost to the H-2C nonimmigrant, insurance covering injury and disease arising out of, and in the course of, the worker’s employment, which will provide benefits at least equal to those provided under the State workers’ compensation law for comparable employment.

“(6) NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The employer has provided notice of the filing of the petition to the bargaining representative of the employer’s employees in the occupational classification and area of employment for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought.

“(B) NO BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVE.—If there is no such bargaining representative, the employer has—

“(i) posted a notice of the filing of the petition in a conspicuous location at the place or places of employment for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought; or

“(ii) electronically disseminated such a notice to the employer’s employees in the oc-

cupational classification for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought.

“(7) RECRUITMENT.—Except where the Secretary of Labor has determined that there is a shortage of United States workers in the occupation and area of intended employment for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought—

“(A) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, and qualified, and who will be available at the time and place needed, to perform the labor or services involved in the petition; and

“(B) good faith efforts have been taken to recruit United States workers, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, which efforts included—

“(i) the completion of recruitment during the period beginning on the date that is 90 days before the date on which the petition was filed with the Department of Homeland Security and ending on the date that is 14 days before such filing date; and

“(ii) the actual wage paid by the employer for the occupation in the areas of intended employment was used in conducting recruitment.

“(8) INELIGIBILITY.—The employer is not currently ineligible from using the H-2C nonimmigrant program described in this section.

“(9) BONAFIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT.—The job for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought is a bona fide job—

“(A) for which the employer needs labor or services;

“(B) which has been and is clearly open to any United States worker; and

“(C) for which the employer will be able to place the H-2C nonimmigrant on the payroll.

“(10) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND RECORDS RETENTION.—A copy of each petition filed under this section and documentation supporting each attestation, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, will—

“(A) be provided to every H-2C nonimmigrant employed under the petition;

“(B) be made available for public examination at the employer’s place of business or work site;

“(C) be made available to the Secretary of Labor during any audit; and

“(D) remain available for examination for 5 years after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(11) NOTIFICATION UPON SEPARATION FROM OR TRANSFER OF EMPLOYMENT.—The employer will notify the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Homeland Security of an H-2C nonimmigrant’s separation from employment or transfer to another employer not more than 3 business days after the date of such separation or transfer, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(12) ACTUAL NEED FOR LABOR OR SERVICES.—The petition was filed not more than 60 days before the date on which the employer needed labor or services for which the H-2C nonimmigrant is sought.

“(c) AUDIT OF ATTESTATIONS.—

“(1) REFERRALS BY SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall refer all approved petitions for H-2C nonimmigrants to the Secretary of Labor for potential audit.

“(2) AUDITS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Labor may audit any approved petition referred pursuant to paragraph (1), in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor.

“(d) INELIGIBLE EMPLOYERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall not approve an employer’s petitions, applications, certifications, or attestations under any immigrant or nonimmigrant program if the Secretary of

Labor determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that the employer submitting such documents—

“(A) has, with respect to the attestations required under subsection (b)—

“(i) misrepresented a material fact;

“(ii) made a fraudulent statement; or

“(iii) failed to comply with the terms of such attestations; or

“(B) failed to cooperate in the audit process in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor.

“(2) LENGTH OF INELIGIBILITY.—An employer described in paragraph (1) shall be ineligible to participate in the labor certification programs of the Secretary of Labor for not less than the time period determined by the Secretary, not to exceed 3 years.

“(3) EMPLOYERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, the Secretary of Homeland Security may not approve any employer's petition under subsection (b) if the work to be performed by the H-2C nonimmigrant is located in a metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) in which the unemployment rate for unskilled and low-skilled workers during the most recently completed 6-month period averaged more than 11.0 percent.

“(e) REGULATION OF FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTORS.—

“(1) COVERAGE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an H-2C nonimmigrant may not be treated as an independent contractor.

“(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—An H-2C nonimmigrant shall not be denied any right or any remedy under Federal, State, or local labor or employment law that would be applicable to a United States worker employed in a similar position with the employer because of the alien's status as a nonimmigrant worker.

“(3) TAX RESPONSIBILITIES.—With respect to each employed H-2C nonimmigrant, an employer shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local tax and revenue laws.

“(f) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—It shall be unlawful for an employer or a labor contractor of an H-2C nonimmigrant to intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, retaliate, discharge, or in any other manner, discriminate against an employee or former employee because the employee or former employee—

“(1) discloses information to the employer or any other person that the employee or former employee reasonably believes demonstrates a violation of this Act; or

“(2) cooperates or seeks to cooperate in an investigation or other proceeding concerning compliance with the requirements of this Act.

“(g) LABOR RECRUITERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each employer that engages in foreign labor contracting activity and each foreign labor contractor shall ascertain and disclose, to each such worker who is recruited for employment at the time of the worker's recruitment—

“(A) the place of employment;

“(B) the compensation for the employment;

“(C) a description of employment activities;

“(D) the period of employment;

“(E) any other employee benefit to be provided and any costs to be charged for each benefit;

“(F) any travel or transportation expenses to be assessed;

“(G) the existence of any labor organizing effort, strike, lockout, or other labor dispute at the place of employment;

“(H) the existence of any arrangement with any owner, employer, foreign contractor, or its agent where such person receives a commission from the provision of items or services to workers;

“(I) the extent to which workers will be compensated through workers' compensation, private insurance, or otherwise for injuries or death, including—

“(i) work related injuries and death during the period of employment;

“(ii) the name of the State workers' compensation insurance carrier or the name of the policyholder of the private insurance;

“(iii) the name and the telephone number of each person who must be notified of an injury or death; and

“(iv) the time period within which such notice must be given;

“(J) any education or training to be provided or required, including—

“(i) the nature and cost of such training;

“(ii) the entity that will pay such costs; and

“(iii) whether the training is a condition of employment, continued employment, or future employment; and

“(K) a statement, in a form specified by the Secretary of Labor, describing the protections of this Act for workers recruited abroad.

“(2) FALSE OR MISLEADING INFORMATION.—No foreign labor contractor or employer who engages in foreign labor contracting activity shall knowingly provide material false or misleading information to any worker concerning any matter required to be disclosed in paragraph (1).

“(3) LANGUAGES.—The information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1) shall be provided in writing in English or, as necessary and reasonable, in the language of the worker being recruited. The Secretary of Labor shall make forms available in English, Spanish, and other languages, as necessary, which may be used in providing workers with information required under this section.

“(4) FEES.—A person conducting a foreign labor contracting activity shall not assess any fee to a worker for such foreign labor contracting activity.

“(5) TERMS.—No employer or foreign labor contractor shall, without justification, violate the terms of any agreement made by that contractor or employer regarding employment under this program.

“(6) TRAVEL COSTS.—If the foreign labor contractor or employer charges the employee for transportation such transportation costs shall be reasonable.

“(7) OTHER WORKER PROTECTIONS.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years, each employer shall notify the Secretary of Labor of the identity of any foreign labor contractor engaged by the employer in any foreign labor contractor activity for, or on behalf of, the employer.

“(B) REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No person shall engage in foreign labor recruiting activity unless such person has a certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor specifying the activities that such person is authorized to perform. An employer who retains the services of a foreign labor contractor shall only use those foreign labor contractors who are registered under this subparagraph.

“(i) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to establish an efficient electronic process for the investigation and approval of an application for a certificate of registration of foreign labor contractors not later than 14 days after such application is filed, including—

“(I) requirements under paragraphs (1), (4), and (5) of section 102 of the Migrant and Sea-

sonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1812);

“(II) an expeditious means to update registrations and renew certificates; and

“(III) any other requirements that the Secretary may prescribe.

“(iii) TERM.—Unless suspended or revoked, a certificate under this subparagraph shall be valid for 2 years.

“(iv) REFUSAL TO ISSUE; REVOCATION; SUSPENSION.—In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary may refuse to issue or renew, or may suspend or revoke, a certificate of registration under this subparagraph if—

“(I) the application or holder of the certification has knowingly made a material misrepresentation in the application for such certificate;

“(II) the applicant for, or holder of, the certification is not the real party in interest in the application or certificate of registration and the real party in interest—

“(aa) is a person who has been refused issuance or renewal of a certificate;

“(bb) has had a certificate suspended or revoked; or

“(cc) does not qualify for a certificate under this paragraph; or

“(III) the applicant for or holder of the certification has failed to comply with this Act.

“(C) REMEDY FOR VIOLATIONS.—An employer engaging in foreign labor contracting activity and a foreign labor contractor that violates the provisions of this subsection shall be subject to remedies for foreign labor contractor violations under subsections (h) and (i). If a foreign labor contractor acting as an agent of an employer violates any provision of this subsection, the employer shall also be subject to remedies under subsections (h) and (i). An employer that violates a provision of this subsection relating to employer obligations shall be subject to remedies under subsections (h) and (i).

“(D) EMPLOYER NOTIFICATION.—An employer shall notify the Secretary of Labor if the employer becomes aware of a violation of this subsection by a foreign labor recruiter.

“(E) WRITTEN AGREEMENTS.—A foreign labor contractor may not violate the terms of any written agreements made with an employer relating to any contracting activity or worker protection under this subsection.

“(F) BONDING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Labor may require a foreign labor contractor to post a bond in an amount sufficient to ensure the protection of individuals recruited by the foreign labor contractor. The Secretary may consider the extent to which the foreign labor contractor has sufficient ties to the United States to adequately enforce this subsection.

“(h) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall promulgate regulations for the receipt, investigation, and disposition of complaints by an aggrieved person respecting a violation of this section.

“(2) FILING DEADLINE.—No investigation or hearing shall be conducted on a complaint concerning a violation under this section unless the complaint was filed not later than 12 months after the date of such violation.

“(3) REASONABLE CAUSE.—The Secretary of Labor shall conduct an investigation under this subsection if there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of this section has occurred. The process established under this subsection shall provide that, not later than 30 days after a complaint is filed, the Secretary shall determine if there is reasonable cause to find such a violation.

“(4) NOTICE AND HEARING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the Secretary of Labor makes a determination of reasonable cause under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall issue a notice

to the interested parties and offer an opportunity for a hearing on the complaint, in accordance with section 556 of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) COMPLAINT.—If the Secretary of Labor, after receiving a complaint under this subsection, does not offer the aggrieved party or organization an opportunity for a hearing under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall notify the aggrieved party or organization of such determination and the aggrieved party or organization may seek a hearing on the complaint in accordance with such section 556.

“(C) HEARING DEADLINE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of a hearing under this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor shall make a finding on the matter in accordance with paragraph (5).

“(5) ATTORNEYS’ FEES.—A complainant who prevails with respect to a claim under this subsection shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

“(6) POWER OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction—

“(A) to seek remedial action, including injunctive relief;

“(B) to recover the damages described in subsection (i); or

“(C) to ensure compliance with terms and conditions described in subsection (g).

“(7) SOLICITOR OF LABOR.—Except as provided in section 518(a) of title 28, United States Code, the Solicitor of Labor may appear for and represent the Secretary of Labor in any civil litigation brought under this subsection. All such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

“(8) PROCEDURES IN ADDITION TO OTHER RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.—The rights and remedies provided to workers under this section are in addition to any other contractual or statutory rights and remedies of the workers, and are not intended to alter or affect such rights and remedies.

“(i) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary of Labor finds a violation of subsection (b), (e), (f), or (g), the Secretary may impose administrative remedies and penalties, including—

“(A) back wages;

“(B) benefits; and

“(C) civil monetary penalties.

“(2) CIVIL PENALTIES.—The Secretary of Labor may impose, as a civil penalty—

“(A) for a violation of subsection (e) or (f)—

“(i) a fine in an amount not to exceed \$2,000 per violation per affected worker;

“(ii) if the violation was willful violation, a fine in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 per violation per affected worker;

“(iii) if the violation was willful and if in the course of such violation a United States worker was harmed, a fine in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per violation per affected worker; and

“(B) for a violation of subsection (g)—

“(i) a fine in an amount not less than \$500 and not more than \$4,000 per violation per affected worker;

“(ii) if the violation was willful, a fine in an amount not less than \$2,000 and not more than \$5,000 per violation per affected worker; and

“(iii) if the violation was willful and if in the course of such violation a United States worker was harmed, a fine in an amount not less than \$6,000 and not more than \$35,000 per violation per affected worker.

“(3) USE OF CIVIL PENALTIES.—All penalties collected under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with section 286(w).

“(4) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—If a willful and knowing violation of subsection (g) causes extreme physical or financial harm to an individual, the person in violation of such subsection may be imprisoned for not more than 6 months, fined in an amount not more than \$35,000, or both.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218A, as added by section 403, the following:

“Sec. 218B. Employer obligations.”

**SEC. 405. ALIEN EMPLOYMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 218B, as added by section 404, the following:

**“SEC. 218C. ALIEN EMPLOYMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of State, and the Commission of Social Security, shall develop and implement a program (referred to in this section as the ‘alien employment management system’) to manage and track the employment of aliens described in sections 218A and 218D.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The alien employment management system shall—

“(1) provide employers who seek employees with an opportunity to recruit and advertise employment opportunities available to United States workers before hiring an H-2C nonimmigrant;

“(2) collect sufficient information from employers to enable the Secretary of Homeland Security to determine—

“(A) if the nonimmigrant is employed;

“(B) which employers have hired an H-2C nonimmigrant;

“(C) the number of H-2C nonimmigrants that an employer is authorized to hire and is currently employing;

“(D) the occupation, industry, and length of time that an H-2C nonimmigrant has been employed in the United States;

“(3) allow employers to request approval of multiple H-2C nonimmigrant workers; and

“(4) permit employers to submit applications under this section in an electronic form.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218B, as added by section 404, the following:

“Sec. 218C. Alien employment management system.”

**SEC. 406. RULEMAKING; EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall promulgate regulations, in accordance with the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out the provisions of sections 218A, 218B, and 218C, as added by this Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by sections 403, 404, and 405 shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to aliens, who, on such effective date, are in the foreign country where they maintain residence.

**SEC. 407. RECRUITMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.**

(a) ELECTRONIC JOB REGISTRY.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a publicly accessible Web page on the Internet website of the Department of Labor that provides a single Internet link to each State workforce agency’s statewide electronic registry of jobs available throughout the United States to United States workers.

(b) RECRUITMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—

(1) POSTING.—An employer shall attest that the employer has posted an employment opportunity in accordance with section 218B(b)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by this Act.

(2) RECORDS.—An employer shall maintain records for not less than 1 year after the date on which an H-2C nonimmigrant is hired that describe the reasons for not hiring any of the United States workers who may have applied for such position.

(c) OVERSIGHT AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—The Secretary of Labor shall promulgate regulations regarding the maintenance of electronic job registry records for the purpose of audit or investigation.

(d) ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC JOB REGISTRY.—The Secretary of Labor shall ensure that job opportunities advertised on an electronic job registry established under this section are accessible—

(1) by the State workforce agencies, which may further disseminate job opportunity information to other interested parties; and

(2) through the Internet, for access by workers, employers, labor organizations, and other interested parties.

**SEC. 408. TEMPORARY GUEST WORKER VISA PROGRAM TASK FORCE.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a task force to be known as the “Temporary Worker Task Force” (referred to in this section as the “Task Force”).

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Task Force are—

(1) to study the impact of the admission of aliens under section 101(a)(15)(ii)(c) on the wages, working conditions, and employment of United States workers; and

(2) to make recommendations to the Secretary of Labor regarding the need for an annual numerical limitation on the number of aliens that may be admitted in any fiscal year under section 101(a)(15)(ii)(c).

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall be composed of 10 members, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be appointed by the President and shall serve as chairman of the Task Force;

(B) 1 shall be appointed by the leader of the minority party in the Senate, in consultation with the leader of the minority party in the House of Representatives, and shall serve as vice chairman of the Task Force;

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(E) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(F) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Task Force shall be appointed not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Task Force shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) QUORUM.—Six members of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum.

(d) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Task Force shall be—

(A) individuals with expertise in economics, demography, labor, business, or immigration or other pertinent qualifications or experience; and

(B) representative of a broad cross-section of perspectives within the United States, including the public and private sectors and academia.

(2) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 5 members of the Task Force may be members of the same political party.

(3) NONGOVERNMENTAL APPOINTEES.—An individual appointed to the Task Force may not be an officer or employee of the Federal Government or of any State or local government.

(e) MEETINGS.—

(1) INITIAL MEETING.—The Task Force shall meet and begin the operations of the Task Force as soon as practicable.

(2) SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.—After its initial meeting, the Task Force shall meet upon the call of the chairman or a majority of its members.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Task Force shall submit, to Congress, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary, a report that contains—

(1) findings with respect to the duties of the Task Force; and

(2) recommendations for imposing a numerical limit.

(g) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 214(g)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c) may not exceed—

“(i) 400,000 for the first fiscal year in which the program is implemented;

“(ii) in any subsequent fiscal year—

“(I) if the total number of visas allocated for that fiscal year are allotted within the first quarter of that fiscal year, then an additional 20 percent of the allocated number shall be made available immediately and the allocated amount for the following fiscal year shall increase by 20 percent of the original allocated amount in the prior fiscal year;

“(II) if the total number of visas allocated for that fiscal year are allotted within the second quarter of that fiscal year, then an additional 15 percent of the allocated number shall be made available immediately and the allocated amount for the following fiscal year shall increase by 15 percent of the original allocated amount in the prior fiscal year;

“(III) if the total number of visas allocated for that fiscal year are allotted within the third quarter of that fiscal year, then an additional 10 percent of the allocated number shall be made available immediately and the allocated amount for the following fiscal year shall increase by 10 percent of the original allocated amount in the prior fiscal year;

“(IV) if the total number of visas allocated for that fiscal year are allotted within the last quarter of that fiscal year, then the allocated amount for the following fiscal year shall increase by 10 percent of the original allocated amount in the prior fiscal year; and

“(V) with the exception of the first subsequent fiscal year to the fiscal year in which the program is implemented, if fewer visas were allotted the previous fiscal year than the number of visas allocated for that year and the reason was not due to processing delays or delays in promulgating regulations, then the allocated amount for the following fiscal year shall decrease by 10 percent of the allocated amount in the prior fiscal year.”

(h) ADJUSTMENT TO LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 245 (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n)(1) For purposes of adjustment of status under subsection (a), employment-based immigrant visas shall be made available to an alien having nonimmigrant status described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c) upon the filing of a petition for such a visa—

“(A) by the alien’s employer; or

“(B) by the alien, if the alien has maintained such nonimmigrant status in the

United States for a cumulative total of 4 years.

“(2) An alien having nonimmigrant status described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c) may not apply for adjustment of status under this section unless the alien—

“(A) is physically present in the United States; and

“(B) the alien establishes that the alien—

“(i) meets the requirements of section 312; or

“(ii) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study to achieve such an understanding of English and knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

“(3) An alien who demonstrates that the alien meets the requirements of section 312 may be considered to have satisfied the requirements of that section for purposes of becoming naturalized as a citizen of the United States under title III.

“(4) Filing a petition under paragraph (1) on behalf of an alien or otherwise seeking permanent residence in the United States for such alien shall not constitute evidence of the alien’s ineligibility for nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c).

“(5) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall extend, in 1-year increments, the stay of an alien for whom a labor certification petition filed under section 203(b) or an immigrant visa petition filed under section 204(b) is pending until a final decision is made on the alien’s lawful permanent residence.

“(6) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent an alien having nonimmigrant status described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c) from filing an application for adjustment of status under this section in accordance with any other provision of law.”

#### SEC. 409. REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Secretary and the Attorney General, shall negotiate with each home country of aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 402, to enter into a bilateral agreement with the United States that conforms to the requirements under subsection (b).

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.—Each agreement negotiated under subsection (a) shall require the participating home country to—

(1) accept the return of nationals who are ordered removed from the United States within 3 days of such removal;

(2) cooperate with the United States Government to—

(A) identify, track, and reduce gang membership, violence, and human trafficking and smuggling; and

(B) control illegal immigration;

(3) provide the United States Government with—

(A) passport information and criminal records of aliens who are seeking admission to, or are present in, the United States; and

(B) admission and entry data to facilitate United States entry-exit data systems; and

(4) educate nationals of the home country regarding United States temporary worker programs to ensure that such nationals are not exploited; and

(5) evaluate means to provide housing incentives in the alien’s home country for returning workers.

#### SEC. 410. S VISAS.

(a) EXPANSION OF S VISA CLASSIFICATION.—Section 101(a)(15)(S) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(S)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “Attorney General” each place that term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;;

(B) in subclause (I), by inserting before the semicolon, “, including a criminal enterprise undertaken by a foreign government, its agents, representatives, or officials”;;

(C) in subclause (III), by inserting “where the information concerns a criminal enterprise undertaken by an individual or organization that is not a foreign government, its agents, representatives, or officials,” before “whose”; and

(D) by striking “or” at the end; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(B) by striking “1956,” and all that follows through “the alien;” and inserting the following: “1956; or

“(iii) who the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, jointly determine—

“(I) is in possession of critical reliable information concerning the activities of governments or organizations, or their agents, representatives, or officials, with respect to weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems, if such governments or organizations are at risk of developing, selling, or transferring such weapons or related delivery systems; and

“(II) is willing to supply or has supplied, fully and in good faith, information described in subclause (I) to appropriate persons within the United States Government;

“and, if the Secretary of Homeland Security (or with respect to clause (ii), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security jointly) considers it to be appropriate, the spouse, married and unmarried sons and daughters, and parents of an alien described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) if accompanying, or following to join, the alien;”.

(b) NUMERICAL LIMITATION.—Section 214(k)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1184(k)(1)) is amended by striking “The number of aliens” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “The number of aliens who may be provided a visa as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15)(S) in any fiscal year may not exceed 1,000.”

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) CONTENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 214(k) (8 U.S.C. 1184(k)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “The Attorney General” and inserting “The Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(ii) by striking “concerning—” and inserting “that includes—”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and”;;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting at the end the following:

“(F) in the event that the total number of such nonimmigrants admitted is fewer than 25 percent of the total number provided for under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

“(i) the reasons why the number of such nonimmigrants admitted is fewer than 25 percent of that provided for by law;

“(ii) the efforts made by the Secretary of Homeland Security to admit such nonimmigrants; and

“(iii) any extenuating circumstances that contributed to the admission of a number of such nonimmigrants that is fewer than 25 percent of that provided for by law.”.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—Section 214(k) (8 U.S.C. 1184(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) To the extent required by law and if it is in the interests of national security or the security of such nonimmigrants that are admitted, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the information contained in a report described in paragraph (4)

may be classified, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, to the extent feasible, submit a non-classified version of the report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.”

#### SEC. 411. L VISA LIMITATIONS.

Section 214(c)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “In the case” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (H), in the case”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G)(i) If the beneficiary of a petition under this subsection is coming to the United States to open, or be employed in, a new facility, the petition may be approved for a period not to exceed 12 months only if the employer operating the new facility has—

“(I) a business plan;

“(II) sufficient physical premises to carry out the proposed business activities; and

“(III) the financial ability to commence doing business immediately upon the approval of the petition.

“(ii) An extension of the approval period under clause (i) may not be granted until the importing employer submits to the Secretary of Homeland Security—

“(I) evidence that the importing employer meets the requirements of this subsection;

“(II) evidence that the beneficiary meets the requirements of section 101(a)(15)(L);

“(III) a statement summarizing the original petition;

“(IV) evidence that the importing employer has fully complied with the business plan submitted under clause (i);

“(V) evidence of the truthfulness of any representations made in connection with the filing of the original petition;

“(VI) evidence that the importing employer, during the previous 12 months, has been doing business at the new facility through regular, systematic, and continuous provision of goods or services, or has otherwise been taking commercially reasonable steps to establish the new facility as a commercial enterprise;

“(VII) a statement of the duties the beneficiary has performed at the new facility during the previous 12 months and the duties the beneficiary will perform at the new facility during the extension period approved under this clause;

“(VIII) a statement describing the staffing at the new facility, including the number of employees and the types of positions held by such employees;

“(IX) evidence of wages paid to employees if the beneficiary will be employed in a managerial or executive capacity;

“(X) evidence of the financial status of the new facility; and

“(XI) any other evidence or data prescribed by the Secretary.

“(iii) Notwithstanding subclauses (I) through (VI) of clause (ii) and subject to the maximum period of authorized admission set forth in subparagraph (D), the Secretary of Homeland Security may approve a subsequently filed petition on behalf of the beneficiary to continue employment at the facility described in this subsection for a period beyond the initially granted 12-month period if the importing employer demonstrates that the failure to satisfy any of the requirements described in those subclauses was directly caused by extraordinary circumstances beyond the control of the importing employer.

“(H)(i) The Secretary of Homeland Security may not authorize the spouse of an alien described under section 101(a)(15)(L), who is a

dependent of a beneficiary under subparagraph (G), to engage in employment in the United States during the initial 9-month period described in subparagraph (G)(i).

“(ii) A spouse described in clause (i) may be provided employment authorization upon the approval of an extension under subparagraph (G)(ii).

“(I) For purposes of determining the eligibility of an alien for classification under Section 101(a)(15)(L) of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a program to work cooperatively with the Department of State to verify a company or facility’s existence in the United States and abroad.”

#### SEC. 412. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle for the first fiscal year beginning before the date of enactment of this Act and each of the subsequent fiscal years beginning not more than 7 years after the effective date of the regulations promulgated by the Secretary to implement this subtitle.

#### Subtitle B—Immigration Injunction Reform

##### SEC. 421. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Fairness in Immigration Litigation Act of 2006”.

##### SEC. 422. APPROPRIATE REMEDIES FOR IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ORDER GRANTING PROSPECTIVE RELIEF AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a court determines that prospective relief should be ordered against the Government in any civil action pertaining to the administration or enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States, the court shall—

(A) limit the relief to the minimum necessary to correct the violation of law;

(B) adopt the least intrusive means to correct the violation of law;

(C) minimize, to the greatest extent practicable, the adverse impact on national security, border security, immigration administration and enforcement, and public safety, and

(D) provide for the expiration of the relief on a specific date, which is not later than the earliest date necessary for the Government to remedy the violation.

(2) WRITTEN EXPLANATION.—The requirements described in subsection (1) shall be discussed and explained in writing in the order granting prospective relief and must be sufficiently detailed to allow review by another court.

(3) EXPIRATION OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Preliminary injunctive relief shall automatically expire on the date that is 90 days after the date on which such relief is entered, unless the court—

(A) makes the findings required under paragraph (1) for the entry of permanent prospective relief; and

(B) makes the order final before expiration of such 90-day period.

(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR ORDER DENYING MOTION.—This subsection shall apply to any order denying the Government’s motion to vacate, modify, dissolve or otherwise terminate an order granting prospective relief in any civil action pertaining to the administration or enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR MOTION AFFECTING ORDER GRANTING PROSPECTIVE RELIEF AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A court shall promptly rule on the Government’s motion to vacate, modify, dissolve or otherwise terminate an order granting prospective relief in any civil action pertaining to the administration or

enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

(2) AUTOMATIC STAYS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Government’s motion to vacate, modify, dissolve, or otherwise terminate an order granting prospective relief made in any civil action pertaining to the administration or enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States shall automatically, and without further order of the court, stay the order granting prospective relief on the date that is 15 days after the date on which such motion is filed unless the court previously has granted or denied the Government’s motion.

(B) DURATION OF AUTOMATIC STAY.—An automatic stay under subparagraph (A) shall continue until the court enters an order granting or denying the Government’s motion.

(C) POSTPONEMENT.—The court, for good cause, may postpone an automatic stay under subparagraph (A) for not longer than 15 days.

(D) ORDERS BLOCKING AUTOMATIC STAYS.—Any order staying, suspending, delaying, or otherwise barring the effective date of the automatic stay described in subparagraph (A), other than an order to postpone the effective date of the automatic stay for not longer than 15 days under subparagraph (C), shall be—

(i) treated as an order refusing to vacate, modify, dissolve or otherwise terminate an injunction; and

(ii) immediately appealable under section 1292(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code.

(c) SETTLEMENTS.—

(1) CONSENT DECREES.—In any civil action pertaining to the administration or enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States, the court may not enter, approve, or continue a consent decree that does not comply with subsection (a).

(2) PRIVATE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall preclude parties from entering into a private settlement agreement that does not comply with subsection (a) if the terms of that agreement are not subject to court enforcement other than reinstatement of the civil proceedings that the agreement settled.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENT DECREE.—The term “consent decree” —

(A) means any relief entered by the court that is based in whole or in part on the consent or acquiescence of the parties; and

(B) does not include private settlements.

(2) GOOD CAUSE.—The term “good cause” does not include discovery or congestion of the court’s calendar.

(3) GOVERNMENT.—The term “Government” means the United States, any Federal department or agency, or any Federal agent or official acting within the scope of official duties.

(4) PERMANENT RELIEF.—The term “permanent relief” means relief issued in connection with a final decision of a court.

(5) PRIVATE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “private settlement agreement” means an agreement entered into among the parties that is not subject to judicial enforcement other than the reinstatement of the civil action that the agreement settled.

(6) PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—The term “prospective relief” means temporary, preliminary, or permanent relief other than compensatory monetary damages.

(e) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—It shall be the duty of every court to advance on the docket and to expedite the disposition of any civil action or motion considered under this section.

**SEC. 423. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—This subtitle shall apply with respect to all orders granting prospective relief in any civil action pertaining to the administration or enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States, whether such relief was ordered before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PENDING MOTIONS.—Every motion to vacate, modify, dissolve or otherwise terminate an order granting prospective relief in any such action, which motion is pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be treated as if it had been filed on such date of enactment.

**(c) AUTOMATIC STAY FOR PENDING MOTIONS.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—An automatic stay with respect to the prospective relief that is the subject of a motion described in subsection (b) shall take effect without further order of the court on the date which is 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act if the motion—

(A) was pending for 45 days as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) is still pending on the date which is 10 days after such date of enactment.

(2) DURATION OF AUTOMATIC STAY.—An automatic stay that takes effect under paragraph (1) shall continue until the court enters an order granting or denying the Government's motion under section 422(b). There shall be no further postponement of the automatic stay with respect to any such pending motion under section 422(b)(2). Any order, staying, suspending, delaying or otherwise barring the effective date of this automatic stay with respect to pending motions described in subsection (b) shall be an order blocking an automatic stay subject to immediate appeal under section 422(b)(2)(D).

**TITLE V—BACKLOG REDUCTION****SEC. 501. ELIMINATION OF EXISTING BACKLOGS.**

(a) FAMILY-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 201(c) (8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF FAMILY-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—The worldwide level of family-sponsored immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to the sum of—

“(1) 480,000;

“(2) the difference between the maximum number of visas authorized to be issued under this subsection during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued during the previous fiscal year;

“(3) the difference between—

“(A) the maximum number of visas authorized to be issued under this subsection during fiscal years 2001 through 2005 minus the number of visas issued under this subsection during those fiscal years; and

“(B) the number of visas calculated under subparagraph (A) that were issued after fiscal year 2005.”

(b) EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 201(d) (8 U.S.C. 1151(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the worldwide level of employment-based immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to the sum of—

“(A) 290,000;

“(B) the difference between the maximum number of visas authorized to be issued under this subsection during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued during the previous fiscal year; and

“(C) the difference between—

“(i) the maximum number of visas authorized to be issued under this subsection during fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and the number of visa numbers issued under this subsection during those fiscal years; and

“(ii) the number of visas calculated under clause (i) that were issued after fiscal year 2005.

“(2) VISAS FOR SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—Immigrant visas issued on or after October 1, 2004, to spouses and children of employment-based immigrants shall not be counted against the numerical limitation set forth in paragraph (1).”

**SEC. 502. COUNTRY LIMITS.**

Section 202(a) (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “, (4), and (5)” and inserting “and (4)”; and

(B) by striking “7 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent” and inserting “10 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 5 percent”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

**SEC. 503. ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS.**

(a) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR FAMILY-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 203(a) (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PREFERENCE ALLOCATIONS FOR FAMILY-SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS.—Aliens subject to the worldwide level specified in section 201(c) for family-sponsored immigrants shall be allocated visas as follows:

“(1) UNMARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a quantity not to exceed the sum of—

“(A) 10 percent of such worldwide level; and

“(B) any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (4).

“(2) SPOUSES AND UNMARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Visas in a quantity not to exceed 50 percent of such worldwide level plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (1) shall be allocated to qualified immigrants who are—

“(i) the spouses or children of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

“(ii) the unmarried sons or daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

“(B) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—Visas allocated to individuals described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall constitute not less than 77 percent of the visas allocated under this paragraph.

“(3) MARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the married sons and daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a quantity not to exceed the sum of—

“(A) 10 percent of such worldwide level; and

“(B) any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(4) BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of a citizen of the United States who is at least 21 years of age shall be allocated visas in a quantity not to exceed 30 percent of the worldwide level.”

(b) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 203(b) (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “28.6 percent” and inserting “15 percent”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “28.6 percent” and inserting “15 percent”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by striking “28.6 percent” and inserting “35 percent”; and

(B) by striking clause (iii);

(4) by striking paragraph (4);

(5) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4);

(6) in paragraph (4)(A), as redesignated, by striking “7.1 percent” and inserting “5 percent”;

(7) by inserting after paragraph (4), as redesignated, the following:

“(5) OTHER WORKERS.—Visas shall be made available, in a number not to exceed 30 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visa numbers not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor that is not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are determined to be unavailable in the United States.”; and

(8) by striking paragraph (6).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT.—Section 101(a)(27)(M) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(M)) is amended by striking “subject to the numerical limitations of section 203(b)(4).”

(2) REPEAL OF TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN WORKERS' VISAS.—Section 203(e) of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (Public Law 105-100; 8 U.S.C. 1153 note) is repealed.

**SEC. 504. RELIEF FOR MINOR CHILDREN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(b)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A)(i) Aliens admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa under section 203(a) to their accompanying parent who is an immediate relative.

“(ii) In this subparagraph, the term ‘immediate relative’ means a child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States (and each child of such child, spouse, or parent who is accompanying or following to join the child, spouse, or parent), except that, in the case of parents, such citizens shall be at least 21 years of age.

“(iii) An alien who was the spouse of a citizen of the United States for not less than 2 years at the time of the citizen's death and was not legally separated from the citizen at the time of the citizen's death, and each child of such alien, shall be considered, for purposes of this subsection, to remain an immediate relative after the date of the citizen's death if the spouse files a petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(ii) before the earlier of—

“(I) 2 years after such date; or

“(II) the date on which the spouse remarries.

“(iv) In this clause, an alien who has filed a petition under clause (iii) or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(A) remains an immediate relative if the United States citizen spouse or parent loses United States citizenship on account of the abuse.

“(B) Aliens born to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence during a temporary visit abroad.”

(b) PETITION.—Section 204(a)(1)(A)(ii) (8 U.S.C. 1154 (a)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “in the second sentence of section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) also” and inserting “in section 201(b)(2)(A)(iii) or an alien child or alien parent described in the 201(b)(2)(A)(iv)”.

**SEC. 505. SHORTAGE OCCUPATIONS.**

(a) EXCEPTION TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 201(b)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F)(i) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 and ending on September 30, 2017, an alien—

“(I) who is otherwise described in section 203(b); and

“(II) who is seeking admission to the United States to perform labor in shortage occupations designated by the Secretary of Labor for blanket certification under section 212(a)(5)(A) due to the lack of sufficient United States workers able, willing, qualified, and available for such occupations and

for which the employment of aliens will not adversely affect the terms and conditions of similarly employed United States workers.

“(ii) During the period described in clause (i), the spouse or dependents of an alien described in clause (i), if accompanying or following to join such alien.”

(b) EXCEPTION TO NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 202(a)(1)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “201(b)(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “201(b)”.

(c) EXCEPTION TO PER COUNTRY LEVELS FOR FAMILY-SPONSORED AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—Section 202(a)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)), as amended by section 502(1), is further amended by inserting “, except for aliens described in section 201(b),” after “any fiscal year”.

(d) INCREASING THE DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF NURSES AND PHYSICAL THERAPISTS.—Not later than January 1, 2007, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) submit to Congress a report on the source of newly licensed nurses and physical therapists in each State, which report shall—

(A) include the past 3 years for which data are available;

(B) provide separate data for each occupation and for each State;

(C) separately identify those receiving their initial license and those licensed by endorsement from another State;

(D) within those receiving their initial license in each year, identify the number who received their professional education in the United States and those who received such education outside the United States; and

(E) to the extent possible, identify, by State of residence and country of education, the number of nurses and physical therapists who were educated in any of the 5 countries (other than the United States) from which the most nurses and physical therapists arrived;

(F) identify the barriers to increasing the supply of nursing faculty, domestically trained nurses, and domestically trained physical therapists;

(G) recommend strategies to be followed by Federal and State governments that would be effective in removing such barriers, including strategies that address barriers to advancement to become registered nurses for other health care workers, such as home health aides and nurses assistants;

(H) recommend amendments to Federal legislation that would increase the supply of nursing faculty, domestically trained nurses, and domestically trained physical therapists;

(I) recommend Federal grants, loans, and other incentives that would provide increases in nurse educators, nurse training facilities, and other steps to increase the domestic education of new nurses and physical therapists;

(J) identify the effects of nurse emigration on the health care systems in their countries of origin; and

(K) recommend amendments to Federal law that would minimize the effects of health care shortages in the countries of origin from which immigrant nurses arrived;

(2) enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine to determine the level of Federal investment under titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act necessary to eliminate the domestic nursing and physical therapist shortage not later than 7 years from the date on which the report is published; and

(3) collaborate with other agencies, as appropriate, in working with ministers of health or other appropriate officials of the 5 countries from which the most nurses and physical therapists arrived, to—

(A) address health worker shortages caused by emigration;

(B) ensure that there is sufficient human resource planning or other technical assistance needed to reduce further health worker shortages in such countries.

#### SEC. 506. RELIEF FOR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Widows and Orphans Act of 2006”.

(b) NEW SPECIAL IMMIGRANT CATEGORY.—

(1) CERTAIN CHILDREN AND WOMEN AT RISK OF HARM.—Section 101(a)(27) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (L), by inserting a semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (M), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(N) subject to subsection (j), an immigrant who is not present in the United States—

“(i) who is—

“(I) referred to a consular, immigration, or other designated official by a United States Government agency, an international organization, or recognized nongovernmental entity designated by the Secretary of State for purposes of such referrals; and

“(II) determined by such official to be a minor under 18 years of age (as determined under subsection (j)(5))—

“(aa) for whom no parent or legal guardian is able to provide adequate care;

“(bb) who faces a credible fear of harm related to his or her age;

“(cc) who lacks adequate protection from such harm; and

“(dd) for whom it has been determined to be in his or her best interests to be admitted to the United States; or

“(ii) who is—

“(I) referred to a consular or immigration official by a United States Government agency, an international organization or recognized nongovernmental entity designated by the Secretary of State for purposes of such referrals; and

“(II) determined by such official to be a female who has—

“(aa) a credible fear of harm related to her sex; and

“(bb) a lack of adequate protection from such harm.”

(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Section 101 (8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) No natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any alien provided special immigrant status under subsection (a)(27)(N)(i) shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act.

“(2)(A) No alien who qualifies for a special immigrant visa under subsection (a)(27)(N)(i) may apply for derivative status or petition for any spouse who is represented by the alien as missing, deceased, or the source of harm at the time of the alien’s application and admission. The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive this requirement for an alien who demonstrates that the alien’s representations regarding the spouse were bona fide.

“(B) An alien who qualifies for a special immigrant visa under subsection (a)(27)(N) may apply for derivative status or petition for any sibling under the age of 18 years or children under the age of 18 years of any such alien, if accompanying or following to join the alien. For purposes of this subparagraph, a determination of age shall be made using the age of the alien on the date the petition is filed with the Department of Homeland Security.

“(3) An alien who qualifies for a special immigrant visa under subsection (a)(27)(N)

shall be treated in the same manner as a refugee solely for purposes of section 412.

“(4) The provisions of paragraphs (4), (5), and (7)(A) of section 212(a) shall not be applicable to any alien seeking admission to the United States under subsection (a)(27)(N), and the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive any other provision of such section (other than paragraph 2(C) or subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (E) of paragraph (3) with respect to such an alien for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest. Any such waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security shall be in writing and shall be granted only on an individual basis following an investigation. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for the annual reporting to Congress of the number of waivers granted under this paragraph in the previous fiscal year and a summary of the reasons for granting such waivers.

“(5) For purposes of subsection (a)(27)(N)(i)(II), a determination of age shall be made using the age of the alien on the date on which the alien was referred to the consular, immigration, or other designated official.

“(6) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall waive any application fee for a special immigrant visa for an alien described in section 101(a)(27)(N).”

(3) EXPEDITED PROCESS.—Not later than 45 days after the date of referral to a consular, immigration, or other designated official (as described in section 101(a)(27)(N) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by paragraph (1))—

(A) special immigrant status shall be adjudicated; and

(B) if special immigrant status is granted, the alien shall be paroled to the United States pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) and allowed to apply for adjustment of status to permanent residence under section 245 of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) within 1 year after the alien’s arrival in the United States.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the progress of the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including—

(A) data related to the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section;

(B) data regarding the number of placements of females and children who faces a credible fear of harm as referred to in section 101(a)(27)(N) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by paragraph (1); and

(C) any other information that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection.

#### (C) REQUIREMENTS FOR ALIENS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) DATABASE SEARCH.—An alien may not be admitted to the United States unless the Secretary has ensured that a search of each database maintained by an agency or department of the United States has been conducted to determine whether such alien is ineligible to be admitted to the United States on criminal, security, or related grounds.

(B) COOPERATION AND SCHEDULE.—The Secretary and the head of each appropriate agency or department of the United States shall work cooperatively to ensure that each database search required by subparagraph



(A) is completed not later than 45 days after the date on which an alien files a petition seeking a special immigration visa under section 101(a)(27)(N) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (b)(1).

(2) REQUIREMENT AFTER ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT FINGERPRINTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date that an alien enters the United States, the alien shall be fingerprinted and submit to the Secretary such fingerprints and any other personal biometric data required by the Secretary.

(ii) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations that permit fingerprints submitted by an alien under section 262 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1302) or any other provision of law to satisfy the requirement to submit fingerprints of clause (i).

(B) DATABASE SEARCH.—The Secretary shall ensure that a search of each database that contains fingerprints that is maintained by an agency or department of the United States be conducted to determine whether such alien is ineligible for an adjustment of status under any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) on criminal, security, or related grounds.

(C) COOPERATION AND SCHEDULE.—The Secretary and the head of each appropriate agency or department of the United States shall work cooperatively to ensure that each database search required by subparagraph (B) is completed not later than 180 days after the date on which the alien enters the United States.

(D) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There may be no review of a determination by the Secretary, after a search required by subparagraph (B), that an alien is ineligible for an adjustment of status, under any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) on criminal, security, or related grounds except as provided in this subparagraph.

(ii) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—An alien may appeal a determination described in clause (i) through the Administrative Appeals Office of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. The Secretary shall ensure that a determination on such appeal is made not later than 60 days after the date that the appeal is filed.

(iii) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There may be no judicial review of a determination described in clause (i).

#### SEC. 507. STUDENT VISAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(15)(F) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(F)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “he has no intention of abandoning, who is” and inserting the following: “except in the case of an alien described in clause (iv), the alien has no intention of abandoning, who is—

“(I);

(B) by striking “consistent with section 214(l)” and inserting “(except for a graduate program described in clause (iv)) consistent with section 214(m)”; and

(C) by striking the comma at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(II) engaged in temporary employment for optional practical training related to the alien’s area of study, which practical training shall be authorized for a period or periods of up to 24 months;”;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by inserting “or (iv)” after “clause (i)”; and

(B) by striking “, and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) an alien described in clause (i) who has been accepted and plans to attend an accredited graduate program in mathematics, engineering, technology, or the sciences in the United States for the purpose of obtaining an advanced degree.”.

(b) ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 214(b) (8 U.S.C. 1184(b)) is amended by striking “subparagraph (L) or (V)” and inserting “subparagraph (F)(iv), (L), or (V)”.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR F-4 VISA.—Section 214(m) (8 U.S.C. 1184(m)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before paragraph (1) the following:

“(m) NONIMMIGRANT ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) A visa issued to an alien under section 101(a)(15)(F)(iv) shall be valid—

“(A) during the intended period of study in a graduate program described in such section;

“(B) for an additional period, not to exceed 1 year after the completion of the graduate program, if the alien is actively pursuing an offer of employment related to the knowledge and skills obtained through the graduate program; and

“(C) for the additional period necessary for the adjudication of any application for labor certification, employment-based immigrant petition, and application under section 245(a)(2) to adjust such alien’s status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if such application for labor certification or employment-based immigrant petition has been filed not later than 1 year after the completion of the graduate program.”.

(d) OFF CAMPUS WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Aliens admitted as non-immigrant students described in section 101(a)(15)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(F)) may be employed in an off-campus position unrelated to the alien’s field of study if—

(A) the alien has enrolled full time at the educational institution and is maintaining good academic standing;

(B) the employer provides the educational institution and the Secretary of Labor with an attestation that the employer—

(i) has spent at least 21 days recruiting United States citizens to fill the position; and

(ii) will pay the alien and other similarly situated workers at a rate equal to not less than the greater of—

(I) the actual wage level for the occupation at the place of employment; or

(II) the prevailing wage level for the occupation in the area of employment; and

(C) the alien will not be employed more than—

(i) 20 hours per week during the academic term; or

(ii) 40 hours per week during vacation periods and between academic terms.

(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—If the Secretary of Labor determines that an employer has provided an attestation under paragraph (1)(B) that is materially false or has failed to pay wages in accordance with the attestation, the employer, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, shall be disqualified from employing an alien student under paragraph (1).

(e) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Section 245(a) (8 U.S.C. 1255(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The status of an alien, who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States, or who has an ap-

proved petition for classification under subparagraph (A)(iii), (A)(iv), (B)(ii), or (B)(iii) of section 204(a)(1), may be adjusted by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, under such regulations as the Secretary or the Attorney General may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if—

“(A) the alien makes an application for such adjustment;

“(B) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa;

“(C) the alien is admissible to the United States for permanent residence; and

“(D) an immigrant visa is immediately available to the alien at the time the application is filed.

(2) STUDENT VISAS.—Notwithstanding the requirement under paragraph (1)(D), an alien may file an application for adjustment of status under this section if—

“(A) the alien has been issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(F)(iv), or would have qualified for such nonimmigrant status if section 101(a)(15)(F)(iv) had been enacted before such alien’s graduation;

“(B) the alien has earned an advanced degree in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics;

“(C) the alien is the beneficiary of a petition filed under subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 204(a)(1); and

“(D) a fee of \$2,000 is remitted to the Secretary on behalf of the alien.

(3) LIMITATION.—An application for adjustment of status filed under this section may not be approved until an immigrant visa number becomes available.”.

(f) USE OF FEES.—

(1) JOB TRAINING; SCHOLARSHIPS.—Section 286(s)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1356(s)(1)) is amended by inserting “and 80 percent of the fees collected under section 245(a)(2)(D)” before the period at the end.

(2) FRAUD PREVENTION AND DETECTION.—Section 286(v)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1356(v)(1)) is amended by inserting “and 20 percent of the fees collected under section 245(a)(2)(D)” before the period at the end.

#### SEC. 508. VISAS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ADVANCED DEGREES.

(a) ALIENS WITH CERTAIN ADVANCED DEGREES NOT SUBJECT TO NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS ON EMPLOYMENT BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(b)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)), as amended by section 505, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) Aliens who have earned an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or math and have been working in a related field in the United States under a non-immigrant visa during the 3-year period preceding their application for an immigrant visa under section 203(b).

“(H) Aliens described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 203(b)(1)(A) or who have received a national interest waiver under section 203(b)(2)(B).

“(I) The spouse and minor children of an alien who is admitted as an employment-based immigrant under section 203(b).”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any visa application—

(A) pending on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) filed on or after such date of enactment.

(b) LABOR CERTIFICATION.—Section 212(a)(5)(A)(ii) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) has an advanced degree in the sciences, technology, engineering, or mathematics from an accredited university in the United States and is employed in a field related to such degree.”.

(c) TEMPORARY WORKERS.—Section 214(g) (8) U.S.C. 1184(g) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “(beginning with fiscal year 1992)”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (vii), by striking “each succeeding fiscal year; or” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006;”;

(ii) by adding after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) 115,000 in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this clause; and

“(ix) the number calculated under paragraph (9) in each fiscal year after the year described in clause (viii); or”;

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) has earned an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or math.”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

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

“(9) If the numerical limitation in paragraph (1)(A)—

“(A) is reached during a given fiscal year, the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(A)(ix) for the subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to 120 percent of the numerical limitation of the given fiscal year; or

“(B) is not reached during a given fiscal year, the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(A)(ix) for the subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to the numerical limitation of the given fiscal year.”.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall apply to any visa application—

(1) pending on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) filed on or after such date of enactment.

## TITLE VI—WORK AUTHORIZATION AND LEGALIZATION OF UNDOCUMENTED INDIVIDUALS

### Subtitle A—Conditional Nonimmigrant Workers

#### SEC. 601. 218D CONDITIONAL NONIMMIGRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 218C, as added by section 405 of this Act, the following:

#### “SEC. 218D. CONDITIONAL NONIMMIGRANT WORK AUTHORIZATION AND STATUS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall grant conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status to remain in the United States to an alien if the alien—

“(1) submits an application for such a grant; and

“(2) meets the requirements of this section.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PRESENCE; EMPLOYMENT.—The alien establishes that the alien—

“(A) was physically present in the United States before January 7, 2004; and

“(B) was employed in the United States before January 7, 2004, and has been employed in the United States since that date.

“(2) EVIDENCE OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) CONCLUSIVE DOCUMENTS.—An alien may conclusively establish employment status in compliance with paragraph (1) by submitting to the Secretary of Homeland Security

records demonstrating such employment maintained by—

“(i) the Social Security Administration, Internal Revenue Service, or by any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

“(ii) an employer; or

“(iii) a labor union, day labor center, or an organization that assists workers in matters related to employment.

“(B) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—An alien who is unable to submit a document described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A) may satisfy the requirement in paragraph (1) by submitting to the Secretary at least 2 other types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

“(i) bank records;

“(ii) business records;

“(iii) sworn affidavits from nonrelatives who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work; or

“(iv) remittance records.

“(3) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress that the requirement in this subsection be interpreted and implemented in a manner that recognizes and takes into account the difficulties encountered by aliens in obtaining evidence of employment due to the undocumented status of the alien.

“(4) BURDEN OF PROOF.—An alien described in paragraph (1) who is applying for adjustment of status under this section has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien has satisfied the requirements of this subsection. An alien may meet such burden of proof by producing sufficient evidence to demonstrate such employment as a matter of reasonable inference.

“(c) SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(1) adjust the status to that of a conditional nonimmigrant under this section for, or provide a nonimmigrant visa to, the spouse or child of an alien who is provided nonimmigrant status under this section; or

“(2) adjust the status to that of a conditional nonimmigrant under this section for an alien who, before January 7, 2004, was the spouse or child of an alien who is provided conditional nonimmigrant status under this section, or is eligible for such status, if—

“(A) the termination of the qualifying relationship was connected to domestic violence; and

“(B) the spouse or child has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by the spouse or parent alien who is provided conditional nonimmigrant status under this section.

“(d) OTHER CRITERIA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien may be granted conditional nonimmigrant status under this section or granted status as the spouse or child of an alien eligible for such status under subsection (c), if the alien establishes that the alien—

“(A) is not inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a), except as provided in paragraph (2); and

“(B) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

“(2) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—In determining an alien’s admissibility under paragraph (1)(A)—

“(A) paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (6)(B), (6)(C), (6)(F), (6)(G), (7), (9), and (10)(B) of section 212(a) shall not apply;

“(B) the Secretary of Homeland Security may not waive—

“(i) subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (E), (G), (H), or (I) of section 212(a)(2) (relating to criminal);

“(ii) section 212(a)(3) (relating to security and related grounds); or

“(iii) subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 212(a)(10) (relating to polygamists and child abductors);

“(C) for conduct that occurred before January 7, 2004, the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of any provision of section 212(a) not listed in subparagraph (B) on behalf of an individual alien for humanitarian purposes, to ensure family unity, or when such waiver is otherwise in the public interest; and

“(D) nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security other than under this paragraph to waive the provisions of section 212(a).

“(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Sections 240B(d) and 241(a)(5) shall not apply to an alien who is applying for adjustment of status in accordance with this title for conduct that occurred before the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006.

“(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR MINORS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO ENTERED AS MINORS.—The employment requirements under this section shall not apply to any alien under 21 years of age.

“(5) EDUCATION PERMITTED.—An alien may satisfy the employment requirements under this section, in whole or in part, by full-time attendance at—

“(A) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)); or

“(B) a secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).

“(e) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF FINGERPRINTS.—An alien may not be granted conditional nonimmigrant status under this section, or granted status as the spouse or child of an alien eligible for such status under subsection (c), unless the alien submits fingerprints in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(2) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall utilize fingerprints and other data provided by the alien to conduct a background check of such alien relating to criminal, national security, or other law enforcement actions that would render the alien ineligible for a grant of conditional nonimmigrant status as described in this section.

“(3) EXPEDITIOUS PROCESSING.—The background checks required under paragraph (2) shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible.

“(f) PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED STAY AND APPLICATION FEE AND FINE.—

“(1) PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED STAY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The period of authorized stay for a conditional nonimmigrant described in this section shall be 6 years.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not authorize a change from such conditional nonimmigrant classification to any other immigrant or nonimmigrant classification until the termination of the 6-year period described in subparagraph (A). The Secretary may only extend such period to accommodate the processing of an application for adjustment of status under section 245B.

“(2) APPLICATION FEE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall impose a fee for filing an application for a grant of status under this section. Such fee shall be sufficient to cover the administrative and other expenses incurred in connection with the review of such applications.

“(3) FINES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the fee required under paragraph (2), the Secretary of

Homeland Security may accept an application for a grant of status under this section only if the alien pays a \$1,000 fine.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Fines paid under this paragraph shall not be required from an alien under the age of 21.

“(4) COLLECTION OF FEES AND FINES.—All fees and fines collected under this section shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with section 286(w).

“(g) TREATMENT OF APPLICANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien who files an application under this section, including the alien's spouse or child—

“(A) shall be granted employment authorization pending final adjudication of the alien's application for a grant of status;

“(B) shall be granted permission to travel abroad;

“(C) may not be detained, determined inadmissible or deportable, or removed pending final adjudication of the alien's application for a grant of status, unless the alien, through conduct or criminal conviction, becomes ineligible for such grant of status; and

“(D) may not be considered an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 274A) until employment authorization under subparagraph (A) is denied.

“(2) BEFORE APPLICATION PERIOD.—If an alien is apprehended after the date of the enactment of this section, but before the promulgation of regulations pursuant to this section, and the alien can establish prima facie eligibility as a conditional nonimmigrant under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the alien with a reasonable opportunity, after promulgation of regulations, to file an application for a grant of status.

“(3) DURING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, an alien who is in removal proceedings shall have an opportunity to apply for a grant of status under this title unless a final administrative determination has been made.

“(4) RELATIONSHIPS OF APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ORDERS.—An alien who is present in the United States and has been ordered excluded, deported, removed, or ordered to depart voluntarily from the United States under any provision of this Act may, notwithstanding such order, apply for a grant of status in accordance with this section. Such an alien shall not be required to file a separate motion to reopen, reconsider, or vacate the exclusion, deportation, removal, or voluntary departure order. If the Secretary of Homeland Security grants the application, the Secretary shall cancel such order. If the Secretary of Homeland Security renders a final administrative decision to deny the application, such order shall be effective and enforceable to the same extent as if the application had not been made.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(A) SINGLE LEVEL OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPELLATE REVIEW.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an appellate authority within the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to provide for a single level of administrative appellate review of a determination respecting an application for a grant of status under this section.

“(B) STANDARD FOR REVIEW.—Administrative appellate review referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the determination on the application and upon the presentation of additional or newly discovered evidence during the time of the pending appeal.

“(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be judicial review in the Federal courts of appeal of the

denial of an application for a grant of status under this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the standard for review of such a denial shall be governed by subparagraph (B).

“(B) STANDARD FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Judicial review of a denial of an application under this section shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the review. The findings of fact and other determinations contained in the record shall be conclusive unless the applicant can establish abuse of discretion or that the findings are directly contrary to clear and convincing facts contained in the record, considered as a whole.

“(C) JURISDICTION OF COURTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any cause or claim arising from a pattern or practice of the Secretary of Homeland Security in the operation or implementation of this section that is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law, and may order any appropriate relief.

“(ii) REMEDIES.—A district court may order any appropriate relief under clause (i) if the court determines that resolution of such cause or claim will serve judicial and administrative efficiency or that a remedy would otherwise not be reasonably available or practicable.

“(3) STAY OF REMOVAL.—Aliens seeking administrative or judicial review under this subsection shall not be removed from the United States until a final decision is rendered establishing ineligibility under this section.

“(i) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, no Federal agency or bureau, nor any officer, employee, or agent of such agency or bureau, may—

“(A) use the information furnished by the applicant pursuant to an application filed under this section for any purpose other than to make a determination on the application;

“(B) make any publication through which the information furnished by any particular applicant can be identified; or

“(C) permit anyone other than the sworn officers and employees of such agency or bureau to examine individual applications.

“(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the information furnished pursuant to an application filed under this section, and any other information derived from such furnished information, to a duly recognized law enforcement entity in connection with a criminal investigation or prosecution or a national security investigation or prosecution, in each instance about an individual suspect or group of suspects, when such information is requested in writing by such entity.

“(3) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000.

“(j) PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS IN APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

“(A) VIOLATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person—

“(i) to file or assist in filing an application for a grant of status under this section and knowingly and willfully falsify, misrepresent, conceal, or cover up a material fact or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; or

“(ii) to create or supply a false writing or document for use in making such an application.

“(B) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(2) INADMISSIBILITY.—An alien who is convicted of a crime under paragraph (1) shall be considered to be inadmissible to the United States on the ground described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i).

“(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), any alien or other entity (including an employer or union) that submits an employment record that contains incorrect data that the alien used in order to obtain such employment before, shall not, on that ground, be determined to have violated this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218C the following:

“Sec. 218D. Conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status.”

**SEC. 602. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR SECTION 218D CONDITIONAL NON-IMMIGRANTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title II (8 U.S.C. 1255 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 245A the following:

**“SEC. 245B. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF SECTION 218D CONDITIONAL NONIMMIGRANT TO THAT OF PERSON ADMITTED FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENCE.**

“(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall adjust the status of an alien from conditional nonimmigrant status under section 218D to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section if the alien satisfies the following requirements:

“(1) COMPLETION OF EMPLOYMENT OR EDUCATION REQUIREMENT.—The alien establishes that the alien has been employed in the United States, either full time, part time, seasonally, or self-employed, or has met the education requirements of section 218D(d)(5) during the period required by section 218D(b)(1)(B).

“(2) APPLICATION AND FEE.—The alien who applies for adjustment of status under this section pays the following fees:

“(A) APPLICATION FEE.—An alien who files an application under this section shall pay an application fee, set by the Secretary.

“(B) ADDITIONAL FEE.—Before the adjudication of an application for adjustment of status filed under this section, an alien who is at least 21 years of age shall pay a fee of \$1,000.

“(3) ADMISSIBLE UNDER IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The alien establishes that the alien is not inadmissible under section 212(a), except for any provision of that section that is not applicable or waived under section 218D(d)(2).

“(4) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—The alien undergoes, at the alien's expense, an appropriate medical examination (including a determination of immunization status) that conforms to generally accepted professional standards of medical practice.

“(5) PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date on which status is adjusted under this section, the alien establishes the payment of all Federal income taxes owed for employment during the period of employment required by section 218D(b)(1)(B) by establishing that—

“(i) no such tax liability exists;

“(ii) all outstanding liabilities have been met; or

“(iii) the alien has entered into an agreement for payment of all outstanding liabilities with the Internal Revenue Service.

“(B) IRS COOPERATION.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall provide documentation to an alien upon request to establish the payment of all income taxes required by this paragraph.

“(6) BASIC CITIZENSHIP SKILLS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the alien establishes that the alien—

“(i) meets the requirements of section 312; or

“(ii) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study to achieve such an understanding of English and knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

“(B) RELATION TO NATURALIZATION EXAMINATION.—An alien who demonstrates that the alien meets the requirements of section 312 may be considered to have satisfied the requirements of that section for purposes of becoming naturalized as a citizen of the United States under title III.

“(7) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall conduct a security and law enforcement background check in accordance with procedures described in section 218D(e) with respect to each alien requesting adjusting of status under this section.

“(8) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—The alien shall establish that if the alien is within the age period required under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.), that such alien has registered under that Act.

“(b) TREATMENT OF SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—

“(1) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) adjust the status to that of a lawful permanent resident under this section, or provide an immigrant visa to the spouse or child of an alien who adjusts status to that of a permanent resident under this section; or

“(B) adjust the status to that of a lawful permanent resident under this section for an alien who was the spouse or child of an alien who adjusts status or is eligible to adjust status to that of a permanent resident under section 245B in accordance with subsection (a), if—

“(i) the termination of the qualifying relationship was connected to domestic violence; and

“(ii) the spouse or child has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by the spouse or parent who adjusts status to that of a permanent resident under this section.

“(2) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAW.—In acting on applications filed under this subsection with respect to aliens who have been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall apply the provisions of section 204(a)(1)(J) and the protections, prohibitions, and penalties under section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367).

“(c) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary shall establish regulations for the timely filing and processing of applications for adjustment of status for conditional nonimmigrants under section 218D.

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW; CONFIDENTIALITY; PENALTIES.—Subsections (h), (i), and (j) of section 218D shall apply to this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 245A the following:

“Sec. 245B. Adjustment of status of section 218D conditional nonimmigrant to that of person admitted for lawful permanent residence.”

#### SEC. 603. ALIENS NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.

Section 201(b)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (A) or (B) of”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Aliens whose status is adjusted from the status described in section 218D.”

#### SEC. 604. EMPLOYER PROTECTIONS.

(a) IMMIGRATION STATUS OF ALIEN.—Employers of aliens applying for adjustment of status under section 245B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by this title, or a grant of status under section 218D of such Act, as added by this title, shall not be subject to civil and criminal tax liability relating directly to the employment of such alien prior to such alien receiving employment authorization under this title.

(b) PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT RECORDS.—Employers that provide unauthorized aliens with copies of employment records or other evidence of employment pursuant to an application for adjustment of status under section 245B of the Immigration and Nationality Act or a grant of status under 218D of such Act or any other application or petition pursuant to any other immigration law, shall not be subject to civil and criminal liability under section 274A of such Act for employing such unauthorized aliens.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section may be used to shield an employer from liability under section 274B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324b) or any other labor or employment law.

#### SEC. 605. LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR ALIENS GRANTED CONDITIONAL NONIMMIGRANT WORK AUTHORIZATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROCESS PENDING APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—The Secretary may not adjust the status of an alien granted conditional nonimmigrant work authorization under section 218D of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by this title, to that of lawful permanent resident under section 245B of such Act, as added by this title, until the Secretary determines that the priority dates have become current for the class of aliens whose family-based or employment-based petitions for permanent residence were pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO ELIMINATE VISA BACKLOG.—If the backlog of applications for family-based and employment-based immigrant visas is not eliminated within 6 years following the date of the enactment of this Act, as predicted under the formulas set out in title V and the amendments made by such title, the Secretary shall hold in abeyance an application submitted by an alien granted conditional nonimmigrant work authorization under section 218D of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 245B of such Act, until the priority dates for the petitions and applications for family-based and employment-based visas pending on the date of the enactment of this Act become current.

#### SEC. 606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) should be directly appropriated so as to facilitate the or-

derly and timely commencement of the processing of applications filed under sections 218D and 245B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by this Act.

#### Subtitle B—Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security

##### SEC. 611. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security Act of 2006” or the “AgJOBS Act of 2006”.

##### SEC. 612. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT.—The term “agricultural employment” means any service or activity that is considered to be agricultural under section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)) or agricultural labor under section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)). For purposes of this paragraph, agricultural employment includes employment under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a)).

(2) BLUE CARD STATUS.—The term “blue card status” means the status of an alien who has been lawfully admitted into the United States for temporary residence under section 613(a).

(3) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer” means any person or entity, including any farm labor contractor and any agricultural association, that employs workers in agricultural employment.

(4) JOB OPPORTUNITY.—The term “job opportunity” means a job opening for temporary full-time employment at a place in the United States to which United States workers can be referred.

(5) TEMPORARY.—A worker is employed on a “temporary” basis where the employment is intended not to exceed 10 months.

(6) UNITED STATES WORKER.—The term “United States worker” means any worker, whether a United States citizen or national, a lawfully admitted permanent resident alien, or any other alien, who is authorized to work in the job opportunity within the United States, except an alien admitted or otherwise provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a)).

(7) WORK DAY.—The term “work day” means any day in which the individual is employed 1 or more hours in agriculture consistent with the definition of “man-day” under section 3(u) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(u)).

#### CHAPTER 1—PILOT PROGRAM FOR EARNED STATUS ADJUSTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

##### SEC. 613. AGRICULTURAL WORKERS.

(a) BLUE CARD PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall confer blue card status upon an alien who qualifies under this subsection if the Secretary determines that the alien—

(A) has performed agricultural employment in the United States for at least 863 hours or 150 work days, whichever is less, during the 24-month period ending on December 31, 2005;

(B) applied for such status during the 18-month application period beginning on the first day of the seventh month that begins after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) is otherwise admissible to the United States under section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182), except as otherwise provided under subsection (e)(2).

(2) AUTHORIZED TRAVEL.—An alien in blue card status has the right to travel abroad (including commutation from a residence

abroad) in the same manner as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(3) AUTHORIZED EMPLOYMENT.—An alien in blue card status shall be provided an “employment authorized” endorsement or other appropriate work permit, in the same manner as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(4) TERMINATION OF BLUE CARD STATUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may terminate blue card status granted under this subsection only upon a determination under this subtitle that the alien is deportable.

(B) GROUNDS FOR TERMINATION OF BLUE CARD STATUS.—Before any alien becomes eligible for adjustment of status under subsection (c), the Secretary may deny adjustment to permanent resident status and provide for termination of the blue card status granted such alien under paragraph (1) if—

(i) the Secretary finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the adjustment to blue card status was the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation (as described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i)); or

(ii) the alien—

(I) commits an act that makes the alien inadmissible to the United States as an immigrant, except as provided under subsection (e)(2);

(II) is convicted of a felony or 3 or more misdemeanors committed in the United States; or

(III) is convicted of an offense, an element of which involves bodily injury, threat of serious bodily injury, or harm to property in excess of \$500.

(5) RECORD OF EMPLOYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each employer of a worker granted status under this subsection shall annually—

(i) provide a written record of employment to the alien; and

(ii) provide a copy of such record to the Secretary.

(B) SUNSET.—The obligation under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date that is 6 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) REQUIRED FEATURES OF BLUE CARD.—The Secretary shall provide each alien granted blue card status and the spouse and children of each such alien residing in the United States with a card that contains—

(A) an encrypted, machine-readable, electronic identification strip that is unique to the alien to whom the card is issued;

(B) biometric identifiers, including fingerprints and a digital photograph; and

(C) physical security features designed to prevent tampering, counterfeiting, or duplication of the card for fraudulent purposes.

(7) FINE.—An alien granted blue card status shall pay a fine to the Secretary in an amount equal to \$100.

(8) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—The Secretary may issue not more than 1,500,000 blue cards during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RIGHTS OF ALIENS GRANTED BLUE CARD STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided under this subsection, an alien in blue card status shall be considered to be an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of any law other than any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(2) DELAYED ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFITS.—An alien in blue card status shall not be eligible, by reason of such status, for any form of assistance or benefit described in section 403(a) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613(a)) until 5 years after the date on which the Secretary confers blue card status upon that alien.

(3) TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT RESPECTING ALIENS ADMITTED UNDER THIS SECTION.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—No alien granted blue card status may be terminated from employment by any employer during the period of blue card status except for just cause.

(B) TREATMENT OF COMPLAINTS.—

(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process for the receipt, initial review, and disposition of complaints by aliens granted blue card status who allege that they have been terminated without just cause. No proceeding shall be conducted under this subparagraph with respect to a termination unless the Secretary determines that the complaint was filed not later than 6 months after the date of the termination.

(ii) INITIATION OF ARBITRATION.—If the Secretary finds that a complaint has been filed in accordance with clause (i) and there is reasonable cause to believe that the complainant was terminated without just cause, the Secretary shall initiate binding arbitration proceedings by requesting the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to appoint a mutually agreeable arbitrator from the roster of arbitrators maintained by such Service for the geographical area in which the employer is located. The procedures and rules of such Service shall be applicable to the selection of such arbitrator and to such arbitration proceedings. The Secretary shall pay the fee and expenses of the arbitrator, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose.

(iii) ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS.—The arbitrator shall conduct the proceeding in accordance with the policies and procedures promulgated by the American Arbitration Association applicable to private arbitration of employment disputes. The arbitrator shall make findings respecting whether the termination was for just cause. The arbitrator may not find that the termination was for just cause unless the employer so demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence. If the arbitrator finds that the termination was not for just cause, the arbitrator shall make a specific finding of the number of days or hours of work lost by the employee as a result of the termination. The arbitrator shall have no authority to order any other remedy, including, but not limited to, reinstatement, back pay, or front pay to the affected employee. Within 30 days from the conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the arbitrator shall transmit the findings in the form of a written opinion to the parties to the arbitration and the Secretary. Such findings shall be final and conclusive, and no official or court of the United States shall have the power or jurisdiction to review any such findings.

(iv) EFFECT OF ARBITRATION FINDINGS.—If the Secretary receives a finding of an arbitrator that an employer has terminated an alien granted blue card status without just cause, the Secretary shall credit the alien for the number of days or hours of work lost for purposes of the requirement of subsection (c)(1).

(v) TREATMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES.—The parties shall bear the cost of their own attorney's fees involved in the litigation of the complaint.

(vi) NONEXCLUSIVE REMEDY.—The complaint process provided for in this subparagraph is in addition to any other rights an employee may have in accordance with applicable law.

(vii) EFFECT ON OTHER ACTIONS OR PROCEEDINGS.—Any finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by an arbitrator in the proceeding before the Secretary shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding between the employee and the em-

ployee's current or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, administrative agency, court, or judge of any State or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts, except that the arbitrator's specific finding of the number of days or hours of work lost by the employee as a result of the employment termination may be referred to the Secretary pursuant to clause (iv).

(C) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that an employer of an alien granted blue card status has failed to provide the record of employment required under subsection (a)(5) or has provided a false statement of material fact in such a record, the employer shall be subject to a civil money penalty in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 per violation.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The penalty applicable under clause (i) for failure to provide records shall not apply unless the alien has provided the employer with evidence of employment authorization granted under this section.

(c) ADJUSTMENT TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—

(1) AGRICULTURAL WORKERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall adjust the status of an alien granted blue card status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the Secretary determines that the following requirements are satisfied:

(i) QUALIFYING EMPLOYMENT.—The alien has performed at least—

(I) 5 years of agricultural employment in the United States, for at least 100 work days or 575 hours, but in no case less than 575 hours per year, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(II) 3 years of agricultural employment in the United States, for at least 150 work days or 863 hours, but in no case less than 863 hours per year, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) PROOF.—An alien may demonstrate compliance with the requirement under clause (i) by submitting—

(I) the record of employment described in subsection (a)(5); or

(II) such documentation as may be submitted under subsection (d)(3).

(iii) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—In determining whether an alien has met the requirement under clause (i)(I), the Secretary may credit the alien with not more than 12 additional months to meet the requirement under clause (i) if the alien was unable to work in agricultural employment due to—

(I) pregnancy, injury, or disease, if the alien can establish such pregnancy, disabling injury, or disease through medical records;

(II) illness, disease, or other special needs of a minor child, if the alien can establish such illness, disease, or special needs through medical records; or

(III) severe weather conditions that prevented the alien from engaging in agricultural employment for a significant period of time.

(iv) APPLICATION PERIOD.—The alien applies for adjustment of status not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(v) FINE.—The alien pays a fine to the Secretary in an amount equal to \$400.

(B) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OF ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—The Secretary may deny an alien adjustment to permanent resident status, and provide for termination of the blue card status granted such alien, if—

(i) the Secretary finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the adjustment to blue card status was the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation, as described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i)); or

(ii) the alien—

(I) commits an act that makes the alien inadmissible to the United States under section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182), except as provided under subsection (e)(2);

(II) is convicted of a felony or 3 or more misdemeanors committed in the United States; or

(III) is convicted of a single misdemeanor for which the actual sentence served is 6 months or longer.

(C) GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL.—Any alien granted blue card status who does not apply for adjustment of status under this subsection before the expiration of the application period described in subparagraph (A)(iv), or who fails to meet the other requirements of subparagraph (A) by the end of the applicable period, is deportable and may be removed under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a).

(D) PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date on which an alien's status is adjusted under this subsection, the alien shall establish the payment of all Federal income taxes owed for employment during the period of employment required under paragraph (1)(A) by establishing that—

(I) no such tax liability exists;

(II) all outstanding liabilities have been met; or

(III) the alien has entered into an agreement for payment of all outstanding liabilities with the Internal Revenue Service.

(ii) IRS COOPERATION.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall provide documentation to an alien upon request to establish the payment of all income taxes required under this paragraph.

(2) SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall confer the status of lawful permanent resident on the spouse and minor child of an alien granted status under paragraph (1), including any individual who was a minor child on the date such alien was granted blue card status, if the spouse or minor child applies for such status, or if the principal alien includes the spouse or minor child in an application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident.

(B) TREATMENT OF SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN BEFORE ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

(i) REMOVAL.—The spouse and any minor child of an alien granted blue card status may not be removed while such alien maintains such status, except as provided in subparagraph (C).

(ii) TRAVEL.—The spouse and any minor child of an alien granted blue card status may travel outside the United States in the same manner as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(iii) EMPLOYMENT.—The spouse of an alien granted blue card status may apply to the Secretary for a work permit to authorize such spouse to engage in any lawful employment in the United States while such alien maintains blue card status.

(C) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OF ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS AND REMOVAL.—The Secretary may deny an alien spouse or child adjustment of status under subparagraph (A) and may remove such spouse or child under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a) if the spouse or child—

(i) commits an act that makes the alien spouse or child inadmissible to the United States under section 212 of such Act (8 U.S.C.

1182), except as provided under subsection (e)(2);

(ii) is convicted of a felony or 3 or more misdemeanors committed in the United States; or

(iii) is convicted of a single misdemeanor for which the actual sentence served is 6 months or longer.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) TO WHOM MAY BE MADE.—The Secretary shall provide that—

(A) applications for blue card status may be filed—

(i) with the Secretary, but only if the applicant is represented by an attorney or a non-profit religious, charitable, social service, or similar organization recognized by the Board of Immigration Appeals under section 292.2 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(ii) with a qualified designated entity (designated under paragraph (2)), but only if the applicant consents to the forwarding of the application to the Secretary; and

(B) applications for adjustment of status under subsection (c) shall be filed directly with the Secretary.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ENTITIES TO RECEIVE APPLICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of receiving applications under subsection (a), the Secretary—

(i) shall designate qualified farm labor organizations and associations of employers; and

(ii) may designate such other persons as the Secretary determines are qualified and have substantial experience, demonstrate competence, and have traditional long-term involvement in the preparation and submission of applications for adjustment of status under section 209, 210, or 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 89-732, Public Law 95-145, or the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

(B) REFERENCES.—Organizations, associations, and persons designated under subparagraph (A) are referred to in this subtitle as “qualified designated entities”.

(3) PROOF OF ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien may establish that the alien meets the requirement of subsection (a)(1)(A) or (c)(1)(A) through government employment records or records supplied by employers or collective bargaining organizations, and other reliable documentation as the alien may provide. The Secretary shall establish special procedures to properly credit work in cases in which an alien was employed under an assumed name.

(B) DOCUMENTATION OF WORK HISTORY.—

(i) BURDEN OF PROOF.—An alien applying for status under subsection (a)(1) or (c)(1) has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien has worked the requisite number of hours or days (as required under subsection (a)(1)(A) or (c)(1)(A)).

(ii) TIMELY PRODUCTION OF RECORDS.—If an employer or farm labor contractor employing such an alien has kept proper and adequate records respecting such employment, the alien's burden of proof under clause (i) may be met by securing timely production of those records under regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary.

(iii) SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—An alien can meet the burden of proof under clause (i) to establish that the alien has performed the work described in subsection (a)(1)(A) or (c)(1)(A) by producing sufficient evidence to show the extent of that employment as a matter of just and reasonable inference.

(4) TREATMENT OF APPLICATIONS BY QUALIFIED DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—Each qualified designated entity shall agree to forward to the Secretary applications filed with it in accordance with paragraph (1)(A)(i)(II) but

shall not forward to the Secretary applications filed with it unless the applicant has consented to such forwarding. No such entity may make a determination required by this section to be made by the Secretary. Upon the request of the alien, a qualified designated entity shall assist the alien in obtaining documentation of the work history of the alien.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—Files and records prepared for purposes of this subsection by qualified designated entities operating under this subsection are confidential and the Secretary shall not have access to such files or records relating to an alien without the consent of the alien, except as allowed by a court order issued pursuant to paragraph (6).

(6) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, neither the Secretary, nor any other official or employee of the Department, or a bureau or agency of the Department, may—

(i) use the information furnished by the applicant pursuant to an application filed under this section, the information provided to the applicant by a person designated under paragraph (2)(A), or any information provided by an employer or former employer, for any purpose other than to make a determination on the application, or for enforcement of paragraph (7);

(ii) make any publication whereby the information furnished by any particular individual can be identified; or

(iii) permit anyone other than the sworn officers and employees of the Department, or a bureau or agency of the Department, or, with respect to applications filed with a qualified designated entity, that qualified designated entity, to examine individual applications.

(B) REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.—The Secretary shall provide the information furnished under this section, or any other information derived from such furnished information, to—

(i) a duly recognized law enforcement entity in connection with a criminal investigation or prosecution, if such information is requested in writing by such entity; or

(ii) an official coroner, for purposes of affirmatively identifying a deceased individual, whether or not the death of such individual resulted from a crime.

(C) CONSTRUCTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the use, or release, for immigration enforcement purposes or law enforcement purposes of information contained in files or records of the Department pertaining to an application filed under this section, other than information furnished by an applicant pursuant to the application, or any other information derived from the application, that is not available from any other source.

(ii) CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS.—Information concerning whether the applicant has at any time been convicted of a crime may be used or released for immigration enforcement or law enforcement purposes.

(D) CRIME.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this paragraph shall be subject to a fine in an amount not to exceed \$10,000.

(7) PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS IN APPLICATIONS.—

(A) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person who—

(i) files an application for status under subsection (a) or (c) and knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up a material fact or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes

or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; or

(ii) creates or supplies a false writing or document for use in making such an application,

shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(B) INADMISSIBILITY.—An alien who is convicted of a crime under subparagraph (A) shall be considered to be inadmissible to the United States on the ground described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i)).

(8) ELIGIBILITY FOR LEGAL SERVICES.—Section 504(a)(11) of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-53 et seq.) shall not be construed to prevent a recipient of funds under the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996 et seq.) from providing legal assistance directly related to an application for adjustment of status under this section.

(9) APPLICATION FEES.—

(A) FEE SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall provide for a schedule of fees that—

(i) shall be charged for the filing of applications for status under subsections (a) and (c); and

(ii) may be charged by qualified designated entities to help defray the costs of services provided to such applicants.

(B) PROHIBITION ON EXCESS FEES BY QUALIFIED DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—A qualified designated entity may not charge any fee in excess of, or in addition to, the fees authorized under subparagraph (A)(ii) for services provided to applicants.

(C) DISPOSITION OF FEES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account, which shall be known as the “Agricultural Worker Immigration Status Adjustment Account”. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be deposited as offsetting receipts into the account all fees collected under subparagraph (A)(i).

(ii) USE OF FEES FOR APPLICATION PROCESSING.—Amounts deposited in the “Agricultural Worker Immigration Status Adjustment Account” shall remain available to the Secretary until expended for processing applications for status under subsections (a) and (c).

(e) WAIVER OF NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS AND CERTAIN GROUNDS FOR INADMISSIBILITY.—

(1) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS DO NOT APPLY.—The numerical limitations of sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 and 1152) shall not apply to the adjustment of aliens to lawful permanent resident status under this section.

(2) WAIVER OF CERTAIN GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—In the determination of an alien's eligibility for status under subsection (a)(1)(C) or an alien's eligibility for adjustment of status under subsection (c)(1)(B)(ii)(I), the following rules shall apply:

(A) GROUNDS OF EXCLUSION NOT APPLICABLE.—The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (7), and (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) shall not apply.

(B) WAIVER OF OTHER GROUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may waive any other provision of such section 212(a) in the case of individual aliens for humanitarian purposes, to ensure family unity, or if otherwise in the public interest.

(ii) GROUNDS THAT MAY NOT BE WAIVED.—Paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), (2)(C), (3), and (4) of such section 212(a) may not be waived by the Secretary under clause (i).

(iii) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as affecting the

authority of the Secretary other than under this subparagraph to waive provisions of such section 212(a).

(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC CHARGE.—An alien is not ineligible for status under this section by reason of a ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) if the alien demonstrates a history of employment in the United States evidencing self-support without reliance on public cash assistance.

(F) TEMPORARY STAY OF REMOVAL AND WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN APPLICANTS.—

(1) BEFORE APPLICATION PERIOD.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide that, in the case of an alien who is apprehended before the beginning of the application period described in subsection (a)(1)(B) and who can establish a nonfrivolous case of eligibility for blue card status (but for the fact that the alien may not apply for such status until the beginning of such period), until the alien has had the opportunity during the first 30 days of the application period to complete the filing of an application for blue card status, the alien—

(A) may not be removed; and

(B) shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and be provided an “employment authorized” endorsement or other appropriate work permit for such purpose.

(2) DURING APPLICATION PERIOD.—The Secretary shall provide that, in the case of an alien who presents a nonfrivolous application for blue card status during the application period described in subsection (a)(1)(B), including an alien who files such an application within 30 days of the alien's apprehension, and until a final determination on the application has been made in accordance with this section, the alien—

(A) may not be removed; and

(B) shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and be provided an “employment authorized” endorsement or other appropriate work permit for such purpose.

(G) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review of a determination respecting an application for status under subsection (a) or (c) except in accordance with this subsection.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

(A) SINGLE LEVEL OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPELLATE REVIEW.—The Secretary shall establish an appellate authority to provide for a single level of administrative appellate review of such a determination.

(B) STANDARD FOR REVIEW.—Such administrative appellate review shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the determination on the application and upon such additional or newly discovered evidence as may not have been available at the time of the determination.

(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(A) LIMITATION TO REVIEW OF REMOVAL.—There shall be judicial review of such a determination only in the judicial review of an order of removal under section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252).

(B) STANDARD FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Such judicial review shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the review by the appellate authority and the findings of fact and determinations contained in such record shall be conclusive unless the applicant can establish abuse of discretion or that the findings are directly contrary to clear and convincing facts contained in the record considered as a whole.

(h) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM.—Beginning not later than the first day of the application period described in subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary, in cooperation with qualified designated entities, shall broadly disseminate information respecting the benefits that aliens may receive under this section and the requirements to be satisfied to obtain such benefits.

(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to implement this section not later than the first day of the seventh month that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that regulations are issued implementing this section on an interim or other basis.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

#### SEC. 614. CORRECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(d)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or” at the end;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) who is granted blue card status under the Agricultural Job Opportunity, Benefits, and Security Act of 2006;” and

(4) by striking “1990.” and inserting “1990, or in the case of an alien described in subparagraph (D), if such conduct is alleged to have occurred before the date on which the alien was granted blue card status.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the seventh month that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### CHAPTER 2—REFORM OF H-2A WORKER PROGRAM

##### SEC. 615. AMENDMENT TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 218 and inserting the following:

#### “SEC. 218. H-2A EMPLOYER APPLICATIONS.

“(a) APPLICATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No alien may be admitted to the United States as an H-2A worker, or otherwise provided status as an H-2A worker, unless the employer has filed with the Secretary of Labor an application containing—

“(A) the assurances described in subsection (b);

“(B) a description of the nature and location of the work to be performed;

“(C) the anticipated period (expected beginning and ending dates) for which the workers will be needed; and

“(D) the number of job opportunities in which the employer seeks to employ the workers.

“(2) ACCOMPANIED BY JOB OFFER.—Each application filed under paragraph (1) shall be accompanied by a copy of the job offer describing the wages and other terms and conditions of employment and the bona fide occupational qualifications that shall be possessed by a worker to be employed in the job opportunity in question.

“(b) ASSURANCES FOR INCLUSION IN APPLICATIONS.—The assurances referred to in subsection (a)(1) are the following:

“(1) JOB OPPORTUNITIES COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—With respect

to a job opportunity that is covered under a collective bargaining agreement:

“(A) UNION CONTRACT DESCRIBED.—The job opportunity is covered by a union contract which was negotiated at arm’s length between a bona fide union and the employer.

“(B) STRIKE OR LOCKOUT.—The specific job opportunity for which the employer is requesting an H-2A worker is not vacant because the former occupant is on strike or being locked out in the course of a labor dispute.

“(C) NOTIFICATION OF BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVES.—The employer, at the time of filing the application, has provided notice of the filing under this paragraph to the bargaining representative of the employer’s employees in the occupational classification at the place or places of employment for which aliens are sought.

“(D) TEMPORARY OR SEASONAL JOB OPPORTUNITIES.—The job opportunity is temporary or seasonal.

“(E) OFFERS TO UNITED STATES WORKERS.—The employer has offered or will offer the job to any eligible United States worker who applies and is equally or better qualified for the job for which the nonimmigrant is, or the nonimmigrants are, sought and who will be available at the time and place of need.

“(F) PROVISION OF INSURANCE.—If the job opportunity is not covered by the State workers’ compensation law, the employer will provide, at no cost to the worker, insurance covering injury and disease arising out of, and in the course of, the worker’s employment which will provide benefits at least equal to those provided under the State’s workers’ compensation law for comparable employment.

“(2) JOB OPPORTUNITIES NOT COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—With respect to a job opportunity that is not covered under a collective bargaining agreement:

“(A) STRIKE OR LOCKOUT.—The specific job opportunity for which the employer is requesting an H-2A worker is not vacant because the former occupant is on strike or being locked out in the course of a labor dispute.

“(B) TEMPORARY OR SEASONAL JOB OPPORTUNITIES.—The job opportunity is temporary or seasonal.

“(C) BENEFIT, WAGE, AND WORKING CONDITIONS.—The employer will provide, at a minimum, the benefits, wages, and working conditions required by section 218E to all workers employed in the job opportunities for which the employer has applied under subsection (a) and to all other workers in the same occupation at the place of employment.

“(D) NONDISPLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—The employer did not displace and will not displace a United States worker employed by the employer during the period of employment and for a period of 30 days preceding the period of employment in the occupation at the place of employment for which the employer seeks approval to employ H-2A workers.

“(E) REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT OF NON-IMMIGRANT WITH OTHER EMPLOYERS.—The employer will not place the nonimmigrant with another employer unless—

“(i) the nonimmigrant performs duties in whole or in part at 1 or more work sites owned, operated, or controlled by such other employer;

“(ii) there are indicia of an employment relationship between the nonimmigrant and such other employer; and

“(iii) the employer has inquired of the other employer as to whether, and has no actual knowledge or notice that, during the period of employment and for a period of 30 days preceding the period of employment,

the other employer has displaced or intends to displace a United States worker employed by the other employer in the occupation at the place of employment for which the employer seeks approval to employ H-2A workers.

“(F) STATEMENT OF LIABILITY.—The application form shall include a clear statement explaining the liability under subparagraph (E) of an employer if the other employer described in such subparagraph displaces a United States worker as described in such subparagraph.

“(G) PROVISION OF INSURANCE.—If the job opportunity is not covered by the State workers’ compensation law, the employer will provide, at no cost to the worker, insurance covering injury and disease arising out of and in the course of the worker’s employment which will provide benefits at least equal to those provided under the State’s workers’ compensation law for comparable employment.

“(H) EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—

“(i) RECRUITMENT.—The employer has taken or will take the following steps to recruit United States workers for the job opportunities for which the H-2A nonimmigrant is, or H-2A nonimmigrants are, sought:

“(I) CONTACTING FORMER WORKERS.—The employer shall make reasonable efforts through the sending of a letter by United States Postal Service mail, or otherwise, to contact any United States worker the employer employed during the previous season in the occupation at the place of intended employment for which the employer is applying for workers and has made the availability of the employer’s job opportunities in the occupation at the place of intended employment known to such previous workers, unless the worker was terminated from employment by the employer for a lawful job-related reason or abandoned the job before the worker completed the period of employment of the job opportunity for which the worker was hired.

“(II) FILING A JOB OFFER WITH THE LOCAL OFFICE OF THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AGENCY.—Not later than 28 days before the date on which the employer desires to employ an H-2A worker in a temporary or seasonal agricultural job opportunity, the employer shall submit a copy of the job offer described in subsection (a)(2) to the local office of the State employment security agency which serves the area of intended employment and authorize the posting of the job opportunity on ‘America’s Job Bank’ or other electronic job registry, except that nothing in this subclause shall require the employer to file an interstate job order under section 653 of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(III) ADVERTISING OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES.—Not later than 14 days before the date on which the employer desires to employ an H-2A worker in a temporary or seasonal agricultural job opportunity, the employer shall advertise the availability of the job opportunities for which the employer is seeking workers in a publication in the local labor market that is likely to be patronized by potential farm workers.

“(IV) EMERGENCY PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Labor shall, by regulation, provide a procedure for acceptance and approval of applications in which the employer has not complied with the provisions of this subparagraph because the employer’s need for H-2A workers could not reasonably have been foreseen.

“(ii) JOB OFFERS.—The employer has offered or will offer the job to any eligible United States worker who applies and is equally or better qualified for the job for which the nonimmigrant is, or non-

immigrants are, sought and who will be available at the time and place of need.

“(iii) PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT.—The employer will provide employment to any qualified United States worker who applies to the employer during the period beginning on the date on which the foreign worker departs for the employer’s place of employment and ending on the date on which 50 percent of the period of employment for which the foreign worker who is in the job was hired has elapsed, subject to the following requirements:

“(I) PROHIBITION.—No person or entity shall willfully and knowingly withhold United States workers before the arrival of H-2A workers in order to force the hiring of United States workers under this clause.

“(II) COMPLAINTS.—Upon receipt of a complaint by an employer that a violation of subclause (I) has occurred, the Secretary of Labor shall immediately investigate. The Secretary of Labor shall, within 36 hours of the receipt of the complaint, issue findings concerning the alleged violation. If the Secretary of Labor finds that a violation has occurred, the Secretary of Labor shall immediately suspend the application of this clause with respect to that certification for that date of need.

“(III) PLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—Before referring a United States worker to an employer during the period described in the matter preceding subclause (I), the Secretary of Labor shall make all reasonable efforts to place the United States worker in an open job acceptable to the worker, if there are other job offers pending with the job service that offer similar job opportunities in the area of intended employment.

“(iv) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prohibit an employer from using such legitimate selection criteria relevant to the type of job that are normal or customary to the type of job involved so long as such criteria are not applied in a discriminatory manner.

“(c) APPLICATIONS BY ASSOCIATIONS ON BEHALF OF EMPLOYER MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An agricultural association may file an application under subsection (a) on behalf of 1 or more of its employer members that the association certifies in its application has or have agreed in writing to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 218E through 218G.

“(2) TREATMENT OF ASSOCIATIONS ACTING AS EMPLOYERS.—If an association filing an application under paragraph (1) is a joint or sole employer of the temporary or seasonal agricultural workers requested on the application, the certifications granted under subsection (e)(2)(B) to the association may be used for the certified job opportunities of any of its producer members named on the application, and such workers may be transferred among such producer members to perform the agricultural services of a temporary or seasonal nature for which the certifications were granted.

“(d) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An employer may withdraw an application filed pursuant to subsection (a), except that if the employer is an agricultural association, the association may withdraw an application filed pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to 1 or more of its members. To withdraw an application, the employer or association shall notify the Secretary of Labor in writing, and the Secretary of Labor shall acknowledge in writing the receipt of such withdrawal notice. An employer who withdraws an application under subsection (a), or on whose behalf an application is withdrawn, is relieved of the obligations undertaken in the application.



“(2) LIMITATION.—An application may not be withdrawn while any alien provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) pursuant to such application is employed by the employer.

“(3) OBLIGATIONS UNDER OTHER STATUTES.—Any obligation incurred by an employer under any other law or regulation as a result of the recruitment of United States workers or H-2A workers under an offer of terms and conditions of employment required as a result of making an application under subsection (a) is unaffected by withdrawal of such application.

“(e) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) RESPONSIBILITY OF EMPLOYERS.—The employer shall make available for public examination, within 1 working day after the date on which an application under subsection (a) is filed, at the employer’s principal place of business or work site, a copy of each such application (and such accompanying documents as are necessary).

“(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

“(A) COMPILATION OF LIST.—The Secretary of Labor shall compile, on a current basis, a list (by employer and by occupational classification) of the applications filed under this subsection. Such list shall include the wage rate, number of workers sought, period of intended employment, and date of need. The Secretary of Labor shall make such list available for examination in the District of Columbia.

“(B) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor shall review such an application only for completeness and obvious inaccuracies. Unless the Secretary of Labor finds that the application is incomplete or obviously inaccurate, the Secretary of Labor shall certify that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary of Labor an application as described in subsection (a). Such certification shall be provided within 7 days of the filing of the application.”; and

(2) by inserting after section 218D, as added by section 601 of this Act, the following:

**“SEC. 218E. H-2A EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS.**

“(a) PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF ALIENS PROHIBITED.—Employers seeking to hire United States workers shall offer the United States workers no less than the same benefits, wages, and working conditions that the employer is offering, intends to offer, or will provide to H-2A workers. Conversely, no job offer may impose on United States workers any restrictions or obligations which will not be imposed on the employer’s H-2A workers.

“(b) MINIMUM BENEFITS, WAGES, AND WORKING CONDITIONS.—Except in cases where higher benefits, wages, or working conditions are required by the provisions of subsection (a), in order to protect similarly employed United States workers from adverse effects with respect to benefits, wages, and working conditions, every job offer which shall accompany an application under section 218(b)(2) shall include each of the following benefit, wage, and working condition provisions:

“(1) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE HOUSING OR A HOUSING ALLOWANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer applying under section 218(a) for H-2A workers shall offer to provide housing at no cost to all workers in job opportunities for which the employer has applied under that section and to all other workers in the same occupation at the place of employment, whose place of residence is beyond normal commuting distance.

“(B) TYPE OF HOUSING.—In complying with subparagraph (A), an employer may, at the employer’s election, provide housing that

meets applicable Federal standards for temporary labor camps or secure housing that meets applicable local standards for rental or public accommodation housing or other substantially similar class of habitation, or in the absence of applicable local standards, State standards for rental or public accommodation housing or other substantially similar class of habitation. In the absence of applicable local or State standards, Federal temporary labor camp standards shall apply.

“(C) FAMILY HOUSING.—When it is the prevailing practice in the occupation and area of intended employment to provide family housing, family housing shall be provided to workers with families who request it.

“(D) WORKERS ENGAGED IN THE RANGE PRODUCTION OF LIVESTOCK.—The Secretary of Labor shall issue regulations that address the specific requirements for the provision of housing to workers engaged in the range production of livestock.

“(E) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require an employer to provide or secure housing for persons who were not entitled to such housing under the temporary labor certification regulations in effect on June 1, 1986.

“(F) CHARGES FOR HOUSING.—

“(i) CHARGES FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—If public housing provided for migrant agricultural workers under the auspices of a local, county, or State government is secured by an employer, and use of the public housing unit normally requires charges from migrant workers, such charges shall be paid by the employer directly to the appropriate individual or entity affiliated with the housing’s management.

“(ii) DEPOSIT CHARGES.—Charges in the form of deposits for bedding or other similar incidentals related to housing shall not be levied upon workers by employers who provide housing for their workers. An employer may require a worker found to have been responsible for damage to such housing which is not the result of normal wear and tear related to habitation to reimburse the employer for the reasonable cost of repair of such damage.

“(G) HOUSING ALLOWANCE AS ALTERNATIVE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the requirement under clause (ii) is satisfied, the employer may provide a reasonable housing allowance instead of offering housing under subparagraph (A). Upon the request of a worker seeking assistance in locating housing, the employer shall make a good faith effort to assist the worker in identifying and locating housing in the area of intended employment. An employer who offers a housing allowance to a worker, or assists a worker in locating housing which the worker occupies, pursuant to this clause shall not be deemed a housing provider under section 203 of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1823) solely by virtue of providing such housing allowance. No housing allowance may be used for housing which is owned or controlled by the employer.

“(ii) CERTIFICATION.—The requirement of this clause is satisfied if the Governor of the State certifies to the Secretary of Labor that there is adequate housing available in the area of intended employment for migrant farm workers, and H-2A workers, who are seeking temporary housing while employed at farm work. Such certification shall expire after 3 years unless renewed by the Governor of the State.

“(iii) AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE.—

“(I) NONMETROPOLITAN COUNTIES.—If the place of employment of the workers provided an allowance under this subparagraph is a nonmetropolitan county, the amount of the housing allowance under this subparagraph shall be equal to the statewide average fair

market rental for existing housing for non-metropolitan counties for the State, as established by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)), based on a 2 bedroom dwelling unit and an assumption of 2 persons per bedroom.

“(II) METROPOLITAN COUNTIES.—If the place of employment of the workers provided an allowance under this paragraph is in a metropolitan county, the amount of the housing allowance under this subparagraph shall be equal to the statewide average fair market rental for existing housing for metropolitan counties for the State, as established by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)), based on a 2-bedroom dwelling unit and an assumption of 2 persons per bedroom.

“(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—

“(A) TO PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT.—A worker who completes 50 percent of the period of employment of the job opportunity for which the worker was hired shall be reimbursed by the employer for the cost of the worker’s transportation and subsistence from the place from which the worker came to work for the employer (or place of last employment, if the worker traveled from such place) to the place of employment.

“(B) FROM PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT.—A worker who completes the period of employment for the job opportunity involved shall be reimbursed by the employer for the cost of the worker’s transportation and subsistence from the place of employment to the place from which the worker, disregarding intervening employment, came to work for the employer, or to the place of next employment, if the worker has contracted with a subsequent employer who has not agreed to provide or pay for the worker’s transportation and subsistence to such subsequent employer’s place of employment.

“(C) LIMITATION.—

“(i) AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the amount of reimbursement provided under subparagraph (A) or (B) to a worker or alien shall not exceed the lesser of—

“(I) the actual cost to the worker or alien of the transportation and subsistence involved; or

“(II) the most economical and reasonable common carrier transportation charges and subsistence costs for the distance involved.

“(ii) DISTANCE TRAVELED.—No reimbursement under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be required if the distance traveled is 100 miles or less, or the worker is not residing in employer-provided housing or housing secured through an allowance as provided in paragraph (1)(G).

“(D) EARLY TERMINATION.—If the worker is laid off or employment is terminated for contract impossibility (as described in paragraph (4)(D)) before the anticipated ending date of employment, the employer shall provide the transportation and subsistence required by subparagraph (B) and, notwithstanding whether the worker has completed 50 percent of the period of employment, shall provide the transportation reimbursement required by subparagraph (A).

“(E) TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN LIVING QUARTERS AND WORK SITE.—The employer shall provide transportation between the worker’s living quarters and the employer’s work site without cost to the worker, and such transportation will be in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

“(3) REQUIRED WAGES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer applying for workers under section 218(a) shall offer to pay, and shall pay, all workers in the occupation for which the employer has applied

for workers, not less (and is not required to pay more) than the greater of the prevailing wage in the occupation in the area of intended employment or the adverse effect wage rate. No worker shall be paid less than the greater of the hourly wage prescribed under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) or the applicable State minimum wage.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Effective on the date of the enactment of the Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security Act of 2006 and continuing for 3 years thereafter, no adverse effect wage rate for a State may be more than the adverse effect wage rate for that State in effect on January 1, 2003, as established by section 655.107 of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(C) REQUIRED WAGES AFTER 3-YEAR FREEZE.—

“(i) FIRST ADJUSTMENT.—If Congress does not set a new wage standard applicable to this section before the first March 1 that is not less than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the adverse effect wage rate for each State beginning on such March 1 shall be the wage rate that would have resulted if the adverse effect wage rate in effect on January 1, 2003, had been annually adjusted, beginning on March 1, 2006, by the lesser of—

“(I) the 12 month percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers between December of the second preceding year and December of the preceding year; and

“(II) 4 percent.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—Beginning on the first March 1 that is not less than 4 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each March 1 thereafter, the adverse effect wage rate then in effect for each State shall be adjusted by the lesser of—

“(I) the 12 month percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers between December of the second preceding year and December of the preceding year; and

“(II) 4 percent.

“(D) DEDUCTIONS.—The employer shall make only those deductions from the worker's wages that are authorized by law or are reasonable and customary in the occupation and area of employment. The job offer shall specify all deductions not required by law which the employer will make from the worker's wages.

“(E) FREQUENCY OF PAY.—The employer shall pay the worker not less frequently than twice monthly, or in accordance with the prevailing practice in the area of employment, whichever is more frequent.

“(F) HOURS AND EARNINGS STATEMENTS.—The employer shall furnish to the worker, on or before each payday, in 1 or more written statements—

“(i) the worker's total earnings for the pay period;

“(ii) the worker's hourly rate of pay, piece rate of pay, or both;

“(iii) the hours of employment which have been offered to the worker (broken out by hours offered in accordance with and over and above the three-quarters guarantee described in paragraph (4));

“(iv) the hours actually worked by the worker;

“(v) an itemization of the deductions made from the worker's wages; and

“(vi) if piece rates of pay are used, the units produced daily.

“(G) REPORT ON WAGE PROTECTIONS.—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and transmit to the Secretary of Labor, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and Committee on the Judiciary

of the House of Representatives, a report that addresses—

“(i) whether the employment of H-2A or unauthorized aliens in the United States agricultural work force has depressed United States farm worker wages below the levels that would otherwise have prevailed if alien farm workers had not been employed in the United States;

“(ii) whether an adverse effect wage rate is necessary to prevent wages of United States farm workers in occupations in which H-2A workers are employed from falling below the wage levels that would have prevailed in the absence of the employment of H-2A workers in those occupations;

“(iii) whether alternative wage standards, such as a prevailing wage standard, would be sufficient to prevent wages in occupations in which H-2A workers are employed from falling below the wage level that would have prevailed in the absence of H-2A employment;

“(iv) whether any changes are warranted in the current methodologies for calculating the adverse effect wage rate and the prevailing wage; and

“(v) recommendations for future wage protection under this section.

“(H) COMMISSION ON WAGE STANDARDS.—

“(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on Agricultural Wage Standards under the H-2A program (in this subparagraph referred to as the ‘Commission’).

“(ii) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall consist of 10 members as follows:

“(I) 4 representatives of agricultural employers and 1 representative of the Department of Agriculture, each appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(II) 4 representatives of agricultural workers and 1 representative of the Department of Labor, each appointed by the Secretary of Labor.

“(iii) FUNCTIONS.—The Commission shall conduct a study that shall address—

“(I) whether the employment of H-2A or unauthorized aliens in the United States agricultural workforce has depressed United States farm worker wages below the levels that would otherwise have prevailed if alien farm workers had not been employed in the United States;

“(II) whether an adverse effect wage rate is necessary to prevent wages of United States farm workers in occupations in which H-2A workers are employed from falling below the wage levels that would have prevailed in the absence of the employment of H-2A workers in those occupations;

“(III) whether alternative wage standards, such as a prevailing wage standard, would be sufficient to prevent wages in occupations in which H-2A workers are employed from falling below the wage level that would have prevailed in the absence of H-2A employment;

“(IV) whether any changes are warranted in the current methodologies for calculating the adverse effect wage rate and the prevailing wage rate; and

“(V) recommendations for future wage protection under this section.

“(iv) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the findings of the study conducted under clause (iii).

“(v) TERMINATION DATE.—The Commission shall terminate upon submitting its final report.

“(4) GUARANTEE OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) OFFER TO WORKER.—The employer shall guarantee to offer the worker employment for the hourly equivalent of at least three-fourths of the work days of the total period of employment, beginning with the

first work day after the arrival of the worker at the place of employment and ending on the expiration date specified in the job offer. For purposes of this subparagraph, the hourly equivalent means the number of hours in the work days as stated in the job offer and shall exclude the worker's Sabbath and Federal holidays. If the employer affords the United States or H-2A worker less employment than that required under this paragraph, the employer shall pay such worker the amount which the worker would have earned had the worker, in fact, worked for the guaranteed number of hours.

“(B) FAILURE TO WORK.—Any hours which the worker fails to work, up to a maximum of the number of hours specified in the job offer for a work day, when the worker has been offered an opportunity to do so, and all hours of work actually performed (including voluntary work in excess of the number of hours specified in the job offer in a work day, on the worker's Sabbath, or on Federal holidays) may be counted by the employer in calculating whether the period of guaranteed employment has been met.

“(C) ABANDONMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, TERMINATION FOR CAUSE.—If the worker voluntarily abandons employment before the end of the contract period, or is terminated for cause, the worker is not entitled to the ‘three-fourths guarantee’ described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) CONTRACT IMPOSSIBILITY.—If, before the expiration of the period of employment specified in the job offer, the services of the worker are no longer required for reasons beyond the control of the employer due to any form of natural disaster, including but not limited to a flood, hurricane, freeze, earthquake, fire, drought, plant or animal disease or pest infestation, or regulatory drought, before the guarantee in subparagraph (A) is fulfilled, the employer may terminate the worker's employment. In the event of such termination, the employer shall fulfill the employment guarantee in subparagraph (A) for the work days that have elapsed from the first work day after the arrival of the worker to the termination of employment. In such cases, the employer will make efforts to transfer the United States worker to other comparable employment acceptable to the worker. If such transfer is not effected, the employer shall provide the return transportation required in paragraph (2)(D).

“(5) MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY.—

“(A) MODE OF TRANSPORTATION SUBJECT TO COVERAGE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (iii) and (iv), this subsection applies to any H-2A employer that uses or causes to be used any vehicle to transport an H-2A worker within the United States.

“(ii) DEFINED TERM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘uses or causes to be used’—

“(I) applies only to transportation provided by an H-2A employer to an H-2A worker, or by a farm labor contractor to an H-2A worker at the request or direction of an H-2A employer; and

“(II) does not apply to—

“(aa) transportation provided, or transportation arrangements made, by an H-2A worker, unless the employer specifically requested or arranged such transportation; or

“(bb) car pooling arrangements made by H-2A workers themselves, using 1 of the workers' own vehicles, unless specifically requested by the employer directly or through a farm labor contractor.

“(iii) CLARIFICATION.—Providing a job offer to an H-2A worker that causes the worker to travel to or from the place of employment, or the payment or reimbursement of the transportation costs of an H-2A worker by an H-2A employer, shall not constitute an

arrangement of, or participation in, such transportation.

“(iv) AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT EXCLUDED.—This subsection does not apply to the transportation of an H-2A worker on a tractor, combine, harvester, picker, or other similar machinery or equipment while such worker is actually engaged in the planting, cultivating, or harvesting of agricultural commodities or the care of livestock or poultry or engaged in transportation incidental thereto.

“(v) COMMON CARRIERS EXCLUDED.—This subsection does not apply to common carrier motor vehicle transportation in which the provider holds itself out to the general public as engaging in the transportation of passengers for hire and holds a valid certification of authorization for such purposes from an appropriate Federal, State, or local agency.

“(B) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARDS, LICENSING, AND INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—When using, or causing to be used, any vehicle for the purpose of providing transportation to which this subparagraph applies, each employer shall—

“(I) ensure that each such vehicle conforms to the standards prescribed by the Secretary of Labor under section 401(b) of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1841(b)) and other applicable Federal and State safety standards;

“(II) ensure that each driver has a valid and appropriate license, as provided by State law, to operate the vehicle; and

“(III) have an insurance policy or a liability bond that is in effect which insures the employer against liability for damage to persons or property arising from the ownership, operation, or causing to be operated, of any vehicle used to transport any H-2A worker.

“(ii) AMOUNT OF INSURANCE REQUIRED.—The level of insurance required shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to regulations to be issued under this subsection.

“(iii) EFFECT OF WORKERS’ COMPENSATION COVERAGE.—If the employer of any H-2A worker provides workers’ compensation coverage for such worker in the case of bodily injury or death as provided by State law, the following adjustments in the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i)(III) relating to having an insurance policy or liability bond apply:

“(I) No insurance policy or liability bond shall be required of the employer, if such workers are transported only under circumstances for which there is coverage under such State law.

“(II) An insurance policy or liability bond shall be required of the employer for circumstances under which coverage for the transportation of such workers is not provided under such State law.

“(c) COMPLIANCE WITH LABOR LAWS.—An employer shall assure that, except as otherwise provided in this section, the employer will comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local labor laws, including laws affecting migrant and seasonal agricultural workers, with respect to all United States workers and alien workers employed by the employer, except that a violation of this assurance shall not constitute a violation of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

“(d) COPY OF JOB OFFER.—The employer shall provide to the worker, not later than the day the work commences, a copy of the employer’s application and job offer described in section 218(a), or, if the employer will require the worker to enter into a separate employment contract covering the employment in question, such separate employment contract.

“(e) RANGE PRODUCTION OF LIVESTOCK.—Nothing in this section, section 218, or section 218F shall preclude the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary from continuing to apply special procedures and requirements to the admission and employment of aliens in occupations involving the range production of livestock.

**“SEC. 218F. PROCEDURE FOR ADMISSION AND EXTENSION OF STAY OF H-2A WORKERS.**

“(a) PETITIONING FOR ADMISSION.—An employer, or an association acting as an agent or joint employer for its members, that seeks the admission into the United States of an H-2A worker may file a petition with the Secretary. The petition shall be accompanied by an accepted and currently valid certification provided by the Secretary of Labor under section 218(e)(2)(B) covering the petitioner.

“(b) EXPEDITED ADJUDICATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure for expedited adjudication of petitions filed under subsection (a) and within 7 working days shall, by fax, cable, or other means assuring expedited delivery, transmit a copy of notice of action on the petition to the petitioner and, in the case of approved petitions, to the appropriate immigration officer at the port of entry or United States consulate (as the case may be) where the petitioner has indicated that the alien beneficiary (or beneficiaries) will apply for a visa or admission to the United States.

“(c) CRITERIA FOR ADMISSIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An H-2A worker shall be considered admissible to the United States if the alien is otherwise admissible under this section, section 218, and section 218E, and the alien is not ineligible under paragraph (2).

“(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—An alien shall be considered inadmissible to the United States and ineligible for nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) if the alien has, at any time during the past 5 years—

“(A) violated a material provision of this section, including the requirement to promptly depart the United States when the alien’s authorized period of admission under this section has expired; or

“(B) otherwise violated a term or condition of admission into the United States as a nonimmigrant, including overstaying the period of authorized admission as such a nonimmigrant.

“(3) WAIVER OF INELIGIBILITY FOR UNLAWFUL PRESENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien who has not previously been admitted into the United States pursuant to this section, and who is otherwise eligible for admission in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), shall not be deemed inadmissible by virtue of section 212(a)(9)(B). If an alien described in the preceding sentence is present in the United States, the alien may apply from abroad for H-2A status, but may not be granted that status in the United States.

“(B) MAINTENANCE OF WAIVER.—An alien provided an initial waiver of ineligibility pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall remain eligible for such waiver unless the alien violates the terms of this section or again becomes ineligible under section 212(a)(9)(B) by virtue of unlawful presence in the United States after the date of the initial waiver of ineligibility pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(d) PERIOD OF ADMISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall be admitted for the period of employment in the application certified by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 218(e)(2)(B), not to exceed 10 months, supplemented by a period of not more than 1 week before the beginning of the period of employment for the purpose of travel to the work site and a period of 14 days following the period of employment for

the purpose of departure or extension based on a subsequent offer of employment, except that—

“(A) the alien is not authorized to be employed during such 14-day period except in the employment for which the alien was previously authorized; and

“(B) the total period of employment, including such 14-day period, may not exceed 10 months.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Secretary to extend the stay of the alien under any other provision of this Act.

“(e) ABANDONMENT OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien admitted or provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) who abandons the employment which was the basis for such admission or status shall be considered to have failed to maintain nonimmigrant status as an H-2A worker and shall depart the United States or be subject to removal under section 237(a)(1)(C)(i).

“(2) REPORT BY EMPLOYER.—The employer, or association acting as agent for the employer, shall notify the Secretary not later than 7 days after an H-2A worker prematurely abandons employment.

“(3) REMOVAL BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall promptly remove from the United States any H-2A worker who violates any term or condition of the worker’s nonimmigrant status.

“(4) VOLUNTARY TERMINATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an alien may voluntarily terminate his or her employment if the alien promptly departs the United States upon termination of such employment.

“(f) REPLACEMENT OF ALIEN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon presentation of the notice to the Secretary required by subsection (e)(2), the Secretary of State shall promptly issue a visa to, and the Secretary shall admit into the United States, an eligible alien designated by the employer to replace an H-2A worker—

“(A) who abandons or prematurely terminates employment; or

“(B) whose employment is terminated after a United States worker is employed pursuant to section 218(b)(2)(H)(iii), if the United States worker voluntarily departs before the end of the period of intended employment or if the employment termination is for a lawful job-related reason.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to limit any preference required to be accorded United States workers under any other provision of this Act.

“(g) IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each alien authorized to be admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) shall be provided an identification and employment eligibility document to verify eligibility for employment in the United States and verify such person’s proper identity.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—No identification and employment eligibility document may be issued which does not meet the following requirements:

“(A) The document shall be capable of reliably determining whether—

“(i) the individual with the identification and employment eligibility document whose eligibility is being verified is in fact eligible for employment;

“(ii) the individual whose eligibility is being verified is claiming the identity of another person; and

“(iii) the individual whose eligibility is being verified is authorized to be admitted into, and employed in, the United States as an H-2A worker.

“(B) The document shall be in a form that is resistant to counterfeiting and to tampering.

“(C) The document shall—

“(i) be compatible with other databases of the Secretary for the purpose of excluding aliens from benefits for which they are not eligible and determining whether the alien is unlawfully present in the United States; and

“(ii) be compatible with law enforcement databases to determine if the alien has been convicted of criminal offenses.

“(h) EXTENSION OF STAY OF H-2A ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES.—

“(1) EXTENSION OF STAY.—If an employer seeks approval to employ an H-2A alien who is lawfully present in the United States, the petition filed by the employer or an association pursuant to subsection (a), shall request an extension of the alien's stay and a change in the alien's employment.

“(2) LIMITATION ON FILING A PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF STAY.—A petition may not be filed for an extension of an alien's stay—

“(A) for a period of more than 10 months; or

“(B) to a date that is more than 3 years after the date of the alien's last admission to the United States under this section.

“(3) WORK AUTHORIZATION UPON FILING A PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF STAY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien who is lawfully present in the United States may commence the employment described in a petition under paragraph (1) on the date on which the petition is filed.

“(B) DEFINITION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘file’ means sending the petition by certified mail via the United States Postal Service, return receipt requested, or delivered by guaranteed commercial delivery which will provide the employer with a documented acknowledgment of the date of receipt of the petition.

“(C) HANDLING OF PETITION.—The employer shall provide a copy of the employer's petition to the alien, who shall keep the petition with the alien's identification and employment eligibility document as evidence that the petition has been filed and that the alien is authorized to work in the United States.

“(D) APPROVAL OF PETITION.—Upon approval of a petition for an extension of stay or change in the alien's authorized employment, the Secretary shall provide a new or updated employment eligibility document to the alien indicating the new validity date, after which the alien is not required to retain a copy of the petition.

“(4) LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION OF ALIENS WITHOUT VALID IDENTIFICATION AND EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY DOCUMENT.—An expired identification and employment eligibility document, together with a copy of a petition for extension of stay or change in the alien's authorized employment that complies with the requirements of paragraph (1), shall constitute a valid work authorization document for a period of not more than 60 days beginning on the date on which such petition is filed, after which time only a currently valid identification and employment eligibility document shall be acceptable.

“(5) LIMITATION ON AN INDIVIDUAL'S STAY IN STATUS.—

“(A) MAXIMUM PERIOD.—The maximum continuous period of authorized status as an H-2A worker (including any extensions) is 3 years.

“(B) REQUIREMENT TO REMAIN OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), in the case of an alien outside the United States whose period of authorized status as an H-2A worker (including any extensions) has expired, the alien may not again apply for admission to the United States as an H-2A worker unless the alien has remained outside the United States for a continuous period equal to at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  the duration of the alien's previous period of authorized status

as an H-2A worker (including any extensions).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply in the case of an alien if the alien's period of authorized status as an H-2A worker (including any extensions) was for a period of not more than 10 months and such alien has been outside the United States for at least 2 months during the 12 months preceding the date the alien again is applying for admission to the United States as an H-2A worker.

“(i) SPECIAL RULES FOR ALIENS EMPLOYED AS SHEEPHERDERS, GOAT HERDERS, OR DAIRY WORKERS.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security Act of 2006, an alien admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) for employment as a shepherd, goat herder, or dairy worker—

“(1) may be admitted for an initial period of 12 months;

“(2) subject to subsection (j)(5), may have such initial period of admission extended for a period of up to 3 years; and

“(3) shall not be subject to the requirements of subsection (h)(5) (relating to periods of absence from the United States).

“(j) ADJUSTMENT TO LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALIENS EMPLOYED AS SHEEPHERDERS, GOAT HERDERS, OR DAIRY WORKERS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE ALIEN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘eligible alien’ means an alien—

“(A) having nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) based on employment as a shepherd, goat herder, or dairy worker;

“(B) who has maintained such nonimmigrant status in the United States for a cumulative total of 36 months (excluding any period of absence from the United States); and

“(C) who is seeking to receive an immigrant visa under section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii).

“(2) CLASSIFICATION PETITION.—In the case of an eligible alien, the petition under section 204 for classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) may be filed by—

“(A) the alien's employer on behalf of an eligible alien; or

“(B) the eligible alien.

“(3) NO LABOR CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding section 203(b)(3)(C), no determination under section 212(a)(5)(A) is required with respect to an immigrant visa described in paragraph (1)(C) for an eligible alien.

“(4) EFFECT OF PETITION.—The filing of a petition described in paragraph (2) or an application for adjustment of status based on the approval of such a petition, shall not constitute evidence of an alien's ineligibility for nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a).

“(5) EXTENSION OF STAY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall extend the stay of an eligible alien having a pending or approved classification petition described in paragraph (2) in 1-year increments until a final determination is made on the alien's eligibility for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

“(6) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent an eligible alien from seeking adjustment of status in accordance with any other provision of law.

“SEC. 218G. WORKER PROTECTIONS AND LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

“(1) INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS.—

“(A) AGGRIEVED PERSON OR THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a process for the receipt, investigation, and disposition of complaints respecting a petitioner's failure to meet a condition

specified in section 218(b), or an employer's misrepresentation of material facts in an application under section 218(a). Complaints may be filed by any aggrieved person or organization (including bargaining representatives). No investigation or hearing shall be conducted on a complaint concerning such a failure or misrepresentation unless the complaint was filed not later than 12 months after the date of the failure, or misrepresentation, respectively. The Secretary of Labor shall conduct an investigation under this subparagraph if there is reasonable cause to believe that such a failure or misrepresentation has occurred.

“(B) DETERMINATION ON COMPLAINT.—Under such process, the Secretary of Labor shall provide, within 30 days after the date such a complaint is filed, for a determination as to whether or not a reasonable basis exists to make a finding described in subparagraph (C), (D), (E), or (H). If the Secretary of Labor determines that such a reasonable basis exists, the Secretary of Labor shall provide for notice of such determination to the interested parties and an opportunity for a hearing on the complaint, in accordance with section 556 of title 5, United States Code, within 60 days after the date of the determination. If such a hearing is requested, the Secretary of Labor shall make a finding concerning the matter not later than 60 days after the date of the hearing. In the case of similar complaints respecting the same applicant, the Secretary of Labor may consolidate the hearings under this subparagraph on such complaints.

“(C) FAILURES TO MEET CONDITIONS.—If the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, a failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), (1)(D), (1)(F), (2)(A), (2)(B), or (2)(G) of section 218(b), a substantial failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1)(C), (1)(E), (2)(C), (2)(D), (2)(E), or (2)(H) of section 218(b), or a material misrepresentation of fact in an application under section 218(a)—

“(i) the Secretary of Labor shall notify the Secretary of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil money penalties in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 per violation) as the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate; and

“(ii) the Secretary may disqualify the employer from the employment of aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) for a period of 1 year.

“(D) WILLFUL FAILURES AND WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATIONS.—If the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and opportunity for hearing, a willful failure to meet a condition of section 218(b), a willful misrepresentation of a material fact in an application under section 218(a), or a violation of subsection (d)(1)—

“(i) the Secretary of Labor shall notify the Secretary of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil money penalties in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 per violation) as the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate;

“(ii) the Secretary of Labor may seek appropriate legal or equitable relief to effectuate the purposes of subsection (d)(1); and

“(iii) the Secretary may disqualify the employer from the employment of H-2A workers for a period of 2 years.

“(E) DISPLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.—If the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and opportunity for hearing, a willful failure to meet a condition of section 218(b) or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact in an application under section 218(a), in the course of which failure or misrepresentation the employer displaced a

United States worker employed by the employer during the period of employment on the employer's application under section 218(a) or during the period of 30 days preceding such period of employment—

“(i) the Secretary of Labor shall notify the Secretary of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil money penalties in an amount not to exceed \$15,000 per violation) as the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate; and

“(ii) the Secretary may disqualify the employer from the employment of H-2A workers for a period of 3 years.

“(F) LIMITATIONS ON CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.—The Secretary of Labor shall not impose total civil money penalties with respect to an application under section 218(a) in excess of \$90,000.

“(G) FAILURES TO PAY WAGES OR REQUIRED BENEFITS.—If the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that the employer has failed to pay the wages, or provide the housing allowance, transportation, subsistence reimbursement, or guarantee of employment, required under section 218E(b), the Secretary of Labor shall assess payment of back wages, or other required benefits, due any United States worker or H-2A worker employed by the employer in the specific employment in question. The back wages or other required benefits under section 218E(b) shall be equal to the difference between the amount that should have been paid and the amount that actually was paid to such worker.

“(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary of Labor to conduct any compliance investigation under any other labor law, including any law affecting migrant and seasonal agricultural workers, or, in the absence of a complaint under this section, under section 218 or 218E.

“(b) RIGHTS ENFORCEABLE BY PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—H-2A workers may enforce the following rights through the private right of action provided in subsection (c), and no other right of action shall exist under Federal or State law to enforce such rights:

“(1) The providing of housing or a housing allowance as required under section 218E(b)(1).

“(2) The reimbursement of transportation as required under section 218E(b)(2).

“(3) The payment of wages required under section 218E(b)(3) when due.

“(4) The benefits and material terms and conditions of employment expressly provided in the job offer described in section 218(a)(2), not including the assurance to comply with other Federal, State, and local labor laws described in section 218E(c), compliance with which shall be governed by the provisions of such laws.

“(5) The guarantee of employment required under section 218E(b)(4).

“(6) The motor vehicle safety requirements under section 218E(b)(5).

“(7) The prohibition of discrimination under subsection (d)(2).

“(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

“(1) MEDIATION.—Upon the filing of a complaint by an H-2A worker aggrieved by a violation of rights enforceable under subsection (b), and within 60 days of the filing of proof of service of the complaint, a party to the action may file a request with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to assist the parties in reaching a satisfactory resolution of all issues involving all parties to the dispute. Upon a filing of such request and giving of notice to the parties, the parties shall attempt mediation within the period specified in subparagraph (B).

“(A) MEDIATION SERVICES.—The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall be available to assist in resolving disputes arising under subsection (b) between H-2A workers and agricultural employers without charge to the parties.

“(B) 90-DAY LIMIT.—The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service may conduct mediation or other non-binding dispute resolution activities for a period not to exceed 90 days beginning on the date on which the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service receives the request for assistance unless the parties agree to an extension of this period of time.

“(C) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service \$500,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this section.

“(ii) MEDIATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is authorized to conduct the mediation or other dispute resolution activities from any other appropriated funds available to the Director and to reimburse such appropriated funds when the funds are appropriated pursuant to this authorization, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt.

“(2) MAINTENANCE OF CIVIL ACTION IN DISTRICT COURT BY AGGRIEVED PERSON.—An H-2A worker aggrieved by a violation of rights enforceable under subsection (b) by an agricultural employer or other person may file suit in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without regard to the amount in controversy, without regard to the citizenship of the parties, and without regard to the exhaustion of any alternative administrative remedies under this Act, not later than 3 years after the date the violation occurs.

“(3) ELECTION.—An H-2A worker who has filed an administrative complaint with the Secretary of Labor may not maintain a civil action under paragraph (2) unless a complaint based on the same violation filed with the Secretary of Labor under subsection (a)(1) is withdrawn before the filing of such action, in which case the rights and remedies available under this subsection shall be exclusive.

“(4) PREEMPTION OF STATE CONTRACT RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish the rights and remedies of an H-2A worker under any other Federal or State law or regulation or under any collective bargaining agreement, except that no court or administrative action shall be available under any State contract law to enforce the rights created by this Act.

“(5) WAIVER OF RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—Agreements by employees purporting to waive or modify their rights under this Act shall be void as contrary to public policy, except that a waiver or modification of the rights or obligations in favor of the Secretary of Labor shall be valid for purposes of the enforcement of this Act. The preceding sentence may not be construed to prohibit agreements to settle private disputes or litigation.

“(6) AWARD OF DAMAGES OR OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.—

“(A) If the court finds that the respondent has intentionally violated any of the rights enforceable under subsection (b), it shall award actual damages, if any, or equitable relief.

“(B) Any civil action brought under this section shall be subject to appeal as provided in chapter 83 of title 28, United States Code.

“(7) WORKERS' COMPENSATION BENEFITS; EXCLUSIVE REMEDY.—

“(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, where a State's workers' compensation law is applicable and coverage

is provided for an H-2A worker, the workers' compensation benefits shall be the exclusive remedy for the loss of such worker under this section in the case of bodily injury or death in accordance with such State's workers' compensation law.

“(B) The exclusive remedy prescribed in subparagraph (A) precludes the recovery under paragraph (6) of actual damages for loss from an injury or death but does not preclude other equitable relief, except that such relief shall not include back or front pay or in any manner, directly or indirectly, expand or otherwise alter or affect—

“(i) a recovery under a State workers' compensation law; or

“(ii) rights conferred under a State workers' compensation law.

“(8) TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—If it is determined under a State workers' compensation law that the workers' compensation law is not applicable to a claim for bodily injury or death of an H-2A worker, the statute of limitations for bringing an action for actual damages for such injury or death under subsection (c) shall be tolled for the period during which the claim for such injury or death under such State workers' compensation law was pending. The statute of limitations for an action for actual damages or other equitable relief arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as the injury or death of the H-2A worker shall be tolled for the period during which the claim for such injury or death was pending under the State workers' compensation law.

“(9) PRECLUSIVE EFFECT.—Any settlement by an H-2A worker and an H-2A employer or any person reached through the mediation process required under subsection (c)(1) shall preclude any right of action arising out of the same facts between the parties in any Federal or State court or administrative proceeding, unless specifically provided otherwise in the settlement agreement.

“(10) SETTLEMENTS.—Any settlement by the Secretary of Labor with an H-2A employer on behalf of an H-2A worker of a complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under this section or any finding by the Secretary of Labor under subsection (a)(1)(B) shall preclude any right of action arising out of the same facts between the parties under any Federal or State court or administrative proceeding, unless specifically provided otherwise in the settlement agreement.

“(d) DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It is a violation of this subsection for any person who has filed an application under section 218(a), to intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, blacklist, discharge, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee (which term, for purposes of this subsection, includes a former employee and an applicant for employment) because the employee has disclosed information to the employer, or to any other person, that the employee reasonably believes evidences a violation of section 218 or 218E or any rule or regulation pertaining to section 218 or 218E, or because the employee cooperates or seeks to cooperate in an investigation or other proceeding concerning the employer's compliance with the requirements of section 218 or 218E or any rule or regulation pertaining to either of such sections.

“(2) DISCRIMINATION AGAINST H-2A WORKERS.—It is a violation of this subsection for any person who has filed an application under section 218(a), to intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, blacklist, discharge, or in any manner discriminate against an H-2A employee because such worker has, with just cause, filed a complaint with the Secretary of Labor regarding a denial of the rights enumerated and enforceable under subsection (b) or instituted, or caused to be instituted, a

private right of action under subsection (c) regarding the denial of the rights enumerated under subsection (b), or has testified or is about to testify in any court proceeding brought under subsection (c).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION TO SEEK OTHER APPROPRIATE EMPLOYMENT.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary shall establish a process under which an H-2A worker who files a complaint regarding a violation of subsection (d) and is otherwise eligible to remain and work in the United States may be allowed to seek other appropriate employment in the United States for a period not to exceed the maximum period of stay authorized for such nonimmigrant classification.

“(f) ROLE OF ASSOCIATIONS.—

“(1) VIOLATION BY A MEMBER OF AN ASSOCIATION.—An employer on whose behalf an application is filed by an association acting as its agent is fully responsible for such application, and for complying with the terms and conditions of sections 218 and 218E, as though the employer had filed the application itself. If such an employer is determined, under this section, to have committed a violation, the penalty for such violation shall apply only to that member of the association unless the Secretary of Labor determines that the association or other member participated in, had knowledge, or reason to know, of the violation, in which case the penalty shall be invoked against the association or other association member as well.

“(2) VIOLATIONS BY AN ASSOCIATION ACTING AS AN EMPLOYER.—If an association filing an application as a sole or joint employer is determined to have committed a violation under this section, the penalty for such violation shall apply only to the association unless the Secretary of Labor determines that an association member or members participated in or had knowledge, or reason to know, of the violation, in which case the penalty shall be invoked against the association member or members as well.

**“SEC. 218H. DEFINITIONS.**

“For purposes of this section, section 218, and sections 218E through 218G:

“(1) AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘agricultural employment’ means any service or activity that is considered to be agricultural under section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)) or agricultural labor under section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)). For purposes of this paragraph, agricultural employment includes employment under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a).

“(2) BONA FIDE UNION.—The term ‘bona fide union’ means any organization in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or other terms and conditions of work for agricultural employees. Such term does not include an organization formed, created, administered, supported, dominated, financed, or controlled by an employer or employer association or its agents or representatives.

“(3) DISPLACE.—The term ‘displace’, in the case of an application with respect to 1 or more H-2A workers by an employer, means laying off a United States worker from a job for which the H-2A worker or workers is or are sought.

“(4) ELIGIBLE.—The term ‘eligible’, when used with respect to an individual, means an individual who is not an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 274A).

“(5) EMPLOYER.—The term ‘employer’ means any person or entity, including any farm labor contractor and any agricultural association, that employs workers in agricultural employment.

“(6) H-2A EMPLOYER.—The term ‘H-2A employer’ means an employer who seeks to hire 1 or more nonimmigrant aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a).

“(7) H-2A WORKER.—The term ‘H-2A worker’ means a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a).

“(8) JOB OPPORTUNITY.—The term ‘job opportunity’ means a job opening for temporary full-time employment at a place in the United States to which United States workers can be referred.

“(9) LAYS OFF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘lays off’, with respect to a worker—

“(i) means to cause the worker’s loss of employment, other than through a discharge for inadequate performance, violation of workplace rules, cause, voluntary departure, voluntary retirement, contract impossibility (as described in section 218E(b)(4)(D)), or temporary layoffs due to weather, markets, or other temporary conditions; but

“(ii) does not include any situation in which the worker is offered, as an alternative to such loss of employment, a similar employment opportunity with the same employer (or, in the case of a placement of a worker with another employer under section 218(b)(2)(E), with either employer described in such section) at equivalent or higher compensation and benefits than the position from which the employee was discharged, regardless of whether or not the employee accepts the offer.

“(B) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph is intended to limit an employee’s rights under a collective bargaining agreement or other employment contract.

“(10) REGULATORY DROUGHT.—The term ‘regulatory drought’ means a decision subsequent to the filing of the application under section 218 by an entity not under the control of the employer making such filing which restricts the employer’s access to water for irrigation purposes and reduces or limits the employer’s ability to produce an agricultural commodity, thereby reducing the need for labor.

“(11) SEASONAL.—Labor is performed on a ‘seasonal’ basis if—

“(A) ordinarily, it pertains to or is of the kind exclusively performed at certain seasons or periods of the year; and

“(B) from its nature, it may not be continuous or carried on throughout the year.

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

“(13) TEMPORARY.—A worker is employed on a ‘temporary’ basis where the employment is intended not to exceed 10 months.

“(14) UNITED STATES WORKER.—The term ‘United States worker’ means any worker, whether a United States citizen or national, a lawfully admitted permanent resident alien, or any other alien, who is authorized to work in the job opportunity within the United States, except an alien admitted or otherwise provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a).”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 218 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 218. H-2A employer applications.”; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 218D, as added by section 601 of this Act, the following:

“Sec. 218E. H-2A employment requirements.

“Sec. 218F. Procedure for admission and extension of stay of H-2A workers.

“Sec. 218G. Worker protections and labor standards enforcement.

“Sec. 218H. Definitions.”.

**CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 616. DETERMINATION AND USE OF USER FEES.**

(a) SCHEDULE OF FEES.—The Secretary shall establish and periodically adjust a schedule of fees for the employment of aliens under this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle, and a collection process for such fees from employers participating in the program provided under this subtitle. Such fees shall be the only fees chargeable to employers for services provided under this subtitle.

(b) DETERMINATION OF SCHEDULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The schedule under subsection (a) shall reflect a fee rate based on the number of job opportunities indicated in the employer’s application under section 218 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 615 of this Act, and sufficient to provide for the direct costs of providing services related to an employer’s authorization to employ eligible aliens pursuant to this subtitle, to include the certification of eligible employers, the issuance of documentation, and the admission of eligible aliens.

(2) PROCEDURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In establishing and adjusting such a schedule, the Secretary shall comply with Federal cost accounting and fee setting standards.

(B) PUBLICATION AND COMMENT.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register an initial fee schedule and associated collection process and the cost data or estimates upon which such fee schedule is based, and any subsequent amendments thereto, pursuant to which public comment shall be sought and a final rule issued.

(c) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all proceeds resulting from the payment of the alien employment user fees shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available without fiscal year limitation to reimburse the Secretary, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Labor for the costs of carrying out sections 218 and 218F of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 615 of this Act, and the provisions of this subtitle.

**SEC. 617. REGULATIONS.**

(a) REGULATIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture on all regulations to implement the duties of the Secretary under this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle.

(b) REGULATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Agriculture on all regulations to implement the duties of the Secretary of State under this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle.

(c) REGULATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.—The Secretary of Labor shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary on all regulations to implement the duties of the Secretary of Labor under this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle.

(d) DEADLINE FOR ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—All regulations to implement the duties of the Secretary, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Labor created under sections 218, 218E, 218F, and 218G of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 615 of this Act, shall take effect on the effective date of section 615 and shall be issued not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 618. REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

Not later than September 30 of each year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that identifies, for the previous year—

(1) the number of job opportunities approved for employment of aliens admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a)), and the number of workers actually admitted, by State and by occupation;

(2) the number of such aliens reported to have abandoned employment pursuant to subsection 218F(e)(2) of such Act;

(3) the number of such aliens who departed the United States within the period specified in subsection 218F(d) of such Act;

(4) the number of aliens who applied for adjustment of status pursuant to section 613(a);

(5) the number of such aliens whose status was adjusted under section 613(a);

(6) the number of aliens who applied for permanent residence pursuant to section 613(c); and

(7) the number of such aliens who were approved for permanent residence pursuant to section 613(c).

#### SEC. 619. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, sections 615 and 616 shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the measures being taken and the progress made in implementing this subtitle.

#### Subtitle C—DREAM Act

#### SEC. 621. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2006” or the “DREAM Act of 2006”.

#### SEC. 622. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(2) UNIFORMED SERVICES.—The term “uniformed services” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

#### SEC. 623. RESTORATION OF STATE OPTION TO DETERMINE RESIDENCY FOR PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1623) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

#### SEC. 624. CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

(a) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, the Secretary may cancel removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, subject to the conditional basis described in section 625, an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States, if the alien demonstrates that—

(A) the alien has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately preceding the date of enactment of this Act, and had not yet reached the age of 16 years at the time of initial entry;

(B) the alien has been a person of good moral character since the time of application;

(C) the alien—

(i) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(B), (6)(C), (6)(E), (6)(F), or (6)(G) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)), or, if inadmissible solely under subparagraph (C) or (F) of paragraph (6) of such subsection, the alien was under the age of 16 years at the time the violation was committed; and

(ii) is not deportable under paragraph (1)(E), (1)(G), (2), (3)(B), (3)(C), (3)(D), (4), or (6) of section 237(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)), or, if deportable solely under subparagraphs (C) or (D) of paragraph (3) of such subsection, the alien was under the age of 16 years at the time the violation was committed;

(D) the alien, at the time of application, has been admitted to an institution of higher education in the United States, or has earned a high school diploma or obtained a general education development certificate in the United States; and

(E) the alien has never been under a final administrative or judicial order of exclusion, deportation, or removal, unless the alien has remained in the United States under color of law or received the order before attaining the age of 16 years.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the grounds of ineligibility under section 212(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the grounds of deportability under paragraphs (1), (3), and (6) of section 237(a) of that Act for humanitarian purposes or family unity or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

(3) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall provide a procedure by regulation allowing eligible individuals to apply affirmatively for the relief available under this subsection without being placed in removal proceedings.

(b) TERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, any period of continuous residence or continuous physical presence in the United States of an alien who applies for cancellation of removal under this section shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States under subsection (a) if the alien has departed from the United States for any period in excess of 90 days or for any periods in the aggregate exceeding 180 days.

(2) EXTENSIONS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in paragraph (1) if the alien demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to exceptional circumstances. The exceptional circumstances determined sufficient to justify an extension should be no less compelling than serious illness of the alien, or death or serious illness of a parent, grandparent, sibling, or child.

(d) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be eligible for cancellation of removal or adjustment of status under this section.

(e) REGULATIONS.—

(1) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish proposed regulations implementing this section. Such regulations shall be effective immediately on an interim basis, but are subject to change

and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period for public comment.

(2) INTERIM, FINAL REGULATIONS.—Within a reasonable time after publication of the interim regulations in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this section.

(f) REMOVAL OF ALIEN.—The Secretary may not remove any alien who has a pending application for conditional status under this subtitle.

#### SEC. 625. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in section 626, an alien whose status has been adjusted under section 624 to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be considered to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions of this section. Such conditional permanent resident status shall be valid for a period of 6 years, subject to termination under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) AT TIME OF OBTAINING PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide for notice to the alien regarding the provisions of this section and the requirements of subsection (c) to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

(B) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE.—The failure of the Secretary to provide a notice under this paragraph—

(i) shall not affect the enforcement of the provisions of this subtitle with respect to the alien; and

(ii) shall not give rise to any private right of action by the alien.

(b) TERMINATION OF STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall terminate the conditional permanent resident status of any alien who obtained such status under this subtitle, if the Secretary determines that the alien—

(A) ceases to meet the requirements of subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 624(a)(1);

(B) has become a public charge; or

(C) has received a dishonorable or other than honorable discharge from the uniformed services.

(2) RETURN TO PREVIOUS IMMIGRATION STATUS.—Any alien whose conditional permanent resident status is terminated under paragraph (1) shall return to the immigration status the alien had immediately prior to receiving conditional permanent resident status under this subtitle.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF TIMELY PETITION FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order for the conditional basis of permanent resident status obtained by an alien under subsection (a) to be removed, the alien must file with the Secretary, in accordance with paragraph (3), a petition which requests the removal of such conditional basis and which provides, under penalty of perjury, the facts and information so that the Secretary may make the determination described in paragraph (2)(A).

(2) ADJUDICATION OF PETITION TO REMOVE CONDITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a petition is filed in accordance with paragraph (1) for an alien, the Secretary shall make a determination as to whether the alien meets the requirements set out in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (d)(1).

(B) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS IF FAVORABLE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines that the alien meets such requirements, the Secretary shall notify the alien of such determination and immediately remove the conditional basis of the status of the alien.

(C) **TERMINATION IF ADVERSE DETERMINATION.**—If the Secretary determines that the alien does not meet such requirements, the Secretary shall notify the alien of such determination and terminate the conditional permanent resident status of the alien as of the date of the determination.

(3) **TIME TO FILE PETITION.**—An alien may petition to remove the conditional basis to lawful resident status during the period beginning 180 days before and ending 2 years after either the date that is 6 years after the date of the granting of conditional permanent resident status or any other expiration date of the conditional permanent resident status as extended by the Secretary in accordance with this subtitle. The alien shall be deemed in conditional permanent resident status in the United States during the period in which the petition is pending.

(d) **DETAILS OF PETITION.**—

(1) **CONTENTS OF PETITION.**—Each petition for an alien under subsection (c)(1) shall contain information to permit the Secretary to determine whether each of the following requirements is met:

(A) The alien has demonstrated good moral character during the entire period the alien has been a conditional permanent resident.

(B) The alien is in compliance with section 624(a)(1)(C).

(C) The alien has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States. The Secretary shall presume that the alien has abandoned such residence if the alien is absent from the United States for more than 365 days, in the aggregate, during the period of conditional residence, unless the alien demonstrates that alien has not abandoned the alien's residence. An alien who is absent from the United States due to active service in the uniformed services has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States during the period of such service.

(D) The alien has completed at least 1 of the following:

(i) The alien has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, in a program for a bachelor's degree or higher degree in the United States.

(ii) The alien has served in the uniformed services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, has received an honorable discharge.

(E) The alien has provided a list of all of the secondary educational institutions that the alien attended in the United States.

(2) **HARDSHIP EXCEPTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may, in the Secretary's discretion, remove the conditional status of an alien if the alien—

(i) satisfies the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1);

(ii) demonstrates compelling circumstances for the inability to complete the requirements described in paragraph (1)(D); and

(iii) demonstrates that the alien's removal from the United States would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a citizen or a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

(B) **EXTENSION.**—Upon a showing of good cause, the Secretary may extend the period of the conditional resident status for the purpose of completing the requirements described in paragraph (1)(D).

(e) **TREATMENT OF PERIOD FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.**—For purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), in the case of an alien who is in the United States as a lawful permanent resident on a conditional basis under this section, the alien shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in

the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. However, the conditional basis must be removed before the alien may apply for naturalization.

**SEC. 626. RETROACTIVE BENEFITS.**

If, on the date of enactment of this Act, an alien has satisfied all the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 624(a)(1) and section 625(d)(1)(D), the Secretary may adjust the status of the alien to that of a conditional resident in accordance with section 624. The alien may petition for removal of such condition at the end of the conditional residence period in accordance with section 625(c) if the alien has met the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 625(d)(1) during the entire period of conditional residence.

**SEC. 627. EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine eligibility for relief under this subtitle, except where the alien has been placed into deportation, exclusion, or removal proceedings either prior to or after filing an application for relief under this subtitle, in which case the Attorney General shall have exclusive jurisdiction and shall assume all the powers and duties of the Secretary until proceedings are terminated, or if a final order of deportation, exclusion, or removal is entered the Secretary shall resume all powers and duties delegated to the Secretary under this subtitle.

(b) **STAY OF REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS ENROLLED IN PRIMARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL.**—The Attorney General shall stay the removal proceedings of any alien who—

(1) meets all the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (E) of section 624(a)(1);

(2) is at least 12 years of age; and

(3) is enrolled full time in a primary or secondary school.

(c) **EMPLOYMENT.**—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to subsection (b) may be engaged in employment in the United States, consistent with the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), and State and local laws governing minimum age for employment.

(d) **LIFT OF STAY.**—The Attorney General shall lift the stay granted pursuant to subsection (b) if the alien—

(1) is no longer enrolled in a primary or secondary school; or

(2) ceases to meet the requirements of subsection (b)(1).

**SEC. 628. PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS IN APPLICATION.**

Whoever files an application for relief under this subtitle and willfully and knowingly falsifies, misrepresents, or conceals a material fact or makes any false or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

**SEC. 629. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—No officer or employee of the United States may—

(1) use the information furnished by the applicant pursuant to an application filed under this subtitle to initiate removal proceedings against any persons identified in the application;

(2) make any publication whereby the information furnished by any particular individual pursuant to an application under this subtitle can be identified; or

(3) permit anyone other than an officer or employee of the United States Government or, in the case of applications filed under

this subtitle with a designated entity, that designated entity, to examine applications filed under this subtitle.

(b) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.**—The Attorney General or the Secretary shall provide the information furnished under this section, and any other information derived from such furnished information, to—

(1) a duly recognized law enforcement entity in connection with an investigation or prosecution of an offense described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)), when such information is requested in writing by such entity; or

(2) an official coroner for purposes of affirmatively identifying a deceased individual (whether or not such individual is deceased as a result of a crime).

(c) **PENALTY.**—Whoever knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000.

**SEC. 630. EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS; PROHIBITION ON FEES.**

Regulations promulgated under this subtitle shall provide that applications under this subtitle will be considered on an expedited basis and without a requirement for the payment by the applicant of any additional fee for such expedited processing.

**SEC. 631. HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.**

Notwithstanding any provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), with respect to assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), an alien who adjusts status to that of a lawful permanent resident under this subtitle shall be eligible only for the following assistance under such title IV:

(1) Student loans under parts B, D, and E of such title IV (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.), subject to the requirements of such parts.

(2) Federal work-study programs under part C of such title IV (42 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), subject to the requirements of such part.

(3) Services under such title IV (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), subject to the requirements for such services.

**SEC. 632. GAO REPORT.**

Seven years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which sets forth—

(1) the number of aliens who were eligible for cancellation of removal and adjustment of status under section 624(a);

(2) the number of aliens who applied for adjustment of status under section 624(a);

(3) the number of aliens who were granted adjustment of status under section 624(a); and

(4) the number of aliens whose conditional permanent resident status was removed under section 625.

**Subtitle D—Grant Programs to Assist Nonimmigrant Workers**

**SEC. 641. GRANTS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY TRAINING.**

(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, may award grants to qualified non-profit community organizations to educate, train, and support non-profit agencies, immigrant communities, and other interested entities regarding the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Grants awarded under this section shall be used—

(A) for public education, training, technical assistance, government liaison, and all



related costs (including personnel and equipment) incurred by the grantee in providing services related to this Act; and

(B) to educate, train, and support nonprofit organizations, immigrant communities, and other interested parties regarding this Act and the amendments made by this Act and on matters related to its implementation.

(2) EDUCATION.—In addition to the purposes described in paragraph (1), grants awarded under this section shall be used to—

(A) educate immigrant communities and other interested entities regarding—

(i) the individuals and organizations that can provide authorized legal representation in immigration matters under regulations prescribed by the Secretary; and

(ii) the dangers of securing legal advice and assistance from those who are not authorized to provide legal representation in immigration matters;

(B) educate interested entities regarding the requirements for obtaining nonprofit recognition and accreditation to represent immigrants under regulations prescribed by the Secretary;

(C) provide nonprofit agencies with training and technical assistance on the recognition and accreditation process; and

(D) educate nonprofit community organizations, immigrant communities, and other interested entities regarding—

(i) the process for obtaining benefits under this Act or under an amendment made by this Act; and

(ii) the availability of authorized legal representation for low-income persons who may qualify for benefits under this Act or under an amendment made by this Act.

(c) DIVERSITY.—The Assistant Attorney General shall ensure, to the extent possible, that the nonprofit community organizations receiving grants under this section serve geographically diverse locations and ethnically diverse populations who may qualify for benefits under the Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2009 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 642. FUNDING FOR THE OFFICE OF CITIZENSHIP.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, is authorized to establish the United States Citizenship and Immigration Foundation (referred to in this subtitle as the “Foundation”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The Foundation shall be incorporated in the District of Columbia, exclusively for charitable and educational purposes to support the functions of the Office of Citizenship of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services.

(c) GIFTS.—

(1) TO FOUNDATION.—The Foundation may solicit, accept, and make gifts of money and other property in accordance with section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) FROM FOUNDATION.—The Office of Citizenship may accept gifts from the Foundation to support the functions of the Office.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the mission of the Office of Citizenship.

#### SEC. 643. CIVICS INTEGRATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a competitive grant program to provide financial assistance to nonprofit organizations, including faith-based organizations, to support—

(1) efforts by entities certified by the Office of Citizenship to provide civics and English as a second language courses; and

(2) other activities approved by the Secretary to promote civics and English as a second language.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—The Secretary may accept and use gifts from the Foundation for grants under this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

**SA 3193.** Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. FRIST, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SECTION 644. STRENGTHENING AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Strengthening American Citizenship Act of 2006”.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Oath of Allegiance” means the binding oath (or affirmation) of allegiance required to be naturalized as a citizen of the United States, as prescribed in section 337(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (h)(1)(B).

(c) ENGLISH FLUENCY.—

(1) EDUCATION GRANTS.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Chief of the Office of Citizenship of the Department (referred to in this paragraph as the “Chief”) shall establish a grant program to provide grants in an amount not to exceed \$500 to assist legal residents of the United States who declare an intent to apply for citizenship in the United States to meet the requirements under section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423).

(B) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this paragraph shall be paid directly to an accredited institution of higher education or other qualified educational institution (as determined by the Chief) for tuition, fees, books, and other educational resources required by a course on the English language in which the legal resident is enrolled.

(C) APPLICATION.—A legal resident desiring a grant under this paragraph shall submit an application to the Chief at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Chief may reasonably require.

(D) PRIORITY.—If insufficient funds are available to award grants to all qualified applicants, the Chief shall give priority based on the financial need of the applicants.

(E) NOTICE.—The Secretary, upon relevant registration of a legal resident with the Department, shall notify such legal resident of the availability of grants under this paragraph for legal residents who declare an intent to apply for United States citizenship.

(2) FASTER CITIZENSHIP FOR ENGLISH FLUENCY.—Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) A legal resident of the United States who demonstrates English fluency, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, will satisfy the residency requirement under subsection (a) upon the completion of 4 years of continuous legal residency in the United States.”.

(3) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

(A) modify the English language requirements for naturalization under section 312(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)(1)); or

(B) influence the naturalization test redesign process of the Office of Citizenship (except for the requirement under subsection (h)(2)).

(d) AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a competitive grant program to provide financial assistance for—

(A) efforts by entities (including veterans and patriotic organizations) certified by the Office of Citizenship to promote the patriotic integration of prospective citizens into the American way of life by providing civics, history, and English as a second language courses, with a specific emphasis on attachment to principles of the Constitution of the United States, the heroes of American history (including military heroes), and the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance; and

(B) other activities approved by the Secretary to promote the patriotic integration of prospective citizens and the implementation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), including grants—

(i) to promote an understanding of the form of government and history of the United States; and

(ii) to promote an attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the well being and happiness of the people of the United States.

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—The Secretary may accept and use gifts from the United States Citizenship Foundation, if the foundation is established under subsection (e), for grants under this subsection.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(e) FUNDING FOR THE OFFICE OF CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, is authorized to establish the United States Citizenship Foundation (referred to in this subsection as the “Foundation”), an organization duly incorporated in the District of Columbia, exclusively for charitable and educational purposes to support the functions of the Office of Citizenship.

(2) DEDICATED FUNDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 1.5 percent of the funds made available to the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (including fees and appropriated funds) shall be dedicated to the functions of the Office of Citizenship, which shall include the patriotic integration of prospective citizens into—

(i) American common values and traditions, including an understanding of American history and the principles of the Constitution of the United States; and

(ii) civic traditions of the United States, including the Pledge of Allegiance, respect for the flag of the United States, and voting in public elections.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that dedicating increased funds to the Office of Citizenship should not result in an increase in fees charged by the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services.

(3) GIFTS.—

(A) TO FOUNDATION.—The Foundation may solicit, accept, and make gifts of money and other property in accordance with section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) FROM FOUNDATION.—The Office of Citizenship may accept gifts from the Foundation to support the functions of the Office.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such

sums as may be necessary to carry out the mission of the Office of Citizenship, including the functions described in paragraph (2)(A).

(f) **RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—No funds appropriated to carry out a program under this subsection (d) or (e) may be used to organize individuals for the purpose of political activism or advocacy.

(g) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief of the Office of Citizenship shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a list of the entities that have received funds from the Office of Citizenship during the reporting period under this section and the amount of funding received by each such entity;

(B) an evaluation of the extent to which grants received under this section successfully promoted an understanding of—

(i) the English language; and

(ii) American history and government, including the heroes of American history, the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance, and an attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States; and

(C) information about the number of legal residents who were able to achieve the knowledge described under paragraph (2) as a result of the grants provided under this section.

(h) **OATH OR AFFIRMATION OF RENUNCIATION AND ALLEGIANCE.**—

(1) **REVISION OF OATH.**—Section 337 (8 U.S.C. 1448) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “under section 310(b) an oath” and all that follows through “personal moral code.” and inserting “under section 310(b), the oath (or affirmation) of allegiance prescribed in subsection (e).”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the oath (or affirmation) of allegiance prescribed in this subsection is as follows: ‘I take this oath solemnly, freely, and without any mental reservation. I absolutely and entirely renounce all allegiance to any foreign state or power of which I have been a subject or citizen. My fidelity and allegiance from this day forward are to the United States of America. I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and will support and defend them against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I will bear arms, or perform noncombatant military or civilian service, on behalf of the United States when required by law. This I do solemnly swear, so help me God.’

“(2) If a person, by reason of religious training and belief (or individual interpretation thereof) or for other reasons of good conscience, cannot take the oath prescribed in paragraph (1)—

“(A) with the term ‘oath’ included, the term ‘affirmation’ shall be substituted for the term ‘oath’; and

“(B) with the phrase ‘so help me God’ included, the phrase ‘so help me God’ shall be omitted.

“(3) If a person shows by clear and convincing evidence to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such person, by reason of religious training and belief, cannot take the oath prescribed in paragraph (1)—

“(A) because such person is opposed to the bearing of arms in the Armed Forces of the United States, the words ‘bear arms, or’ shall be omitted; and

“(B) because such person is opposed to any type of service in the Armed Forces of the United States, the words ‘bear arms, or’ and ‘noncombatant military or’ shall be omitted.

“(4) As used in this subsection, the term ‘religious training and belief’—

“(A) means a belief of an individual in relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation; and

“(B) does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code.

“(5) Any reference in this title to ‘oath’ or ‘oath of allegiance’ under this section shall be deemed to refer to the oath (or affirmation) of allegiance prescribed under this subsection.”

(2) **HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT TEST.**—The Secretary shall incorporate a knowledge and understanding of the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance into the history and government test given to applicants for citizenship.

(3) **NOTICE TO FOREIGN EMBASSIES.**—Upon the naturalization of a new citizen, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, shall notify the embassy of the country of which the new citizen was a citizen or subject that such citizen has—

(A) renounced allegiance to that foreign country; and

(B) sworn allegiance to the United States.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) **ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW CITIZENS AWARD PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a new citizens award program to recognize citizens who—

(A) have made an outstanding contribution to the United States; and

(B) were naturalized during the 10-year period ending on the date of such recognition.

(2) **PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President is authorized to present a medal, in recognition of outstanding contributions to the United States, to citizens described in paragraph (1).

(B) **MAXIMUM NUMBER OF AWARDS.**—Not more than 10 citizens may receive a medal under this subsection in any calendar year.

(3) **DESIGN AND STRIKING.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall strike a medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the President.

(4) **NATIONAL MEDALS.**—The medals struck pursuant to this subsection are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(j) **NATURALIZATION CEREMONIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Park Service, the Archivist of the United States, and other appropriate Federal officials, shall develop and implement a strategy to enhance the public awareness of naturalization ceremonies.

(2) **VENUES.**—In developing the strategy under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the use of outstanding and historic locations as venues for select naturalization ceremonies.

(3) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress that includes—

(A) the content of the strategy developed under this subsection; and

(B) the progress made towards the implementation of such strategy.

**SA 3194.** Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to

amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE —CITIZENSHIP ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES**

**SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Kendell Frederick Citizenship Assistance Act”.

**SEC. 02. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR FINGERPRINTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any regulation, the Secretary shall use the fingerprints provided by an individual at the time the individual enlists in the Armed Forces to satisfy any requirement for fingerprints as part of an application for naturalization if the individual—

(1) may be naturalized pursuant to section 328 or 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439 or 1440);

(2) was fingerprinted in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Defense at the time the individual enlisted in the Armed Forces; and

(3) submits an application for naturalization not later than 12 months after the date the individual enlisted in the Armed Forces.

**SEC. 03. PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NATURALIZATION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**

(a) **CITIZENSHIP ADVOCATE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish the position of Citizenship Advocate at each Military Entry Processing Station to provide information and assistance related to the naturalization process to members of the Armed Forces. An individual serving as a Citizenship Advocate may be a civilian.

(b) **WRITTEN MATERIALS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that written information describing the naturalization process for members of the Armed Forces is provided to each individual who is not a citizen of the United States at the time that the individual enlists in the Armed Forces.

(c) **TELEPHONE HOT LINE.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) establish a dedicated toll free telephone service available only to members of the Armed Forces and the families of such members to provide information related to naturalization pursuant to section 328 or 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439 or 1440), including the status of an application for such naturalization;

(2) ensure that the telephone service required by paragraph (1) is operated by employees of the Department who—

(A) have received specialized training on the naturalization process for members of the Armed Forces and the families of such members; and

(B) are physically located in the same unit as the military processing unit that adjudicates applications for naturalization pursuant to such section 328 or 329; and

(3) implement a quality control program to monitor, on a regular basis, the accuracy and quality of information provided by the employees who operate the telephone service required by paragraph (1), including the breadth of the knowledge related to the naturalization process of such employees.

**SEC. 04. PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NATURALIZATION TO THE PUBLIC.**

Not later than 30 days after the date that a modification to any law or regulation related to the naturalization process becomes

effective, the Secretary shall update the appropriate application form for naturalization, the instructions and guidebook for obtaining naturalization, and the Internet website maintained by the Secretary to reflect such modification.

#### SEC. 05. REPORTS.

(a) ADJUDICATION PROCESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the entire process for the adjudication of an application for naturalization filed pursuant to section 328 or 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439 or 1440), including the process that begins at the time the application is mailed to, or received by, the Secretary, regardless of whether the Secretary determines that such application is complete, through the final disposition of such application. Such report shall include shall include a description of—

(1) the methods of the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense to prepare, handle, and adjudicate such applications;

(2) the effectiveness of the chain of authority, supervision, and training of employees of the Government or of other entities, including contract employees, who have any role in the such process or adjudication; and

(3) the ability of the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense to use technology to facilitate or accomplish any aspect of such process or adjudication.

#### (b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the implementation of this title by the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense, including studying any technology that may be used to improve the efficiency of the naturalization process for members of the Armed Forces.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date that the Comptroller General submits the report required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study required by paragraph (1). The report shall include any recommendations of the Comptroller General for improving the implementation of this title by the Secretary or the Secretary of Defense.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

**SA 3195.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

(b) UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Secretary shall acquire and maintain MQ-9 unmanned aerial vehicles for use on the border, including related equipment such as—

- (1) additional sensors;
- (2) critical spares;
- (3) satellite command and control; and
- (4) other necessary equipment for operational support.

#### (c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) BORDER CONTROL FACILITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out subsection (a).

#### (2) UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out subsection (b)—

- (i) \$178,400,000 for fiscal year 2007; and
- (ii) \$276,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall remain available until expended.

**SA 3196.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. 107. BORDER SECURITY CERTIFICATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not implement a new H-2C guest worker program, a new conditional nonimmigrant work authorization program, or any similar or subsequent program authorizing the employment of alien workers until the Secretary provides written certification to the President and the Congress that the borders of the United States are reasonably sealed and secured.

**SA 3197.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

#### SEC. 107. STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall award competitive grants to eligible State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to provide financial assistance for costs related to border security activities, including efforts to combat criminal activity within the jurisdiction of such agencies.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used to provide additional resources for law enforcement agencies to combat criminal activity occurring near the border, including—

- (1) law enforcement technologies;
- (2) equipment, such as police-type vehicles, all-terrain vehicles, firearms, sensors, cameras, and lighting, and maintenance for such equipment;
- (3) computer equipment; and
- (4) such other resources that may be available to assist the law enforcement agency with border security.

(c) APPLICATION.—A law enforcement agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants providing law enforcement for jurisdictions that—

- (1) are close to the border;
- (2) have small populations;
- (3) have more felony criminal cases filed per United States district court judge;

(4) are located in States with more undocumented aliens, based on the most recent decennial census; or

(5) are located in States with more undocumented alien apprehensions in the most recent fiscal year.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SA 3198.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

#### (3) EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(A) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of hiring, on a part-time basis, retired Federal law enforcement officers to supplement the capabilities of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report, in classified form, if necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees. The report shall include—

(i) the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) a plan to implement a program that employs retired Federal law enforcement officers for border security, if the Secretary determines that such plan is feasible.

(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—If the Secretary determines that the plan described in subparagraph (B)(ii) is feasible, the Secretary shall implement the plan not later than 90 days after the submission of the report to Congress under subparagraph (B).

(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this paragraph.

**SA 3199.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7, line 13, strike “(b)” and insert the following:

#### (b) RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION PROGRAM.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall conduct a 5-year program to facilitate the recruitment and retention of agents within the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) REPORT.—Not less frequently than once every 90 days during the 5-year period of the program authorized under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results and progress of the program, in classified form, if necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this subsection.

(c)

**SA 3200.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

(b) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall make necessary improvements to the following law enforcement training facilities:

(1) The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

(2) The residential training sites located in Artesia, New Mexico and Charleston, South Carolina.

(3) The inservice requalification training facility located in Cheltenham, Maryland.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SA 3201.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

(b) **DETENTION FACILITIES.**—

(1) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The Attorney General shall plan, construct, maintain, and acquire additional detention facilities for the purpose of immigration detention and removal.

(2) **USE OF CLOSED OR UNUSED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct a study of the feasibility of using military installations designated for closure or realignment as possible immigration detention facilities.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SA 3202.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 13 through 20 and insert the following:

**SEC. 105. PORTS OF ENTRY.**

(a) **CONSTRUCTION; IMPROVEMENTS.**—The Secretary is authorized to—

(1) construct additional ports of entry along the international land borders of the United States, at locations to be determined by the Secretary; and

(2) make necessary improvements to the ports of entry in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT.**—The Administrator of General Services shall submit an annual report to Congress that—

(1) describes the status of the infrastructure at ports of entry into the United States; and

(2) identifies projects to improve security at such ports of entry.

(c) **VULNERABILITY REPORT.**—Not less frequently than once every 6 months, the Secretary shall submit a report, in classified form if necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees on vulnerabilities at ports of entry into the United States.

(d) **DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall establish demonstration programs to evaluate and assess border security and port of entry technologies.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out this section.

**SA 3203.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION EFFICIENCY REVIEW.**

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall conduct a comprehensive review of the immigration procedures in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report, in classified form, if necessary, that—

(1) identifies inefficient immigration procedures; and

(2) outlines a plan to improve the efficiency and responsiveness of the immigration process.

**SA 3204.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . NATIONAL LANGUAGE ACT OF 2006.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “National Language Act of 2006”.

(b) **ENGLISH AS OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

**“CHAPTER 6—LANGUAGE OF THE GOVERNMENT**

“Sec

“161. Declaration of official language

“162. Official Government activities in English

“163. Preserving and enhancing the role of the official language

“164. Exceptions

**“§ 161. Declaration of official language**

“English shall be the official language of the Government of the United States.

**“§ 162. Official government activities in English**

“The Government of the United States shall conduct its official business in English, including publications, income tax forms, and informational materials.

**“§ 163. Preserving and enhancing the role of the official language**

“The Government of the United States shall preserve and enhance the role of English as the official language of the United States of America. Unless specifically stated in applicable law, no person has a right, entitlement, or claim to have the Government of the United States or any of its officials or representatives act, communicate, perform or provide services, or provide materials in any language other than English. If exceptions are made, that does not create a legal entitlement to additional services in that language or any language other than English. If any forms are issued by the Federal government in a language other than English (or such forms are completed in a language other than English), the English language version of the form is the sole authority for all legal purposes.

**SA 3205.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, after line 23, add the following:

**Subtitle E—National Border Neighborhood Watch Program**

**SEC. 151. NATIONAL BORDER NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH PROGRAM.**

The Commissioner of the United States Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this subtitle as the “USCBP”) shall establish a National Border Neighborhood Watch Program (referred to in this subtitle as the “NBNW Program”) to permit retired law enforcement officers and civilian volunteers to combat illegal immigration into the United States.

**SEC. 152. BRAVE FORCE.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the USCBP a Border Regiment Assisting in Valuable Enforcement Force (referred to in this subtitle as “BRAVE Force”), which shall consist of retired law enforcement officers, to carry out the NBNW Program.

(b) **RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “retired law enforcement officer” means an individual who—

(1) has retired from employment as a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer; and

(2) has not reached the Social Security retirement age (as defined in section 216(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(l)).

(c) **EFFECT ON PERSONNEL CAPS.**—Employees of BRAVE Force hired to carry out the NBNW Program shall be considered as additional agents and shall not count against the USCBP personnel limits.

(d) **RETIRED ANNUITANTS.**—An employee of BRAVE Force who has worked for the Federal Government shall be considered a rehired annuitant and shall have no reduction in annuity as a result of salary payment for such employees’ service in the NBNW Program.

**SEC. 153. CIVILIAN VOLUNTEERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The USCBP shall provide the opportunity for civilian volunteers to assist in carrying out the purposes of the NBNW Program.

(b) ORGANIZATION.—Not less than 3 civilian volunteers in the NBNW Program may report to each employee of BRAVE Force.

(c) REPORTING.—A civilian volunteer shall report a violation of Federal immigration law to the appropriate employee of BRAVE Force as soon as possible after observing such violation.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—A civilian volunteer participating in the NBNW Program shall be eligible for reimbursement by the USCBP for expenses related to carrying out the duties of the NBNW Program.

**SEC. 154. LIABILITY OF BRAVE FORCE EMPLOYEES AND CIVILIAN VOLUNTEERS.**

(a) CIVILIANS.—A civilian volunteer participating in the NBNW Program shall not be entitled to any immunity from personal liability by virtue of the volunteer's participation in the NBNW Program.

(b) EMPLOYEES.—An employee of the BRAVE Force shall not be liable for the actions of a civilian volunteer participating in the NBNW Program.

**SEC. 155. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

**SA 3206.** Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 329, line 11, insert "(other than subparagraph (C)(i)(II) of such paragraph (9))" after "212(a)".

On page 330, strike lines 10 through 15, and insert the following:

"(3) INELIGIBILITY.—An alien is ineligible for conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status under this section if—

"(A) the alien is subject to a final order of removal under section 217, 235, 238, or 240;

"(B) the alien failed to depart the United States during the period of a voluntary departure order entered under section 240B;

"(C) the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that—

"(i) the alien, having been convicted by a final judgment of a serious crime, constitutes a danger to the community of the United States;

"(ii) there are reasonable grounds for believing that the alien has committed a serious crime outside the United States prior to the arrival of the alien in the United States; or

"(iii) there are reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States;

"(D) the alien has been convicted of any felony or three or more misdemeanors; or

**SA 3207.** Mr. CORNYN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3206 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) to the amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

This provision shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

**SA 3208.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ BORDER SECURITY CERTIFICATION.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not implement a new H-2C guest worker program, a new conditional nonimmigrant work authorization program, any Title IV provisions, or any similar or subsequent program authorizing the employment of alien workers until the Secretary provides written certification to the President and the Congress that the borders of the United States are reasonably sealed and secured, and that Title I border security provisions are implemented.

**SA 3209.** Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ ACCESS TO EARNED ADJUSTMENT AND MANDATORY DEPARTURE AND RE-ENTRY.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006".

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title II (8 U.S.C. 1255 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 245A the following:

**"SEC. 245B. ACCESS TO EARNED ADJUSTMENT.**

"(a) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

"(1) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, an alien who satisfies the following requirements:

"(A) APPLICATION.—The alien shall file an application establishing eligibility for adjustment of status and pay the fine required under subsection (m) and any additional amounts owed under that subsection.

"(B) CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall establish that the alien—

"(I) was physically present in the United States on or before the date that is 5 years before the date of introduction of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006;

"(II) was not legally present in the United States on such date of introduction; and

"(III) did not depart from the United States during the 5-year period ending on such date of introduction, except for brief, casual, and innocent departures.

"(ii) LEGALLY PRESENT.—For purposes of this subparagraph, an alien who has violated any conditions of his or her visa shall be considered not to be legally present in the United States.

"(C) ADMISSIBLE UNDER IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The alien shall establish that the alien is not inadmissible under section 212(a) except for any provision of that section that is waived under subsection (b) of this section.

"(D) EMPLOYMENT IN UNITED STATES.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall have been employed in the United States, in the aggregate, for—

"(I) at least 3 years during the 5-year period ending on the date of introduction of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006; and

"(II) at least 6 years after the date of enactment of such Act.

"(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(I) The employment requirement in clause (i)(I) shall not apply to an individual who is under 20 years of age on the date of enactment of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006.

"(II) The employment requirement in clause (i)(II) shall be reduced for an individual who cannot demonstrate employment based on a physical or mental disability or as a result of pregnancy.

"(III) The employment requirement in clause (i)(II) shall be reduced for an individual who is under 20 years of age on the date of enactment of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006 by a period of time equal to the time period beginning on such date of enactment and ending on the date on which the individual reaches 20 years of age.

"(IV) The employment requirements in clause (i) shall be reduced by 1 year for each year of full time post-secondary study in the United States during the relevant period.

"(iii) PORTABILITY.—An alien shall not be required to complete the employment requirements in clause (i) with the same employer.

"(iv) EVIDENCE OF EMPLOYMENT.—

"(I) CONCLUSIVE DOCUMENTS.—For purposes of satisfying the requirements in clause (i), the alien shall submit at least 2 of the following documents for each period of employment, which shall be considered conclusive evidence of such employment:

"(aa) Records maintained by the Social Security Administration.

"(bb) Records maintained by an employer, such as pay stubs, time sheets, or employment work verification.

"(cc) Records maintained by the Internal Revenue Service.

"(dd) Records maintained by a union or day labor center.

"(ee) Records maintained by any other government agency, such as worker compensation records, disability records, or business licensing records.

"(II) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—Aliens unable to submit documents described in subclause (I) shall submit at least 3 other types of reliable documents, including sworn declarations, for each period of employment to satisfy the requirement in clause (i).

"(III) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress that the requirement in clause (i) be interpreted and implemented in a manner that recognizes and takes into account the difficulties encountered by aliens in obtaining evidence of employment due to the undocumented status of the alien.

"(v) BURDEN OF PROOF.—An alien applying for adjustment of status under this subsection has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien has satisfied the employment requirements in clause (i). An alien may satisfy such burden of proof by producing sufficient evidence to show the extent of that employment as a matter of just and reasonable inference. Once the burden is met, the burden shall shift to the Secretary of Homeland Security to disprove the alien's evidence with a showing which negates the reasonableness of the inference to be drawn from the evidence.

"(E) PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES.—Not later than the date on which status is adjusted under this subsection, the alien shall establish the payment of all Federal and State income taxes owed for employment during the period of employment required under subparagraph (D)(i). The alien may satisfy such requirement by establishing that—

"(i) no such tax liability exists;

"(ii) all outstanding liabilities have been met; or

“(iii) the alien has entered into an agreement for payment of all outstanding liabilities with the Internal Revenue Service and with the department of revenue of each State to which taxes are owed.

“(F) BASIC CITIZENSHIP SKILLS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the alien shall demonstrate that the alien either—

“(I) meets the requirements of section 312(a) (relating to minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and Government of the United States); or

“(II) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study, recognized by the Secretary of Homeland Security, to achieve such understanding of English and the history and Government of the United States.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(I) MANDATORY.—The requirements of clause (i) shall not apply to any person who is unable to comply with those requirements because of a physical or developmental disability or mental impairment.

“(II) DISCRETIONARY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive all or part of the requirements of clause (i) in the case of an alien who is 65 years of age or older as of the date of the filing of the application for adjustment of status.

“(G) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT CLEARANCES.—The alien shall submit fingerprints in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security. Such fingerprints shall be submitted to relevant Federal agencies to be checked against existing databases for information relating to criminal, national security, or other law enforcement actions that would render the alien ineligible for adjustment of status under this subsection. The relevant Federal agencies shall work to ensure that such clearances are completed within 90 days of the submission of fingerprints. An appeal of a security clearance determination by the Secretary of Homeland Security shall be processed through the Department of Homeland Security.

“(H) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—The alien shall establish that if the alien is within the age period required under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.) that such alien has registered under that Act.

“(I) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—An alien may not adjust to an immigrant classification under this section until after the earlier of—

“(i) the consideration of all applications filed under section 201, 202, or 203 before the date of enactment of this section; or

“(ii) 8 years after the date of enactment of this section.

“(2) SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, if otherwise eligible under subparagraph (B), adjust the status to that of a lawful permanent resident for—

“(I) the spouse, or child who was under 21 years of age on the date of enactment of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006, of an alien who adjusts status or is eligible to adjust status to that of a permanent resident under paragraph (1); or

“(II) an alien who, within 5 years preceding the date of enactment of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006, was the spouse or child of an alien who adjusts status to that of a permanent resident under paragraph (1), if—

“(aa) the termination of the qualifying relationship was connected to domestic violence; or

“(bb) the spouse or child has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by the

spouse or parent who adjusts status or is eligible to adjust status to that of a permanent resident under paragraph (1).

“(ii) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAW.—In acting on applications filed under this paragraph with respect to aliens who have been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall apply the provisions of section 204(a)(1)(J) and the protections, prohibitions, and penalties under section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367).

“(B) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY NOT APPLICABLE.—In establishing admissibility to the United States, the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) shall establish that they are not inadmissible under section 212(a), except for any provision of that section that is waived under subsection (b) of this section.

“(C) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT CLEARANCE.—The spouse or child, if that child is 14 years of age or older, described in subparagraph (A) shall submit fingerprints in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security. Such fingerprints shall be submitted to relevant Federal agencies to be checked against existing databases for information relating to criminal, national security, or other law enforcement actions that would render the alien ineligible for adjustment of status under this subsection. The relevant Federal agencies shall work to ensure that such clearances are completed within 90 days of the submission of fingerprints. An appeal of a denial by the Secretary of Homeland Security shall be processed through the Department of Homeland Security.

“(3) NONAPPLICABILITY OF NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—When an alien is granted lawful permanent resident status under this subsection, the number of immigrant visas authorized to be issued under any provision of this Act shall not be reduced.

“(b) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—

“(1) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—In the determination of an alien's admissibility under paragraphs (1)(C) and (2) of subsection (a), the following provisions of section 212(a) shall apply and may not be waived by the Secretary of Homeland Security under paragraph (3)(A):

“(A) Paragraph (1) (relating to health).

“(B) Paragraph (2) (relating to criminals).

“(C) Paragraph (3) (relating to security and related grounds).

“(D) Subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (10) (relating to polygamists and child abductors).

“(2) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY NOT APPLICABLE.—The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6)(A), (6)(B), (6)(C), (6)(F), (6)(G), (7), (9), and (10)(B) of section 212(a) shall not apply to an alien who is applying for adjustment of status under subsection (a).

“(3) WAIVER OF OTHER GROUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive any provision of section 212(a) in the case of individual aliens for humanitarian purposes, to ensure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

“(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security, other than under this subparagraph, to waive the provisions of section 212(a).

“(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC CHARGE.—An alien is not ineligible for adjustment of status under subsection (a) by reason of a ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(4) if the alien establishes a history of employment in the United States evidencing self-support without public cash assistance.

“(5) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS WHERE THERE IS NO COMMERCIAL PURPOSE.—An alien is not ineligible for adjustment of status under subsection (a) by reason of a ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(E) if the alien establishes that the action referred to in that section was taken for humanitarian purposes, to ensure family unity, or was otherwise in the public interest.

“(6) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Section 241(a)(5) and section 240B(d) shall not apply with respect to an alien who is applying for adjustment of status under subsection (a).

“(c) TREATMENT OF APPLICANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien who files an application under subsection (a)(1)(A) for adjustment of status, including a spouse or child who files for adjustment of status under subsection (b)—

“(A) shall be granted employment authorization pending final adjudication of the alien's application for adjustment of status;

“(B) shall be granted permission to travel abroad pursuant to regulation pending final adjudication of the alien's application for adjustment of status;

“(C) shall not be detained, determined inadmissible or deportable, or removed pending final adjudication of the alien's application for adjustment of status, unless the alien commits an act which renders the alien ineligible for such adjustment of status; and

“(D) shall not be considered an unauthorized alien as defined in section 274A(h)(3) until such time as employment authorization under subparagraph (A) is denied.

“(2) DOCUMENT OF AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide each alien described in paragraph (1) with a counterfeit-resistant document of authorization that—

“(A) meets all current requirements established by the Secretary of Homeland Security for travel documents, including the requirements under section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note); and

“(B) reflects the benefits and status set forth in paragraph (1).

“(3) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT CLEARANCE.—Before an alien is granted employment authorization or permission to travel under paragraph (1), the alien shall be required to undergo a name check against existing databases for information relating to criminal, national security, or other law enforcement actions. The relevant Federal agencies shall work to ensure that such name checks are completed not later than 90 days after the date on which the name check is requested.

“(4) TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—An alien in removal proceedings who establishes prima facie eligibility for adjustment of status under subsection (a) shall be entitled to termination of the proceedings pending the outcome of the alien's application, unless the removal proceedings are based on criminal or national security grounds.

“(d) APPREHENSION BEFORE APPLICATION PERIOD.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide that in the case of an alien who is apprehended before the beginning of the application period described in subsection (a) and who can establish prima facie eligibility to have the alien's status adjusted under that subsection (but for the fact that the alien may not apply for such adjustment until the beginning of such period), until the alien has had the opportunity during the first 180 days of the application period to complete the filing of an application for adjustment, the alien may not be removed from the United States unless the alien is removed on the basis that the alien has engaged in criminal conduct or is a threat to the national security of the United States.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, no Federal agency or bureau, nor any officer or employee of such agency or bureau, may—

“(A) use the information furnished by the applicant pursuant to an application filed under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) for any purpose other than to make a determination on the application;

“(B) make any publication through which the information furnished by any particular applicant can be identified; or

“(C) permit anyone other than the sworn officers and employees of such agency, bureau, or approved entity, as approved by the Secretary of Homeland Security, to examine individual applications that have been filed.

“(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State shall provide the information furnished pursuant to an application filed under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), and any other information derived from such furnished information, to a duly recognized law enforcement entity in connection with a criminal investigation or prosecution or a national security investigation or prosecution, in each instance about an individual suspect or group of suspects, when such information is requested in writing by such entity.

“(3) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000.

“(f) PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS IN APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

“(A) VIOLATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

“(i) file or assist in filing an application for adjustment of status under this section and knowingly and willfully falsify, conceal, or cover up a material fact or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; or

“(ii) create or supply a false writing or document for use in making such an application.

“(B) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(2) INADMISSIBILITY.—An alien who is convicted of a crime under paragraph (1) shall be considered to be inadmissible to the United States.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), any alien or other entity (including an employer or union) that submits an employment record that contains incorrect data that the alien used in order to obtain such employment, shall not have violated this subsection.

“(g) INELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC BENEFITS.—For purposes of section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613), an alien whose status has been adjusted in accordance with subsection (a) shall not be eligible for any Federal means-tested public benefit unless the alien meets the alien eligibility criteria for such benefit under title IV of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(h) RELATIONSHIPS OF APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien who is present in the United States and has been ordered excluded, deported, removed, or to depart voluntarily from the United States or is subject to reinstatement of removal under any provision of this Act may, notwithstanding such order, apply for adjustment of status

under subsection (a). Such an alien shall not be required, as a condition of submitting or granting such application, to file a separate motion to reopen, reconsider, or vacate the exclusion, deportation, removal or voluntary departure order. If the Secretary of Homeland Security grants the application, the order shall be canceled. If the Secretary of Homeland Security renders a final administrative decision to deny the application, such order shall be effective and enforceable. Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the review or stay of removal under subsection (j).

“(2) STAY OF REMOVAL.—The filing of an application described in paragraph (1) shall stay the removal or detention of the alien pending final adjudication of the application, unless the removal or detention of the alien is based on criminal or national security grounds.

“(i) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section shall preclude an alien who may be eligible to be granted adjustment of status under subsection (a) from seeking such status under any other provision of law for which the alien may be eligible.

“(j) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, there shall be no administrative or judicial review of a determination respecting an application for adjustment of status under subsection (a).

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(A) SINGLE LEVEL OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPELLATE REVIEW.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an appellate authority to provide for a single level of administrative appellate review of a determination respecting an application for adjustment of status under subsection (a).

“(B) STANDARD FOR REVIEW.—Administrative appellate review referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the determination on the application and upon the presentation of additional or newly discovered evidence during the time of the pending appeal.

“(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) DIRECT REVIEW.—A person whose application for adjustment of status under subsection (a) is denied after administrative appellate review under paragraph (2) may seek review of such denial, in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, before the United States district court for the district in which the person resides.

“(B) REVIEW AFTER REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—There shall be judicial review in the Federal courts of appeal of the denial of an application for adjustment of status under subsection (a) in conjunction with judicial review of an order of removal, deportation, or exclusion, but only if the validity of the denial has not been upheld in a prior judicial proceeding under subparagraph (A). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the standard for review of such a denial shall be governed by subparagraph (C).

“(C) STANDARD FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Judicial review of a denial of an application under this section shall be based solely upon the administrative record established at the time of the review. The findings of fact and other determinations contained in the record shall be conclusive unless the applicant can establish abuse of discretion or that the findings are directly contrary to clear and convincing facts contained in the record, considered as a whole.

“(4) STAY OF REMOVAL.—Aliens seeking administrative or judicial review under this subsection shall not be removed from the United States until a final decision is rendered establishing ineligibility under this

section, unless such removal is based on criminal or national security grounds.

“(k) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM.—During the 12 months following the issuance of final regulations in accordance with subsection (o), the Secretary of Homeland Security, in cooperation with approved entities, approved by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall broadly disseminate information respecting adjustment of status under this section and the requirements to be satisfied to obtain such status. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall also disseminate information to employers and labor unions to advise them of the rights and protections available to them and to workers who file applications under this section. Such information shall be broadly disseminated, in the languages spoken by the top 15 source countries of the aliens who would qualify for adjustment of status under this section, including to television, radio, and print media such aliens would have access to.

“(1) EMPLOYER PROTECTIONS.—

“(1) IMMIGRATION STATUS OF ALIEN.—Employers of aliens applying for adjustment of status under this section shall not be subject to civil and criminal tax liability relating directly to the employment of such alien.

“(2) PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT RECORDS.—Employers that provide unauthorized aliens with copies of employment records or other evidence of employment pursuant to an application for adjustment of status under this section or any other application or petition pursuant to other provisions of the immigration laws, shall not be subject to civil and criminal liability pursuant to section 274A for employing such unauthorized aliens.

“(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this subsection shall be used to shield an employer from liability pursuant to section 274B or any other labor and employment law provisions.

“(m) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS; FINES.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security such sums as are necessary to commence the processing of applications filed under this section.

“(2) FINE.—An alien who files an application under this section shall pay a fine commensurate with levels charged by the Department of Homeland Security for other applications for adjustment of status.

“(3) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS OWED.—Prior to the adjudication of an application for adjustment of status filed under this section, the alien shall pay an amount equaling \$2,000, but such amount shall not be required from an alien under the age of 18.

“(4) USE OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall deposit payments received under this subsection in the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, and these payments in such account shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, such that—

“(A) 80 percent of such funds shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security for border security purposes;

“(B) 10 percent of such funds shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security for implementing and processing applications under this section; and

“(C) 10 percent of such funds shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to cover administrative and other expenses incurred in connection with the review of applications filed by immediate relatives as a result of the amendments made by title II of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006.

“(n) MANDATORY DEPARTURE AND REENTRY.—Any alien who is physically present in the United States on the date of introduction of the Immigrant Accountability Act of

2006 who seeks to adjust status under this section but does not satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (B) or (D) of subsection (a)(1) shall be eligible to depart the United States and to seek admission as a non-immigrant or immigrant alien as described in section 245C.

“(o) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue regulations to implement this section.”

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 245A the following:

“245B. Access to Earned Adjustment.”.

(c) MANDATORY DEPARTURE AND REENTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title II (8 U.S.C. 1255 et seq.), as amended by this title, is further amended by inserting after section 245B the following:

“SEC. 245C. MANDATORY DEPARTURE AND REENTRY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may grant Deferred Mandatory Departure status to aliens who are in the United States illegally to allow such aliens time to depart the United States and to seek admission as a nonimmigrant or immigrant alien.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—An alien desiring an adjustment of status under subsection (a) shall meet the following requirements:

“(1) PRESENCE.—The alien shall establish that the alien—

“(A) was physically present in the United States on the date of introduction of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006;

“(B) has been continuously in the United States since such date, except for brief, casual, and innocent departures; and

“(C) was not legally present in the United States on that date under any classification set forth in section 101(a)(15).

“(2) EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall establish that the alien—

“(i) was employed in the United States, whether full time, part time, seasonally, or self-employed, before the date on which the Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act was introduced; and

“(ii) has been employed in the United States since that date.

“(B) EVIDENCE OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien may conclusively establish employment status in compliance with subparagraph (A) by submitting to the Secretary of Homeland Security records demonstrating such employment maintained by—

“(I) the Social Security Administration, Internal Revenue Service, or by any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

“(II) an employer; or

“(III) a labor union, day labor center, or an organization that assists workers in matters related to employment.

“(ii) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—An alien who is unable to submit a document described in subclauses (I) through (III) of clause (i) may satisfy the requirement in subparagraph (A) by submitting to the Secretary at least 2 other types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

“(I) bank records;

“(II) business records;

“(III) sworn affidavits from nonrelatives who have direct knowledge of the alien's work; or

“(IV) remittance records.

“(iii) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress that the requirement in this subsection be interpreted and implemented in a manner that recognizes and takes into ac-

count the difficulties encountered by aliens in obtaining evidence of employment due to the undocumented status of the alien.

“(iv) BURDEN OF PROOF.—An alien who is applying for adjustment of status under this section has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien has satisfied the requirements of this subsection. An alien may meet such burden of proof by producing sufficient evidence to demonstrate such employment as a matter of reasonable inference.

“(3) ADMISSIBILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The alien shall establish that such alien—

“(i) is admissible to the United States, except as provided as in (B); and

“(ii) has not assisted in the persecution of any person or persons on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

“(B) GROUNDS NOT APPLICABLE.—The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6)(A), and (7) of section 212(a) shall not apply.

“(C) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive any other provision of section 212(a), or a ground of ineligibility under paragraph (4), in the case of individual aliens for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

“(4) INELIGIBLE.—The alien is ineligible for Deferred Mandatory Departure status if the alien—

“(A) has been ordered excluded, deported, removed, or to depart voluntarily from the United States; or

“(B) fails to comply with any request for information by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(5) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—The alien may be required, at the alien's expense, to undergo such a medical examination (including a determination of immunization status) as is appropriate and conforms to generally accepted professional standards of medical practice.

“(6) TERMINATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may terminate an alien's Deferred Mandatory Departure status if—

“(A) the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the alien was not in fact eligible for such status; or

“(B) the alien commits an act that makes the alien removable from the United States.

“(7) APPLICATION CONTENT AND WAIVER.—

“(A) APPLICATION FORM.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall create an application form that an alien shall be required to complete as a condition of obtaining Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(B) CONTENT.—In addition to any other information that the Secretary requires to determine an alien's eligibility for Deferred Mandatory Departure, the Secretary shall require an alien to answer questions concerning the alien's physical and mental health, criminal history, gang membership, renunciation of gang affiliation, immigration history, involvement with groups or individuals that have engaged in terrorism, genocide, persecution, or who seek the overthrow of the United States Government, voter registration history, claims to United States citizenship, and tax history.

“(C) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require an alien to include with the application a waiver of rights that explains to the alien that, in exchange for the discretionary benefit of obtaining Deferred Mandatory Departure status, the alien agrees to waive any right to administrative or judicial review or appeal of an immigration officer's determination as to the alien's eligibility, or to contest any removal action, other than on the basis of an application for asylum or restriction of removal pursuant to the provisions contained in section 208 or

241(b)(3), or under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984, or cancellation of removal pursuant to section 240A(a).

“(D) KNOWLEDGE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require an alien to include with the application a signed certification in which the alien certifies that the alien has read and understood all of the questions and statements on the application form, and that the alien certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the application, and any evidence submitted with it, are all true and correct, and that the applicant authorizes the release of any information contained in the application and any attached evidence for law enforcement purposes.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION AND APPLICATION TIME PERIODS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the application process is secure and incorporates anti-fraud protection. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall interview an alien to determine eligibility for Deferred Mandatory Departure status and shall utilize biometric authentication at time of document issuance.

“(2) INITIAL RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall begin accepting applications for Deferred Mandatory Departure status not later than 3 months after the date on which the application form is first made available.

“(3) APPLICATION.—An alien must submit an initial application for Deferred Mandatory Departure status not later than 6 months after the date on which the application form is first made available. An alien that fails to comply with this requirement is ineligible for Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(4) COMPLETION OF PROCESSING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all applications for Deferred Mandatory Departure status are processed not later than 12 months after the date on which the application form is first made available.

“(d) SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT BACKGROUND CHECKS.—An alien may not be granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status unless the alien submits biometric data in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security. The Secretary of Homeland Security may not grant Deferred Mandatory Departure status until all appropriate background checks are completed to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(e) ACKNOWLEDGMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien who applies for Deferred Mandatory Departure status shall submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security—

“(A) an acknowledgment made in writing and under oath that the alien—

“(i) is unlawfully present in the United States and subject to removal or deportation, as appropriate, under this Act; and

“(ii) understands the terms of the terms of Deferred Mandatory Departure;

“(B) any Social Security account number or card in the possession of the alien or relied upon by the alien;

“(C) any false or fraudulent documents in the alien's possession.

“(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—None of the documents or other information provided in accordance with paragraph (1) may be used in a criminal proceeding against the alien providing such documents or information.

“(f) MANDATORY DEPARTURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall grant Deferred Mandatory Departure status to an alien who meets the requirements of this section for a period not to exceed 3 years.



“(2) REGISTRATION AT TIME OF DEPARTURE.—An alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure shall—

“(A) depart from the United States before the expiration of the period of Deferred Mandatory Departure status;

“(B) register with the Secretary of Homeland Security at the time of departure; and

“(C) surrender any evidence of Deferred Mandatory Departure status at the time of departure.

“(3) APPLICATION FOR READMISSION.—An alien under this section may apply for admission to the United States as an immigrant or nonimmigrant while in the United States or from any location outside of the United States, but may not be granted admission until the alien has departed from the United States in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(4) EFFECT OF READMISSION ON SPOUSE OR CHILD.—The spouse or child of an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure and subsequently granted an immigrant or nonimmigrant visa before departing the United States shall be—

“(A) deemed to have departed under this section upon the successful admission of the principal alien; and

“(B) eligible for the derivative benefits associated with the immigrant or nonimmigrant visa granted to the principal alien without regard to numerical caps related to such visas.

“(5) WAIVERS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the departure requirement under this subsection if the alien—

“(A) is granted an immigrant or nonimmigrant visa; and

“(B) can demonstrate that the departure of the alien would create a substantial hardship on the alien or an immediate family member of the alien.

“(6) RETURN IN LEGAL STATUS.—An alien who complies with the terms of Deferred Mandatory Departure status and who departs before the expiration of such status—

“(A) shall not be subject to section 212(a)(9)(B); and

“(B) if otherwise eligible, may immediately seek admission as a nonimmigrant or immigrant.

“(7) FAILURE TO DEPART.—An alien who fails to depart the United States prior to the expiration of Mandatory Deferred Departure status is not eligible and may not apply for or receive any immigration relief or benefit under this Act or any other law for a period of 10 years, with the exception of section 208 or 241(b)(3) or the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984, in the case of an alien who indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution or torture.

“(8) PENALTIES FOR DELAYED DEPARTURE.—An alien who fails to depart immediately shall be subject to—

“(A) no fine if the alien departs not later than 1 year after the grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure;

“(B) a fine of \$2,000 if the alien does not depart within 2 years after the grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure; and

“(C) a fine of \$3,000 if the alien does not depart within 3 years after the grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure.

“(g) EVIDENCE OF DEFERRED MANDATORY DEPARTURE STATUS.—Evidence of Deferred Mandatory Departure status shall be machine-readable and tamper-resistant, shall allow for biometric authentication, and shall comply with the requirements under section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note). The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to incorporate

integrated-circuit technology into the document. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with the Forensic Document Laboratory in designing the document. The document may serve as a travel, entry, and work authorization document during the period of its validity. The document may be accepted by an employer as evidence of employment authorization and identity under section 274A(b)(1)(B).

“(h) TERMS OF STATUS.—

“(1) REPORTING.—During the period of Deferred Mandatory Departure, an alien shall comply with all registration requirements under section 264.

“(2) TRAVEL.—

“(A) An alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure is not subject to section 212(a)(9) for any unlawful presence that occurred prior to the Secretary of Homeland Security granting the alien Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(B) Under regulations established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure—

“(i) may travel outside of the United States and may be readmitted if the period of Deferred Mandatory Departure status has not expired; and

“(ii) must establish at the time of application for admission that the alien is admissible under section 212.

“(C) EFFECT ON PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—Time spent outside the United States under subparagraph (B) shall not extend the period of Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(3) BENEFITS.—During the period in which an alien is granted Deferred Mandatory Departure under this section—

“(A) the alien shall not be considered to be permanently residing in the United States under the color of law and shall be treated as a nonimmigrant admitted under section 214; and

“(B) the alien may be deemed ineligible for public assistance by a State (as defined in section 101(a)(36)) or any political subdivision thereof which furnishes such assistance.

“(i) PROHIBITION ON CHANGE OF STATUS OR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Before leaving the United States, an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status may not apply to change status under section 248.

“(j) APPLICATION FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien seeking a grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure status shall submit, in addition to any other fees authorized by law, an application fee of \$1,000.

“(2) USE OF FEE.—The fees collected under paragraph (1) shall be available for use by the Secretary of Homeland Security for activities to identify, locate, or remove illegal aliens.

“(k) FAMILY MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject subsection (f)(4), the spouse or child of an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status is subject to the same terms and conditions as the principal alien.

“(2) APPLICATION FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The spouse or child of an alien seeking Deferred Mandatory Departure status shall submit, in addition to any other fee authorized by law, an additional fee of \$500.

“(B) USE OF FEE.—The fees collected under subparagraph (A) shall be available for use by the Secretary of Homeland Security for activities to identify, locate, or remove aliens who are removable under section 237.

“(1) EMPLOYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien who has applied for or has been granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status may be employed in the United States.

“(2) CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT.—An alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status must be employed while in the United States. An alien who fails to be employed for 60 days is ineligible for hire until the alien has departed the United States and reentered. The Secretary of Homeland Security may reauthorize an alien for employment without requiring the alien's departure from the United States.

“(m) ENUMERATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Commissioner of the Social Security system, shall implement a system to allow for the enumeration of a Social Security number and production of a Social Security card at the time the Secretary of Homeland Security grants an alien Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(n) PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS IN APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED MANDATORY DEPARTURE.—

“(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

“(A) VIOLATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person—

“(i) to file or assist in filing an application for adjustment of status under this section and knowingly and willfully falsify, misrepresent, conceal, or cover up a material fact or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; or

“(ii) to create or supply a false writing or document for use in making such an application.

“(B) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(2) INADMISSIBILITY.—An alien who is convicted of a crime under paragraph (1) shall be considered to be inadmissible to the United States on the ground described in section 212(a)(6)(C)(i).

“(O) RELATION TO CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL.—With respect to an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status under this section, the period of such status shall not be counted as a period of physical presence in the United States for purposes of section 240A(a), unless the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that extreme hardship exists.

“(p) WAIVER OF RIGHTS.—An alien is not eligible for Deferred Mandatory Departure status, unless the alien has waived any right to contest, other than on the basis of an application for asylum, restriction of removal, or protection under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984, or cancellation of removal pursuant to section 240A(a), any action for deportation or removal of the alien that is instituted against the alien subsequent to a grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure status.

“(q) DENIAL OF DISCRETIONARY RELIEF.—The determination of whether an alien is eligible for a grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure status is solely within the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review—

“(1) any judgment regarding the granting of relief under this section; or

“(2) any other decision or action of the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority for which is specified under this section to be in the discretion of the Secretary, other than the granting of relief under section 208(a).

“(r) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) LIMITATIONS ON RELIEF.—Without regard to the nature of the action or claim and without regard to the identity of the party

or parties bringing the action, no court may—

“(A) enter declaratory, injunctive, or other equitable relief in any action pertaining to—

“(i) an order or notice denying an alien a grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure status or any other benefit arising from such status; or

“(ii) an order of removal, exclusion, or deportation entered against an alien after a grant of Deferred Mandatory Departure status; or

“(B) certify a class under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in any action for which judicial review is authorized under a subsequent paragraph of this subsection.

**(2) CHALLENGES TO VALIDITY.—**

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any right or benefit not otherwise waived or limited pursuant to this section is available in an action instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, but shall be limited to determinations of—

“(i) whether such section, or any regulation issued to implement such section, violates the Constitution of the United States; or

“(ii) whether such a regulation, or a written policy directive, written policy guideline, or written procedure issued by or under the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement such section, is not consistent with applicable provisions of this section or is otherwise in violation of law.”.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), as amended by this title, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 245B the following:

“245C. Mandatory Departure and Reentry.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 237(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)(A)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting “(or 6 months in the case of an alien granted Deferred Mandatory Departure status under section 245C)” after “imposed”.

(4) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection, or any amendment made by this subsection, shall be construed to create any substantive or procedural right or benefit that is legally enforceable by any party against the United States or its agencies or officers or any other person.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for facilities, personnel (including consular officers), training, technology, and processing necessary to carry out the amendments made by this subsection.

(d) CORRECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY RECORDS.—Section 208(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or” at the end;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) whose status is adjusted to that of lawful permanent resident under section 245B of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”; and

(4) by striking “1990.” and inserting “1990, or in the case of an alien described in subparagraph (D), if such conduct is alleged to have occurred prior to the date on which the alien became lawfully admitted for temporary residence.”.

On page \_\_, strike line \_\_ and all that follows through page \_\_, line \_\_, and insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_. FAMILY REUNIFICATION.**

(a) TREATMENT OF IMMEDIATE RELATIVES WITH RESPECT TO THE FAMILY IMMIGRATION CAP.—

(1) EXEMPTION OF IMMEDIATE RELATIVES FROM FAMILY SPONSORED IMMIGRANT CAP.—Section 201(c)(1)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1151(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) and inserting the following:

“(i) 480,000, minus

“(ii) the number computed under paragraph (3), plus

“(iii) the number (if any) computed under paragraph (2).”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 201(c) (8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

(b) RECLASSIFICATION OF SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN OF LEGAL PERMANENT RESIDENTS AS IMMEDIATE RELATIVES.—

(1) IMMEDIATE RELATIVES.—Section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(2)(A)(i)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting “or the spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence,” after “United States.”;

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by inserting “or lawful permanent resident” after “citizen” each place that term appears; and

(ii) by inserting “or lawful permanent resident’s” after “citizen’s” each place that term appears;

(C) in the third sentence, by inserting “or the lawful permanent resident loses lawful permanent resident status” after “United States citizenship”;

(D) by adding at the end the following: “A spouse or child, as defined in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 101(b)(1), shall be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in the respective subsection, if accompanying or following to join the spouse or parent. The same treatment shall apply to parents of citizens of the United States being entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in the respective subsection, if accompanying or following to join their daughter or son.”.

(2) ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS.—Section 203(a) (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “23,400” and inserting “38,000”;

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

“(2) UNMARRIED SONS AND UNMARRIED DAUGHTERS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or unmarried daughters (but are not the children) of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 60,000 plus the number (if any) by which such worldwide level exceeds 226,000, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (1).”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “23,400” and inserting “38,000”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “65,000” and inserting “90,000”.

(3) RULES FOR DETERMINING WHETHER CERTAIN ALIENS ARE IMMEDIATE RELATIVES.—Section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(f)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3),” and inserting “paragraph (2).”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(4) NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE.—Section 202 (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(4)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(iii) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated, by striking “section 203(a)(2)(B)” and inserting “section 203(a)(2)”;

(B) in subsection (e), in the flush matter following paragraph (3), by striking “, or as limiting the number of visas that may be issued under section 203(a)(2)(A) pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(A)”.

(5) ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRATION VISAS.—Section 203(h) (8 U.S.C. 1153(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsections (a)(2)(A) and (d)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “becomes available for such alien (or, in the case of subsection (d), the date on which an immigrant visa number became available for the alien’s parent),” and inserting “became available for the alien’s parent.”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “applicable”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “The petition” and all that follows through the period and inserting “The petition described in this paragraph is a petition filed under section 204 for classification of the alien’s parent under subsection (a), (b), or (c).”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsections (a)(2)(A) and (d)” and inserting “subsection (d)”.

(6) PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS.—Section 204 (8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (iii)—

(aa) by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “citizen” each place that term appears; and

(bb) in subclause (II)(aa)(CC)(bbb), by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “citizenship”;

(II) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “citizen” each place that term appears; and

(bb) by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “citizenship”;

(III) in clause (v)(I), by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “citizen”; and

(IV) in clause (vi)—

(aa) by inserting “or legal permanent resident status” after “renunciation of citizenship”;

(bb) by inserting “or legal permanent resident” after “abuser’s citizenship”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (J) as subparagraphs (B) through (I), respectively;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (A)(iii), (A)(iv), (B)(ii), or (B)(iii)” and inserting “clause (iii) or (iv) of subparagraph (A)”;

(v) in subparagraph (I), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “or clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (B)”;

(II) by striking “under subparagraphs (C) and (D)” and inserting “under subparagraphs (B) and (C)”;

(B) by striking subsection (a)(2);

(C) in subsection (h), by striking “or a petition filed under subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii)”;

(D) in subsection (j), by striking “subsection (a)(1)(D)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)(C)”.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Section 212(a)(9)(B)(iii) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(V) SPOUSES, CHILDREN, AND PARENTS.—The provisions of this subparagraph and subparagraph (C)(i)(I) shall be waived for

spouses and children of legal permanent residents or citizens of the United States and parents of citizens of the United States (as such terms are defined in section 201(b)(2)(A)(i)) on whose behalf a petition was filed under section 203 on or before the date of introduction of the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2006, or who are derivative beneficiaries of such a petition.”

**SA 3210.** Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**TITLE \_\_\_\_\_ BORDER LAW ENFORCEMENT RELIEF ACT**

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_ 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2006”

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_ 02. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) It is the obligation of the Federal Government of the United States to adequately secure the Nation’s borders and prevent the flow of undocumented persons and illegal drugs into the United States.

(2) Despite the fact that the United States Border Patrol apprehends over 1,000,000 people each year trying to illegally enter the United States, according to the Congressional Research Service, the net growth in the number of unauthorized aliens has increased by approximately 500,000 each year. The Southwest border accounts for approximately 94 percent of all migrant apprehensions each year. Currently, there are an estimated 11,000,000 unauthorized aliens in the United States.

(3) The border region is also a major corridor for the shipment of drugs. According to the El Paso Intelligence Center, 65 percent of the narcotics that are sold in the markets of the United States enter the country through the Southwest Border.

(4) Border communities continue to incur significant costs due to the lack of adequate border security. A 2001 study by the United States-Mexico Border Counties Coalition found that law enforcement and criminal justice expenses associated with illegal immigration exceed \$89,000,000 annually for the Southwest border counties.

(5) In August 2005, the States of New Mexico and Arizona declared states of emergency in order to provide local law enforcement immediate assistance in addressing criminal activity along the Southwest border.

(6) While the Federal Government provides States and localities assistance in covering costs related to the detention of certain criminal aliens and the prosecution of Federal drug cases, local law enforcement along the border are provided no assistance in covering such expenses and must use their limited resources to combat drug trafficking, human smuggling, kidnappings, the destruction of private property, and other border-related crimes.

(7) The United States shares 5,525 miles of border with Canada and 1,989 miles with Mexico. Many of the local law enforcement agencies located along the border are small, rural departments charged with patrolling large areas of land. Counties along the Southwest United States-Mexico border are some of the poorest in the country and lack the financial resources to cover the additional costs associated with illegal immigration, drug trafficking, and other border-related crimes.

(8) Federal assistance is required to help local law enforcement operating along the border address the unique challenges that arise as a result of their proximity to an international border and the lack of overall border security in the region

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_ 03. BORDER RELIEF GRANT PROGRAM.**

(A) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to an eligible law enforcement agency to provide assistance to such agency to address—

(A) a criminal activity that occurs in the jurisdiction of such agency by virtue of such agency’s proximity to the United States border; and

(B) the impact of any lack of security along the United States border.

(2) DURATION.—Grants may be awarded under this subsection during fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

(3) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis, except that the Secretary shall give priority to applications from any eligible law enforcement agency serving a community—

(A) with a population of less than 50,000; and

(B) located no more than 100 miles from a United States border with—

(i) Canada; or

(ii) Mexico.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded pursuant to subsection (a) may only be used to provide additional resources for an eligible law enforcement agency to address criminal activity occurring along any such border, including—

(1) to obtain equipment;

(2) to hire additional personnel;

(3) to upgrade and maintain law enforcement technology;

(4) to cover operational costs, including overtime and transportation costs; and

(5) such other resources as are available to assist that agency.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought; and

(B) provide such additional assurances as the Secretary determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “eligible law enforcement agency” means a tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency—

(A) located in a county no more than 100 miles from a United States border with—

(i) Canada; or

(ii) Mexico; or

(B) located in a county more than 100 miles from any such border, but where such county has been certified by the Secretary as a High Impact Area.

(2) HIGH IMPACT AREA.—The term “High Impact Area” means any county designated by the Secretary as such, taking into consideration—

(A) whether local law enforcement agencies in that county have the resources to protect the lives, property, safety, or welfare of the residents of that county;

(B) the relationship between any lack of security along the United States border and the rise, if any, of criminal activity in that county; and

(C) any other unique challenges that local law enforcement face due to a lack of security along the United States border.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) DIVISION OF AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A)  $\frac{2}{3}$  shall be set aside for eligible law enforcement agencies located in the 6 States with the largest number of undocumented alien apprehensions; and

(B)  $\frac{1}{3}$  shall be set aside for areas designated as a High Impact Area under subsection (d).

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts appropriated for grants under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other State and local public funds obligated for the purposes provided under this title.

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_ 04. ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW.**

Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize State or local law enforcement agencies or their officers to exercise Federal immigration law enforcement authority.

**SA 3211.** Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 232. NONIMMIGRANT ALIEN STATUS FOR CERTAIN ATHLETES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(c)(4)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i)(I) performs as an athlete, individually or as part of a group or team, at an internationally recognized level of performance,

“(II) is a professional athlete, as defined in section 204(i)(2),

“(III) performs as an athlete, or as a coach, as part of a team or franchise that is located in the United States and a member of a foreign league or association of 15 or more amateur sports teams, if—

“(aa) the foreign league or association is the highest level of amateur performance of that sport in the relevant foreign country,

“(bb) participation in such league or association renders players ineligible, whether on a temporary or permanent basis, to earn a scholarship in, or participate in, that sport at a college or university in the United States under the rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and

“(cc) a significant number of the individuals who play in such league or association are drafted by a major sports league or a minor league affiliate of such a sports league, or

“(IV) is a professional athlete or amateur athlete who performs individually or as part of a group in a theatrical ice skating production, and

“(ii) seeks to enter the United States temporarily and solely for the purpose of performing—

“(I) as such an athlete with respect to a specific athletic competition, or

“(II) in the case of an individual described in clause (i)(IV), in a specific theatrical ice skating production or tour.”.

(b) ADVISORY OPINIONS.—Section 214(c) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(D), by inserting “(other than with respect to aliens seeking entry under subclause (II), (III), or (IV) of subparagraph (A)(i) of this paragraph),” after “101(a)(15)(P)”;

(2) in paragraph (6)(A)(iii), by inserting “(other than with respect to aliens seeking entry under subclause (II), (III), or (IV) of paragraph (4)(A)(i))” after “101(a)(15)(P)(i)”.

(c) PETITIONS FOR MULTIPLE ALIENS.—Section 214(c)(4) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(F) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit a petition under this subsection to seek classification of more than one alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(P)(i)(a). The fee charged for such a petition may not be more than the fee charged for a petition seeking classification of one such alien.”

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—Section 214(c)(4) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(4)), as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(G) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit an athlete, or the employer of an athlete, to seek admission to the United States for such athlete under a provision of this Act other than section 101(a)(15)(P)(i).”

**SA 3212.** Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SOUTHWEST BORDER SECURITY TASK FORCE.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Southwest Border Security Task Force Act of 2006”.

(b) SOUTHWEST BORDER SECURITY TASK FORCE PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Southwest Border Security Task Force Program to—

(A) facilitate local participation in providing recommendations regarding steps to enhance border security; and

(B) provide financial and other assistance in implementing such recommendations.

(2) NUMBER.—In carrying out the program established under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall establish at least 1 Border Security Task Force (referred to in this section as a “Task Force”) in each State that is adjacent to the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—Each Task Force shall be composed of representatives from—

- (A) relevant Federal agencies;
- (B) State and local law enforcement agencies;
- (C) State and local government;
- (D) community organizations;
- (E) Indian tribes; and
- (F) other interested parties.

(4) CHAIRMAN.—Each Task Force shall select a Chairman from among its members.

(5) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each Task Force shall submit a report to the Secretary containing—

(A) specific recommendations to enhance border security along the international border between the State in which such Task Force is located and Mexico; and

(B) a request for financial and other resources necessary to implement the recommendations during the subsequent fiscal year.

(c) BORDER SECURITY GRANTS.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall award a grant to each Task Force submitting a request under subsection (b)(5)(B) to the extent that—

(A) sufficient funds are available; and

(B) the request is consistent with the Nation’s comprehensive border security strategy.

(2) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Not less than 1 Task Force in each of the States bordering Mexico shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection in an amount not less than \$500,000.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year for which Federal financial assistance or other resources were received by a Task Force, the Task Force shall submit a report to the Secretary describing how such financial assistance or other resources were used by the Task Force and by the organizations that its members represent.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 to carry out this section.

**SA 3213.** Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . COMPREHENSIVE METHAMPHETAMINE PLAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the Chairman of Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a formal plan that outlines the diplomatic, law enforcement, and other procedures that the Federal Government should implement to reduce the amount of Methamphetamine being trafficked into the United States.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include—

(1) a specific timeline for engaging elected and diplomatic officials in a bilateral process focused on developing a framework to reduce the inflow of Methamphetamine into the United States;

(2) a specific plan to engage the 5 countries who export the most pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, and other such Methamphetamine precursor chemicals during calendar year preceding the year in which the plan is prepared; and

(3) a specific funding request that outlines what, if any, additional appropriations are needed to secure the border, ports of entry, or any other Methamphetamine trafficking windows that are currently being exploited by Methamphetamine traffickers.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall prepare and submit to the committees of Con-

gress referred to in subsection (a), a report to determine whether the President is in compliance with this section.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 10 a.m. to mark up an original bill entitled “Foreign Investment and National Security Act of 2006.”

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 30, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on “McKinney-Vento Act Reauthorization and Consolidation of HUD’s Homeless Programs.”

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 10 a.m., on pending Committee business.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., on Competition and Convergence.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on The Hidden Cost of Oil.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

*Agenda*

I. Nominations: Norman Randy Smith to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; Michael A. Chagares to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit; Patrick J. Schiltz to be U.S. District Court Judge for the District of Minnesota; Gray Hampton Miller to be United States District Judge

for the Southern District of Texas; Steven G. Bradbury to be an Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel; Sharee M. Freeman to be Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice; Jeffrey L. Sedgwick to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

II. Bills: S. 1768, A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings—Specter, Leahy, Cornyn, Grassley, Schumer, Feingold, Durbin; S. 829, Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2005—Grassley, Schumer, Cornyn, Leahy, Feingold, Durbin, Graham, DeWine, Specter; S. 489, Federal Consent Decree Fairness Act—Alexander, Kyl, Cornyn, Graham, Hatch; S. 2039, Prosecutors and Defenders Incentive Act of 2005—Durbin, Specter, DeWine, Leahy, Kennedy, Feinstein, Feingold, Schumer; S. 2292, A bill to provide relief for the Federal judiciary from excessive rent charges—Specter, Leahy, Cornyn, Feinstein, Biden; S. 2453, National Security Surveillance Act of 2006—Specter; S. 2455, Terrorist Surveillance Act of 2006—DeWine, Graham.

III. Matters: S.J. Res. 1, Marriage Protection Amendment—Allard, Sessions, Kyl, Hatch, Cornyn, Coburn, Brownback; S. Res. 398, A resolution relating to the censure of George W. Bush; Feingold.

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

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 30, 2006, to hear the legislative presentations of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, the AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War and the Vietnam Veterans of America. The hearing will take place in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

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

#### PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 10 a.m., for a hearing entitled "Neutralizing The Nuclear and Radiological Threat: Securing the Global Supply Chain (Part Two)."

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

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 30, 2006 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing.

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

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER PREVENTION AND PREDICTION

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee

on Disaster Prevention and Prediction be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 30, 2006, at 11 a.m., on National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) Oversight.

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

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 30, 2006 at 2:30 p.m., for a hearing entitled, "Fulfilling the Promise? A Review of Veterans' Preference in the Federal Government?"

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

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 30, 2006, at 2 p.m., in open session to receive testimony on reserve component personnel policies in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007.

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

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 30 at 2:30 p.m.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1577, to facilitate the transfer of Spearfish Hydroelectric Plant Number 1 to the city of Spearfish, SD; S. 1962 and H.R. 4000, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise certain repayment contracts with the Bostwick Irrigation District in Nebraska, the Kansas Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, the Frenchman-Cambridge Irrigation District, and the Webster Irrigation District No. 4, all a part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program; S. 2028, to provide for the reinstatement of a license for a certain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project; S. 2035, to extend the time required for construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Idaho; S. 2054, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the State of Vermont; S. 2205, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit, James Division, SD, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands and the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential leaseholders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission; and H.R. 3812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a

feasibility study with respect to the Mokelumne River, and for other purposes.

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

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Judiciary Committee detailees and interns be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of debate on S. 2454, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006: Kenneth Cohen, George Farmakides, and Robert Newell.

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

#### AMERICAN DIABETES ALERT DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this week, the National Medical Association sponsored American Diabetes Alert Day, with the purpose of bringing the public's attention to this distressingly prevalent disease.

Approximately 20.8 million people in the United States have diabetes; 6.2 million, or about a third of that number, are unaware that they suffer from the disease, although they have it.

Among African Americans, approximately 3.2 million people, age 20 or older, have diabetes, with as many as one-third of that number remaining undiagnosed. Yet the ravages of that disease, which can be quite silent at first, continue.

These disparities also mean higher rates of heart disease, amputations, loss of eyesight, and a host of other serious complications caused by diabetes.

African Americans are over two times as likely as non-Hispanic Whites to die from the disease. Today, nobody knows exactly why, and it needs to be explored and it needs to be eliminated.

I strongly believe that the troubling persistence of health disparities, these gaps and differences that are based on race, and even where you live at times, based on socioeconomic status—diabetes being one example—is a national issue that almost by definition affects us all.

I congratulate the National Medical Association, a very active organization, a tremendous organization, for their outreach, which they have explored through conferences and through e-mail and direct mail, for raising this awareness. A third of the people don't know they have diabetes.

All this is an issue of our common humanity, our oneness, and our commitment to one another as deserving, equal, and comparable citizens. Yet these disparities exist. Even if a person disagrees with my reasons, as others have pointed out, we all suffer the economic consequences in higher insurance rates and a compromised health system.

As a doctor, I have had the opportunity to interact with hundreds, actually thousands, of patients with a

whole variety of health problems. Oftentimes, these patients have heart problems, cardiovascular problems, as a result of diabetic complications. Some of our patients with diabetes had to have heart transplants, developing a diabetes cardiomyopathy. That was in medicine, but today in the Senate, as the majority leader, working with my colleagues, I have had the opportunity to address this issue through legislative remedies.

Two years ago, in 2004, I joined a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor legislation that I have written called Closing The Health Care Gap. It was bipartisan and it addressed the issue of disparities. Our work has been ongoing, and I look forward, in the coming weeks, to addressing another bipartisan bill with the help of, again, many of the same colleagues, including Senators KENNEDY, ENZI, and many others, that addresses these health care disparities, including diabetes.

Together we are working to craft the very best possible strategies to eliminate health care disparities all across the country. With the great work of groups such as the National Medical Association, we are able to explore and educate at the grassroots level, building support for not just this legislation but for the policies in this legislation that can eliminate these gaps over time.

Speaking of grassroots, in Nashville, TN, my hometown, on April 8, citizens will go out to the location at our Nashville Zoo for the 15th annual "Walk on the Wild Side." It is also known as "America's Walk for Diabetes." This is a nationwide walk, and it is the American Diabetes Association's signature special event.

With strong support from the business community, including sponsorship and corporate teams, the walk raises nearly \$20 million nationwide to find a cure for diabetes and to support the overall mission. I encourage those listening to sign up and throw their support behind those worthy efforts.

Dr. James Galvin, III, a close friend of mine, president of Morehouse School of Medicine, someone who has been a colleague, somebody I admire tremendously in his work at Morehouse, has said:

Diabetes is a disease about which we can do a great deal, but only when those affected are informed and empowered to take the kind of control of this disease that is now possible.

I agree. I wholeheartedly agree. I look forward to the day when all of our citizens around the country have access to quality care, no matter what location they live in, who they are, or where they are from.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, March 31. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 2454, the border security bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we had some good debate, made good progress, had good discussion on this border security bill. We had hoped to have more votes on amendments to this bill this evening. We were unable to make that progress. But we will return tomorrow and try to set up votes on the three pending amendments.

Again, I am disappointed we could not schedule more action on this bill this week in terms of votes. We have Senators who are waiting to offer amendments, so I hope tomorrow we can reach agreement for a time-certain for the next votes. It is clear to me at this point that we will not be able to set any votes for tomorrow, and therefore I announce now that there will be no votes tomorrow. We will have multiple votes on Monday, and we will announce that schedule on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:49 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 31, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 30, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

DANIEL L. COOPER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR BENEFITS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN AND INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

CRAIG B. ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

ANN M. BACHER, OF FLORIDA  
E. SCOTT BOZEK, OF VIRGINIA  
DANIEL D. DEVITO, OF FLORIDA

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE FOLLOWING FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.

To be lieutenant

CHRISTIAAN H. VAN WESTENDORP

To be ensign

MARY A. BARBER  
MATTHEW P. BERG  
CHRISTOPHER W. DANIELS  
MATTHEW C. DAVIS  
NATHAN P. ELDRIDGE  
FRANCISCO J. FUENMAYOR  
MATTHEW GLAZIEWSKI  
DAVID M. GOTHAN  
SARAH A. T. HARRIS  
MEGHAN E. MCGOVERN  
DAMIAN M. RAY  
LECIA M. SALERNO  
RAUL VASQUEZ DEL MERCADO  
WILLIAM G. WINNER  
VICTORIA E. ZALEWSKI

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY D. ORTON, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RICHARD ZENOS WINGET.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID F. MELCHER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT WILSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL D. ROCHELLE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

SOONJA CHOI, 0000  
STEVEN D. CLIFT, 0000  
ROBERT KASPAR, 0000  
LOUIS WALKER, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

GERARDO FRONDA, 0000  
THOMAS JACKSON, 0000  
RICHARD LUCCHESI, 0000  
REBECCA TOMSYCK, 0000

To be major

WISLY AGUSTIN, 0000  
JOE HAINES, 0000  
ADAM B. KANIS, 0000  
ANGELA LIJIN, 0000  
MEHDY ZARANDY, 0000

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 30, 2006, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

DANIEL P. RYAN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 14, 2005.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### TRIBUTE TO GERASIMOS C. VANS ON HIS RETIREMENT

#### HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Gerasimos (Gerry) Vans, who is retiring after more than 25 years of distinguished service to this institution. Throughout his years of service to the House, Gerry has tackled a wide range of institutional challenges. In every aspect of his service to the House, Gerry has demonstrated his characteristic professionalism, knowledge, and creativity, and has without exception conducted himself with the utmost integrity.

Gerry, a native of Milwaukee, Wisconsin began his career with summer intern positions in the House and Senate while attending college. Following his graduation from Marquette University, Gerry pursued a masters degree at The George Washington University while employed in the House mail room. Gerry began his congressional career in earnest following his appointment to the U.S. Capitol Police force where he remained for two years. His next appointment was as the Executive Assistant to the House Sergeant at Arms, where he served as secretary to the U.S. Capitol Police Board and primary Capitol Police liaison for the Sergeant at Arms. Gerry had primary operational responsibilities for major House events and congressional funeral delegations, and was a key staffer in Capitol security planning.

Since joining the Office of the Clerk's front office staff in 1991, he has served under four Clerks, first in a support capacity to senior management, and since 1995 as a senior manager—as Special Assistant, Assistant to the Clerk, 1999, and Deputy Clerk, 2003. Because of his fluency with congressional operations and practice, he is frequently called upon to brief visiting foreign parliamentarians and senior officials, and has participated in various legislative-related conferences.

Gerry has also been instrumental in the development and implementation of the Lobbying Disclosure Act; the five-year project to move the Legislative Information Management System, LIMS, from a mainframe to a client-server platform; the Document Management Initiative: conversion of all legislative documents to a common Extensible Markup Language (XML) standard; Continuity of Operations: development and planning leading to the first comprehensive House-wide continuity of operations apparatus; and the development of the History and Preservation Office.

Over the years, Gerry's responsibilities have grown to include the day-to-day oversight and operations of the Clerk's 9 departments and 270 employees, which provide legislative and information services to the House and the general public. He is involved daily and directly with such issues as Member of Congress relations, House floor operations, plan-

ning, personnel, procurement, information technology, printing, oversight of vacant congressional offices, and event planning.

There is no doubt that the House as an institution is losing one of its hardest working public servants. Gerry's dedication and professionalism has spanned both Democratic and Republican majorities, during which time his mission has always been to complete any task, big or small, with the same tenacity and thoroughness. Gerry will be dearly missed by the House of Representatives and by all those among us who have had the pleasure of working with him during his more than 25 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this institution, I wish to extend to Gerry Vans our heartfelt gratitude for his tireless service to the House, and wish him the very best as he embarks upon his new career.

### RECOGNIZING ROBERT R. RUBANO, JR.

#### HON. MELISSA A. HART

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the superintendent of Farrell Schools, Robert R. Rubano, Jr., and the school board members who have served for over 9 years.

Mr. Rubano not only serves as the superintendent of the schools in Farrell, but also teaches a leadership class to juniors and seniors in the school district 1 day a week. The subjects taught in the class vary from speech preparation to key decision making to job and college outlook. This leadership class has become very popular among students in the Farrell School District.

Mr. Rubano has been the superintendent of the Farrell School District since 1997. Before committing to be the superintendent, Mr. Rubano spent many years as a teacher, then principal. Mr. Rubano served as a team facilitator for a group of 10 who designed new math curriculum for grades K–6. He also assisted in writing the district's Act 178 Professional Development Plan. Mr. Rubano has dedicated his career to bettering the education of young minds.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing all of the hard work and time Robert R. Rubano, Jr. has put in to making the school district better. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute such a dedicated individual like Robert R. Rubano, Jr.

### A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF ROOSEVELT EARLY

#### HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Roosevelt Early, a veteran high school educator from Crossett, AR, who died at the age of 72 on February 26, 2006. I wish to recognize his lifetime of dedication to public education and the city of Crossett.

A native of West Helena, AR, Mr. Early earned a bachelor's degree at Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College, now the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, UAPB, where he played football and sang in the choir. Mr. Early also attended the University of Central Arkansas where he received a master's degree.

Moving to Crossett in 1958, Mr. Early spent nearly a half century as a public school educator at T.W. Daniel and Crossett School District. He began as a shop teacher at T.W. Daniel High School in 1958 and rose to the post of assistant principal of T.W. Daniel Middle School in 1973, and principal 2 short years later of T.W. Daniel High School. Following his tenure at T.W. Daniel, Mr. Early served as principal at Norman Junior High School beginning in 1980 and Crossett High School in 1985.

Mr. Early was active throughout the Ashley County community. He served as director of the E.C. Crossett Community Center, president of the UAPB Ashley County Alumni Association, and was a member of the Ashley County Medical Center Board of Directors, Ashley County Martin Luther King Planning Commission, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Society, Georgia-Pacific Planning Commission, the Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators, the Arkansas Association of Secondary Principals, Crossett Classroom Teachers Association, Arkansas Education Association and the National Education Association.

As a man of faith, Mr. Early served as chairman of the Deacon Board at New Bethel Missionary Baptist Church and chairman of the Trustee Board. The Roosevelt Early Memorial Scholarship was started shortly after his death to commemorate and honor the impact he made as an educator at Crossett High School.

As the son of public school educators, I believe there are few jobs more noble than that of educating our Nation's children. Mr. Early spent a lifetime dedicated to this end. I extend my deepest condolences to his wife of 48 years, Lendora; his daughters, Cassandra and Patricia; his brother, David; his sisters, Thelma, Lola, and Alma, and his grandchildren, Kenyellshia and Chase. Though Mr. Early may no longer be with us, his spirit and legacy will live on for generations to come.

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTH OF  
CHARLES AURELIO HUDSON  
EYNON

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am happy to congratulate Elizabeth and Teddy Eynon of Washington, DC, on the birth of their new baby boy. Charles Aurelio Hudson Eynon was born on March 17, 2006, at 9:09 p.m., weighing 8 pounds and 7 ounces. Hudson has been born into a loving home, where he will be raised by parents who are devoted to his well-being and bright future. His birth is a blessing.

HONORING FRANK G. JACKSON,  
MAYOR OF CLEVELAND

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, SHERROD BROWN, MARCY KAPTUR, TED STRICKLAND, TIM RYAN, and I rise today in tribute and recognition of Cleveland Mayor Frank G. Jackson, as he was honored by the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party on March 26, 2006.

Mayor Jackson was elected last November to lead the City of Cleveland—a continuation of his lifelong activism and devotion on behalf of our Cleveland community. He is a United States veteran, having served our country in Vietnam. After being honorably discharged, he returned to his East 38th Street neighborhood—where his commitment to making a difference would only grow stronger.

Following his military service, Mayor Jackson armed himself with a focus on educational achievement. He attended classes at Cuyahoga Community College and in 1975, he graduated with a Bachelor's degree from Cleveland State University. In 1977, Mr. Jackson earned a Master's degree in Urban Studies from CSU. In 1983, after working his way through law school as a night clerk at Cleveland Municipal Clerk's Office, Mr. Jackson earned a law degree from the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. He worked as an assistant county prosecutor until his 1990 election to Cleveland City Council, representing Ward 5. For 15 years, Mayor Jackson focused his efforts on revitalizing the housing and commercial aspects of the Ward 5 community. He did so by forming vital bonds with neighborhood leaders and development organizations, and by setting a tone of integrity, diligence, commitment and cooperation among City Council members and City administrators—a vital relationship that remains strong today.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join us in honoring Frank G. Jackson, Mayor of the City of Cleveland, in recognition of his outstanding service and leadership focused on the people of the City of Cleveland. Mayor Jackson's integrity, energy, vision, unwavering service and complete devotion to his constituents continues to illuminate hope and strength throughout the streets of Ward 5 and throughout every Cleveland neighborhood—offering a

vision for a brighter tomorrow for every one of us along Ohio's north shores.

IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF  
GORDON PARKS

**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as St. Paul and our Nation say goodbye to a legend this month, I rise to lend my support to House Resolution 720, a resolution to honor the life of Gordon Roger Alexander Buchanan Parks. I hope that the House will soon consider this important resolution. Gordon Parks passed away on March 7, 2006 at the age of 93 after a courageous battle with cancer. With strong Minnesota ties, Mr. Parks became a world-famous photographer, filmmaker, and music composer. His work and life are an inspiration to artists and art lovers, and the people of St. Paul will be forever grateful for his contributions.

Mr. Gordon Parks will be remembered as an African American pioneer who used his experiences as a black man to create some of the 20th century's most powerful images for social justice. Mr. Parks was born in 1912, 1 of 15 children. He spent his young adulthood in St. Paul, where he developed his skills as an artist. Parks earned his first professional photojournalist jobs with the Saint Paul Recorder and the Minneapolis Spokesman, which served as catalysts for the great work by the beloved artist we recognize today.

Mr. Parks was a true pioneer. He was the first African American to work as a photojournalist for Life and Vogue magazines. As a trailblazing filmmaker, Mr. Parks was the first African American to write, score, and direct a Hollywood movie, "The Learning Tree." Mr. Parks was part of a generation of African Americans who directed and produced films that starred African Americans, like the film "Shaft." He was also committed to documenting poverty and racial injustice. Mr. Parks used the medium of film to tell the story of the black experience.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to Gordon Parks, an artist who taught us about human dignity and the African American experience. St. Paul will always remember him for his many artistic contributions.

CONGRATULING HIGHLAND HIGH  
SCHOOL

**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Highland School District for its nomination for the 2006 Rising Star Award presented by People Do Matter, which is part of the Pittsburgh Human Resources Association.

This award was given to the school district because they demonstrated a link between Professional Development, their people practices, and their students' test score results and achievements by using innovative and emerg-

ing practices. They are the only school district to ever receive this award.

The Highland School District will receive the "Rising Star" Award on April 5, 2006 at a dinner at the Rivers Club in Pittsburgh.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Highland School District for receiving the Rising Star Award. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute such a dedicated school district as the Highland School District.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING GENERAL  
LEON J. LAPORTE

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that General Leon J. LaPorte, Commander of the United Nations Command, Republic of Korea/United States Combined Forces and Commander of the United States Forces Korea, will soon be retiring after a long and distinguished career.

General LaPorte was born in Providence, Rhode Island, and graduated from the University of Rhode Island. He completed the Armor Officer Advanced Course in 1975 and he earned a Master's Degree in Administration from the University of California.

After General LaPorte was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of Armor, he served as a Platoon Leader and Motor Officer in Alpha Company, 3d Battalion, 64th Armor. In 1971, he served as a Platoon Commander and Company Executive Officer in the 283rd Aerial Weapons Company in the Republic of Vietnam. He commanded the 3d Battalion, 64th Armor, 3d Infantry Division in Schweinfur, Germany, and following the Army War College, he served as the G3, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. In October 1990, he deployed with the division to Southwest Asia and was Chief of Staff during Operations DESERT SHIELD and DESERT STORM. In 1997, he assumed the duties of Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Operation and Plans, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, DC. Prior to assuming his current position, General LaPorte served as Deputy Commanding General/Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Forces Command.

General LaPorte has earned numerous decorations and badges for his outstanding service in the military. These decorations and badges include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit (three oak leaf clusters), the Distinguished Flying Cross, a Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal (two oak leaf clusters), an Air Medal ("V" device), an Army Commendation Medal ("V" device), a Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry (with Palm), a Kuwait Liberation Medal, an Army Aviator Badge, a Parachutist Badge, and a Ranger Tab.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to General Leon J. LaPorte for his exceptional service to the United States and will wish him all the best in the days ahead.



HONORING ROSENDO CARRANCO

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rosendo Carranco, an upstanding citizen of Laredo, Texas, who was recently awarded the Spirit of Jerusalem Award by the state of Israel.

It is a great honor for me to enter into the RECORD the accomplishments of Mr. Carranco in tribute to his dedication to the business community, and numerous charitable works that have benefited the citizens of Laredo. After he graduated from Texas A&M University in 1977, he returned to Laredo to start his own accounting firm, Carranco & Lawson, where his wife, Mary, serves as partner. In addition to his work as an accountant, Mr. Carranco works as a real estate developer whose work includes the Cielito Lindo subdivision, and he is also involved in various business ventures that include insurance, oil, and gas. He and his wife, Mary are the proud parents of three children, Andrew, Kathryn, and Robert.

Mr. Carranco is well known in Laredo for his gregarious and outgoing demeanor as well as numerous contributions to community service. He is a beloved coach in the local youth basketball, football, and baseball teams as well as a highly active participant in the Boys and Girls Club, Young President's Organization, United Way, Junior Achievement, Laredo A&M Club, and Daybreak Rotary organizations. His exemplary compassion and his deep commitment to his faith make him a fine role model for young people in Laredo, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to honor Rosendo Carranco, recipient of the Spirit of Jerusalem Award by the state of Israel.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ANDREA  
MARIE PEREA**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Andrea Marie Perea, who is a two-time State Champion in the sport of Gymnastics.

At 12 years old, Andrea has achieved more in the sport of gymnastics than many athletes will accomplish in a lifetime. In the 2005 Nevada State Championships in Reno, Nevada, Andrea scored first place in 4 of the 5 events that she competed in, including uneven bars, balance beam, floor exercise, and best all around performance, leading her to win her first Nevada State Championship. She became a two-time title holder at the 2006 Nevada State Championships in Las Vegas, Nevada, where she took home first place on the vault, balance beam, and again received the title of best all around.

Andrea's athleticism does not stop with gymnastics. She takes ballet and belly dance lessons, and participates in a Fiesta Flamenca dance troupe. In addition to her athletic achievements, Andrea gives back to the Las Vegas community by volunteering with Salud en Accion, a program that provides outreach

to the Hispanic community on Medicare, Medicaid, and basic health services. Furthermore, Andrea acts as an altar server for the Guardian Angel Cathedral Catholic Church in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Andrea is committed to maintaining her public service, and would like to get more involved with events in her local Las Vegas community. A straight "A" student, she intends to maintain her grades while continuing to practice dance and violin in her spare time. She has set her sights on participating in the 2012 Olympic Games in London, and then taking her gold medal to West Point where she will study medicine, and eventually become a surgeon. With more young women like Andrea Marie Perea, who strive to meet their goals with great ambition and pride, I see a bright future for America.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to honor Andrea Marie Perea and her outstanding accomplishments. I wish her the best in her gymnastics career, as well as with all of her future endeavors.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT PENSION  
CONFEREES**HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, we need common sense, bipartisan legislation to protect pension benefits and to honor the promise of pensions.

I rise to support this motion to ensure the Senate provisions are included in the final Pension bill—especially the provision that ensures airlines like American, Continental, Delta, and Northwest are not forced to terminate pension plans. The Senate provision would provide the critical time needed to fund pension plans promised to employees.

No such provision exists in the House bill. Airlines were promised, in exchange for their support of the House Pension bill, that House leadership would work with them in conference to obtain the relief they wanted—though Republican leadership declined to include their provisions in the House bill. The Bush administration opposes the airline provisions.

We must help airlines avoid the termination of their pension plans. Timing is of the essence. Two of the airlines that would benefit from this provision are currently in bankruptcy and could terminate their pension plans. And, two others could take advantage of this relief.

In September 2005, Northwest Airlines filed for bankruptcy after losing more than \$4 billion since 2001. Northwest's pension plans are underfunded by \$3.8 billion. Without airline relief provisions, Northwest would be required to pay \$3.3 billion in pension funding obligations by 2007 and would likely need to abandon and turn over its pension plans to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. In January 2006, the pilots union agreed with Northwest to freeze the pilot pension plan and replace it with a defined contribution plan. I support the decision made by Northwest and their pilots.

Labor, employees, and airline management strongly support an airlines provision in the Pension bill.

Keep the airlines flying and employees working. Support this motion.

RECOGNIZING GREATER PITTS-  
BURGH CHAPTER OF NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN BUSI-  
NESS OWNERS**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the Greater Pittsburgh Chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners (NAWBO).

The National Association of Women Business Owners was established in Washington, DC in 1975. NAWBO is the only dues-based national organization that represents all women business owners in all industries. It's the voice of the American business woman. 10.1 million women-owned businesses are represented nationwide. Today there are over 80 chapters throughout the United States. The Pittsburgh Chapter of NAWBO was established in 1977 and since then has had the privilege of having two its members serve as national presidents. In 2000, Greater Pittsburgh Chapter of NAWBO was named the fastest growing Chapter in United States.

This year the Greater Pittsburgh Chapter of NAWBO has many Make the Connection Award Honorees. The honorees are: Pamela Abdalla of The Salvation Army Family Crisis Center; Bonnie Anton of the American Heart Association; Dr. Joseph Bairn of The Bradley Center; Aggie Brose of the Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group; Mary Jean Byrnes of Carlow University, Community Education; Beth Caldwell of the Incredible Mom Award; Bonnie DiCarlo of Celebrate and Share; JoAnn Forrester of Celebrate and Share; Shamina Frank of the Antioch Baptist Church; Suzanne Froehlich of the Power Lunch; Bonnie Hassan of A Place for Reiki; Dorothy M. Horvath of ACHIEVA; Tracy Lee Janov of the McKeesport Weed and Seed Program; Marleen Kasbee of the North Hills Community Outreach; Lillian T. King of the St. Cyril of Alexandria Church; Carol MacPhail of the United Way of Allegheny County; Maryann Magra of the Senator John Heinz Pittsburgh Regional History Center; Steve Miklas of Calliope, the Pittsburgh Folk Music Society; Susan Miller of WBN North Points North Chapter; Grace Moffett of POWER; Shaela Montague-Phillips of the Meeting of the Minds Publications; Anne Mullaney of Neighbors in the Strip; Martha Murdock of Care Break at Watson Institute; Susanne Parks of ACHIEVA-POWER; Rae Reynolds of UMOJA African Arts Company; Linda Rinchiuso of The Lighthouse; Phyllis Rinsma of Exceptional Friends; Beth Rom of ABOARD—Advisory Board on Autism: Related Services; Barbara Sallo of PowerLink; Sydney Schwartz-Hardiman of WBN North Points North Chapter; Steve Smith of Elliot West End Athletic Association; Mary Sutphen of POWER; Sandra Talley of Morningside Church of God in Christ; Lisa Vandemia of Care Break at Watson Institute; and Andrea M. Williams of the Children's Sickle Cell Foundation.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the honorees of the Make a Connection Award. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania

and a pleasure to salute such hardworking individuals like those in the National Association of Women Business Owners.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF  
GEORGE ODOM

**HON. MIKE ROSS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of George Odom, a long time resident of my hometown of Prescott, Arkansas who passed away at the age of 70 on February 15, 2006. George was born on August 23, 1935 in Heflin, Louisiana and I would like to recognize his life and achievements.

Raised in Minden, Louisiana, George attended Webster High School followed by service in the United States Army. Upon leaving the Army, he attended Grambling State University where he received a degree in Secondary Education.

Shortly after moving to Prescott in August 1964, George married Dorothy Jones. He led an exemplary life and was extremely active in many different capacities. At Prescott High School he assumed many roles including librarian, history teacher, track and football coach. Additionally, George was a member of the Lions Club, Director of Alcoholics Anonymous, Treasurer of the Youth Organization: Boys II Men, Girls II Women, Treasurer for Ila Upchurch Community Education Center, Prescott School Board Member and President and Director of Prescott Parks and Recreation Department. Following his retirement, George worked part-time at the Bank of Prescott.

George was also very active at Macedonia Baptist Church where he served as Chairman of the Deacon Board, Church Trustee, Church Treasurer, Sunday School Teacher and Superintendent.

Leading by example through a lifetime of dedication, community service, and commitment to children, George has left an undeniable mark on countless students who attended Prescott Schools and on the Nevada County community. Prescott is a better place, a more cohesive community because of George Odom and he will be deeply missed. My heart felt condolences are with his sons, Mario and Corwin; his daughters, Charra and Chandra; his sister Annie Mae Odom Knowles; and his six grandchildren. While George may no longer be with us, his spirit will live on forever in the lives he touched.

TRIBUTE TO LYN NOFZIGER

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a grassroots volunteer in the Reagan for President campaign of 1976, I saw firsthand the historic efforts of Lyn Nofziger who died Monday in Falls Church, Virginia.

Mr. Nofziger was crucial for the success of the Reagan Revolution which revitalized the American spirit by building an economy of hope through reducing taxes, by enhancing

our military for victory in the Cold War, and by growing the Republican Party to today's status of majority in the state legislatures, state governorships, the U.S. House, the U.S. Senate, and the Presidency.

His contributions for America were highlighted on March 29, 2006 in The Washington Times:

Few people played as a critical a behind-the-scenes role in the rise of Ronald Reagan and the modern American conservative movement as Lyn Nofziger, who died Monday at his home in Falls Church at 81. An Army ranger who lost fingers to shrapnel during the D-Day landing, Mr. Nofziger left a successful career in political reporting to become a top Reagan adviser.

As spokesman for Mr. Reagan's 1966 campaign for California governor, he was a trusted aide in 1968 when the California governor tried to wrest the Republican presidential nomination away from Richard Nixon. During the spring of 1968, Mr. Nofziger recounted many years later, Mr. Reagan visited Republican Sen. Strom Thurmond, who told the then-governor: "You'll be president some day, young man, but not this year."

Perhaps the most serious political challenge Mr. Nofziger would face during his many years as a senior Reagan aide came in March 1976, during the primaries. President Ford had swept all of the early primaries, and prominent Republicans were pressuring Mr. Reagan to drop out and endorse Mr. Ford. Mr. Nofziger, a stalwart conservative, would have none of it. As political consultant Craig Shirley told Ralph Hallow of The Washington Times: Mr. Nofziger "was the steel in Reagan's back that kept him going in 1976 when everyone else wanted him to drop out of the nomination race before the North Carolina primary."

After Mr. Reagan's election, Mr. Nofziger served slightly over a year as White House political director, before leaving the White House in 1982. He became a lobbyist, but instead of the conventional K Street uniform, he was usually seen with his shirt collar unbuttoned and tie loosened, chomping on a cigar and drinking a concoction of whiskey mixed with milk. The editor of this page, who was a young White House aide during the 1980s, recalls meeting Mr. Nofziger, who had left the government, for lunch. Mr. Nofziger grabbed his White House badge and twirled it, telling him that the same people who wouldn't return his calls before he joined the White House wouldn't return them after he left.

In his final years, Mr. Nofziger established his own blog, wrote poetry and became prolific as a book critic for this newspaper. In one case, Mr. Nofziger wrote a scathing review of a professor's book. The writer complained and Mr. Nofziger responded that he would have written a nicer review if the book hadn't been so bad. But Mr. Nofziger subsequently ended up befriending the professor and they established a friendly e-mail relationship.

Lyn Nofziger—journalist, gruff, cigar-chomping pol, trusted aide, and warm, kind-hearted man—will be missed.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL  
REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

**HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme dis-

appointment with S. 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. This bill purports to increase protections for libraries and people who have been issued National Security Letters and Section 215 intelligence orders, though in reality, it offers very little recourse for U.S. citizens.

I voted against the Patriot Act Reauthorization in July 2005, and the conference report in December 2005. Neither version of H.R. 3199 sufficiently balanced the needs of law enforcement to protect our country, with the protection of our civil liberties. In December, I stated my firm belief that it is possible to be safe, free, and to protect security while still respecting civil liberties. Unfortunately, H.R. 3199 did not recognize this reality, and neither does S. 2271.

The amendments that were added make it harder to challenge a Section 215 intelligence order than before. Currently, recipients may challenge the gag order immediately after receiving a Section 215 intelligence order. However, S. 2271 would make the recipient wait one year before having the opportunity to challenge the gag order.

I have expressed in the past my serious concern regarding the use of National Security Letters to access Internet records in public libraries. While this bill attempts to exempt libraries from receiving National Security Letters, it fails terribly. According to S. 2271, libraries are only exempt from National Security Letters if they do not offer Internet access—a preposterous claim in this day and age, and an unrealistic expectation. This exemption does nothing to protect public libraries, or their patrons, from having their privacy invaded by the Federal government, and I do not support this provision.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2271 does nothing regarding the Patriot Act to allay the concerns that Democrats and Republicans alike have regarding the protections of our civil liberties. It is disappointing that the Administration has chosen to embrace extreme measures in the name of fighting terrorism, over protecting the civil liberties we all cherish so much. These need not be mutually exclusive—we can fight terrorism, keep our country safe, and respect the rights and liberties that generations of Americans have fought so hard to uphold. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support these additional amendments and intend to vote against S. 2271.

CONGRATULATING ANDREA FREED

**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Andrea Freed for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program in New Castle, PA.

The Missionette Program is sponsored by First Assembly of God in New Castle, PA. It is a national program that is equivalent to the Girl Scout program, except the Missionette Program emphasizes Biblical themes. Andrea has achieved the highest award in the program which includes 27 units with each unit consisting of 4 lessons, a memory verse, activities, and a project. They are required to read the entire New Testament and nine

honor steps are to be completed which include intense memorization, and this all concludes with testing. This is not an easy achievement.

Andrea, a 5th grade student, will be honored May 7, 2006, at First Assembly of God for her outstanding accomplishment.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Andrea Freed for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute outstanding citizens such as Kayla.

#### TRIBUTE TO PAUL BEYKIRCH

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this means to congratulate and pay tribute to Paul Beykirch, who recently received the Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen Award. He has distinguished himself with dedicated service to the community of Sedalia, MO.

The Chamber of Commerce honored Mr. Beykirch for his values, community service, and involvement. Mr. Beykirch has been a member of the Bothwell Regional Health Center's Board of Trustees for the past 16 years and currently serves as its president. He is a former Rotary Club president and is currently the president of County Distributing Company Incorporated. Mr. Beykirch enjoys working with children as an assistant golf coach and as a Cub Scout Leader. I had previously honored Mr. Beykirch by nominating him to serve on the National Security Forum at America's Air War College.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Paul Beykirch and in wishing him luck in his future endeavors.

#### IN HONOR OF JUDGE MARCEL NOTZON

### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Marcel Notzon II, who has admirably served Laredo for the past twenty-three years as a United States Magistrate Judge for the Southern District of Texas. After such a long and distinguished career, Judge Notzon is retiring this month to spend time with his wife of forty-four years, Nora Lee, and his thirteen grandchildren.

It is a great honor for me to enter into the record the accomplishments of Judge Notzon in recognition of his legal career which has spanned over thirty-nine years, and extraordinary service to the federal judiciary. He served his country as a part of the United States Navy from 1956 to 1960, and was honorably discharged from his service. Following his discharge, he attended Laredo Junior College, and went on to complete law school at St. Mary's University, where he graduated first in his class.

Judge Notzon is well-known in Laredo for his compassion for people, including the defendants that come in front of him in the court. He has made great contributions to the community as well through his involvement with the Boys and Girls Club of Laredo, Little League, and other charities since 1974. Early in his legal career, he joined the Laredo Legal Aid Society, an organization that offers legal representation to those who otherwise could not afford it. It is his exemplary compassion, and his deep commitment to his faith that makes him such a great public servant to the community of Laredo.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to honor Judge Marcel Notzon II, who has left a lasting impact on the South Texas legal community, and the country at large.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO CHARLES "CHUCK" FULKERSON

### HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Charles W. "Chuck" Fulkerson, a retired U.S. Army Colonel, who will retire from the position of Executive Director of the Nevada Office of Veterans' Services, effective March 31, 2006.

Born in Idaho, he graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno in 1958, with a degree in Agriculture Economics. As a Distinguished Military Graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corp, he was commissioned as second lieutenant infantry in 1958. Chuck served in a wide variety of assignments in the U.S. Army until his retirement from military service in 1991. His active duty military career includes two combat tours in Vietnam as an Infantry Officer, assignments in Europe and a tour as the Assistant Professor of Military Science at the University of Nevada, Reno. After leaving active service, Chuck served with the Nevada Military Department. He was appointed by Governor Robert List as the Director of the State Selective Service from 1979 to 1985. Recalled to active duty by Governor Richard Bryan in 1985, Chuck concluded his military career as the United States Property and Fiscal Officer for the Nevada National Guard. He is a graduate of the National Defense University and his military decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal the Air Medal, the coveted Combat Infantry Badge and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with the Gold Star.

Under Chuck's leadership, the Nevada Office of Veterans Services realized significant achievements benefiting Nevada's veterans and their families. The State's Veterans Service Officer staff doubled in size, making it possible for more Nevada veterans to receive their VA benefits and recognition for their service than ever before. His leadership was also instrumental in securing \$9 million for the expansion of the State's two veterans' cemeteries; the Northern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Fernley and the Southern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Boulder City. Chuck's efforts made possible additional burial plots, columbariums, and new maintenance and administration buildings, greatly increasing the Cemeteries' ability to properly

honor those who served. Additionally, the State's Guardianship Program was expanded under his leadership, affording care to many more indigent veterans residing in the State of Nevada than ever before.

Of his many achievements during his tenure as the Executive Director of the Nevada Office of Veterans Service, Chuck is most proud of his efforts to bring skilled nursing services to Nevada veterans in need of long term care through the construction of the Nevada State Veterans Home in Boulder City. Prior to the opening of the State's Veterans Home, Nevada was one of very few states in the U.S. that did not have a state veterans home to care for veterans in need of 24-hour skilled nursing care. Chuck's leadership not only dramatically increased the State's offerings to Nevada veterans, but created a road map for future increases in services for veterans.

Chuck has been actively involved in veterans' issues throughout his career. He is a founder and officer of the Veterans Hospital Foundation in Reno and a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the U.S. Army Retired Officers Association. Active in the community, Chuck belongs to the Reno Sunrise Rotary Club where he has been designated a Paul Harris Fellow. He also serves on the Executive Board of the Nevada Area council of the Boy Scouts of America and is a guest lecturer at the UNR and UNLV military departments. Chuck is married to Mary Lee Metzker and has three children and five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Chuck Fulkerson on the floor of the House. He is a fine American and a true hero to those who have had the honor of knowing and serving with him. He has an unwavering spirit for the veterans of yesterday, today and tomorrow. I wish him the best in retirement.

#### NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT

### HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the National Food Uniformity Act (H.R. 4167) and in support of the right of every state to enforce their laws and protect the health of their citizens.

This legislation amends the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to create a national standard for food safety labeling. It seeks to achieve a national standard by overriding most state and local food safety warnings and by prohibiting new ones unless they are identical to national requirements.

If enacted, this legislation would not only compromise consumer safety with a "lowest-common denominator protection" but also seriously undermine state authority. Over two hundred state laws regarding food safety labeling would be superseded by the National Food Uniformity Act. The specter of such a wide-reaching federal measure has prompted thirty-nine state attorney generals to organize in opposition to legislation they say would "strip state governments of their ability to protect their residents through state laws and regulations relating to the safety of food and food packaging."

The attorney general in my state of Minnesota warns that the bill would eliminate alcohol labels on candy products that provide vital information to expectant mothers and nullify thirty years of work by tribal communities in Minnesota to create labeling standards for wild rice, the state's official grain.

The bill does include so-called flexibility provisions, which allow states to petition the Food and Drug Administration to restore current safety regulations. But the process is expected to be slow, expensive and uncertain, costing states \$400,000 per petition. The added federal costs for administering the process are an estimated \$100 million over five years. At a time when government agencies at all levels are struggling to cope with deep cuts in federal funding, these provisions create a frivolous and burdensome bureaucracy that serves only to restore state laws that already exist today.

Proponents of this bill say fears over consumer safety and local authority are unwarranted and overblown. But despite introduction in the past five Congresses, this legislation has never had a full hearing where testimony from experts could be heard and critical questions explored. This lack of transparency and due diligence is unconscionable considering the bill's potentially serious effects to public health.

I proudly stand with consumers, family farmers, physicians, environmentalists, state attorney generals, state agriculture department officials and many other consumer advocates in opposing the National Food Uniformity Act.

---

CONGRATULATING DESIRAE  
MONTGOMERY

**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Desirae Montgomery for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program in New Castle, PA.

The Missionette Program is sponsored by First Assembly of God in New Castle, PA. It is a national program that is equivalent to the Girl Scouts program, except the Missionette Program emphasizes Biblical themes. Desirae has achieved the highest award in the program which includes 27 units with each unit consisting of four lessons, a memory verse, activities, and a project. They are required to read the entire New Testament and nine honor steps are to be completed which include intense memorization, and this all concludes with testing. This is not an easy achievement.

Desirae, a fifth grade student, will be honored May 7, 2006 at First Assembly of God for her outstanding accomplishment.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Desirae Montgomery for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute an outstanding citizen such as Desirae.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF  
JACOB ANDREW "DOOLEY"  
WOMACK

**HON. MIKE ROSS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Jacob Andrew "Dooley" Womack of Camden, AR who died on February 16, 2006, at the age of 81.

Dooley was born in 1924 in Dallas County, AR. Upon graduating from Princeton High School, Dooley joined the Armed Services where he served with the 448th Bomb Group of the 8th Air Force during World War II. Dooley began a long and distinguished political career in 1950 at the age of 23 while he was a student at Henderson State Teachers College. As a Representative in the Arkansas State House of Representatives, he represented Dallas and Ouachita Counties. Following his tenure in the Arkansas State House, he served in the Arkansas State Senate for 12 years.

For more than a half century, Dooley owned and operated Womack Brothers Realty. Dooley was also involved in the First United Methodist Church of Camden, and enjoyed both hunting and fishing.

Camden, Ouachita County, and the State of Arkansas have lost one of its most ardent supporters. Dooley had a deep love for Camden and South Arkansas, and dedicated a lifetime working to make it a better place.

While Dooley may no longer be with us, his spirit and legacy will live on forever in the lives he touched. My deepest sympathies and heartfelt condolences go out to his beloved wife of 55 years, Amy; his three sons, Lance, Tim, and Carey; his daughter, Anna; and his grandchildren, Jacob, Wesley, Taylor, Joshua, Erin, Leah, and Diana.

---

TRIBUTE TO CASPAR WEINBERGER

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, America lost a statesman with the death of former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger on Tuesday in Bangor, Maine.

Secretary Weinberger was the architect of President Ronald Reagan's vision to establish Peace Through Strength leading to victory in the Cold War and liberation of millions of people across Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Asia.

I am glad to join President Bush's heartfelt praise:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE DEATH  
OF CASPAR WEINBERGER

Caspar Weinberger was an American statesman and a dedicated public servant. He wore the uniform in World War II, held elected office, and served in the cabinets of three Presidents. As Secretary of Defense for President Reagan, he worked to strengthen our military and win the Cold War. In all his years, this good man made many contributions to our Nation. America is grateful for Caspar Weinberger's lifetime of service. Laura and I send our condolences and prayers to the entire Weinberger family.

Another fitting tribute was in The Washington Times on March 29, 2006:

"Caspar Weinberger, who died yesterday, was a lifelong Anglophile who embraced Winston Churchill as 'one of my great heroes' for forlornly warning in the 1930s that Europe must re-arm against the German threat. Throughout his distinguished seven years of service as Ronald Reagan's defense secretary, Mr. Weinberger warned of 'some rather deadly parallels' in the threat from the Soviet Union.

While Britain and the rest of Europe effectively ignored Churchill's plaintive pleas, helping to set the stage for World War II, Americans responded to Mr. Reagan's warnings by electing him president. Mr. Weinberger, who earlier served in the Reagan gubernatorial administration during the 1960s, was promptly selected to be the architect of the largest American peacetime military build-up in history. That strategy culminated in American victory in the nearly five-decade-long Cold War.

Barely six weeks into Mr. Reagan's first presidential term, Mr. Weinberger delivered to Congress the administration's first defense budget, which: resurrected the B-1 bomber; greatly expanded the procurement of fighter aircraft for the Navy and Air Force; virtually doubled the purchase of sea-launched cruise missiles; significantly increased the production of tanks and other Army weapons systems; and reactivated World War II battleships as a first step toward building the fabled 600-ship Navy, which would eventually feature 12 aircraft-carrier battlegroups and dozens of the world's most powerful ballistic-missile-carrying submarines.

During Mr. Weinberger's tenure, America spent \$1.7 trillion on national defense (or \$3 trillion in today's dollars). By any fair-minded calculation, it was a bargain. Less than a month after Mr. Weinberger left the Pentagon in November 1987, the world witnessed the first fruits (many others would follow) of his seven-year tenure. On Dec. 8, 1987, Mr. Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev signed the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which required the destruction of about 425 single-warhead intermediate-range U.S. nuclear missiles based in Western Europe and 650 triple-warhead intermediate-range Soviet SS-20 nuclear missiles capable of striking Europe and Asia. Following steady Soviet deployment of SS-20s beginning in the 1970s, NATO began installing the U.S. missiles in Europe in late 1983. Self-styled peace groups on both sides of the Atlantic, including congressional Democrats who preferred the Soviets' self-serving nuclear-freeze offer, pilloried Mr. Weinberger and Mr. Reagan for the missile deployment in Europe. History has recorded who was right.

Known as "Cap the Knife" during his budget-cutting days in the Nixon administration, Mr. Weinberger became "Cap the Saber" in 1981, indispensably helping the president rattle the nation to the cause of its defense. When the Soviet Union imploded in 1991, it did so with a very able assist from Caspar Weinberger. Winston Churchill would have been very proud."

---

IN HONOR OF MARTIN J. SWEENEY

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, SHERRON BROWN, MARCY KAPTUR, TED STRICKLAND, TIM RYAN and I rise

today in tribute and recognition of City of Cleveland Council President Martin J. Sweeney, as he is being honored by the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party on March 26, 2006.

Councilman Sweeney was born and raised in Cleveland. After graduating from St. Ignatius High School, he enrolled at Cleveland State University, where he earned a Bachelor's degree in political science. A natural athlete, Councilman Sweeney was a member of the 1986 Cleveland State Basketball team that reached the "Sweet 16" in that year's NCAA tournaments. He also graduated from the Leadership Cleveland Class of 2004—an organization that unites community leaders from a myriad of fields and areas with a focus on improving the overall quality of life throughout the Cleveland community.

The residents of Ward 20 have entrusted Councilman Sweeney with the direction and well being of their neighborhood by voting him as their representative for four consecutive terms. Last December, Council Representatives also reflected their unwavering faith in his leadership by unanimously electing him as President of Cleveland City Council. Councilman Sweeney also serves the City as Chair of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join us in honor of Martin J. Sweeney, Ward 20 Cleveland Councilman and President of Cleveland City Council, as we join with the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party in recognition of his dedicated service and contribution focused on the residents of Ward 20. Councilman Sweeney's steady leadership and focus on uplifting the quality of life for his constituents serves to elevate the well being of our entire community.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF  
GEORGE BECKER

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of George Becker, former International President of the United Steelworkers of America, a former marine, steelworker, and noble and fine worker for labor who has helped to build a greater United Steelworkers of America throughout his membership.

Mr. Becker was raised in Granite City, Illinois as a second-generation Steelworker. Later he went to work at American City Steel in the summer of 1944.

In 1965, he was named as a USWA staff representative and came to the International headquarters in 1975. In the Safety and Health Department, he was instrumental in establishing some of the first national health standards adopted by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for workers exposed to lead, arsenic and other toxic substances.

Mr. Becker served as administrative assistant to Lynn Williams, after Williams became international secretary in 1977 and international president in 1983. Becker served two terms as international vice president for administration, having been elected to that position in 1985 and re-elected in 1989.

As vice president, Becker chaired the United Steelworkers of America's Aluminum Industry

Conference and guided the union's collective bargaining in the aluminum industry. He led major corporate campaigns, including the campaign against Ravenswood Aluminum Corporation that achieved the significant firing of 1,300 permanent scab replacement workers and the return to work of 1,600 steelworkers after a 20-month lockout.

In November 1993 he was elected United Steelworker's sixth international president and reelected in November 1997. George Becker's presidency was marked by many major achievements. He restructured the union efficiency and political strength. He led the successful merger of the United Rubber Workers into the USWA in July 1995. And in January 1997, he finalized the merger of the Aluminum, Brick and Glass Workers with the United Steelworkers of America.

He also worked as a crane operator at General Steel Castings, and as an assembler at Fisher Body. Becker became active in the United Steelworkers of America as a member of Local 4804 at Dow Chemical's aluminum rolling mill in Madison, Illinois. Working as an inspector in the mill, he was elected successively as a local treasurer, vice president and president.

Becker was a vocal advocate for the United Steelworkers of America in Washington, testifying before Congress and meeting with Congressional leaders and members of the Administration. On the world stage, he was an executive committee member of the International Metalworkers Federation and chairman of the world rubber council of the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers' Unions.

This man is truly one to be honored and emulated as a great president of the United Steelworkers and a representative of labor who worked tirelessly for workers everywhere.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of George Becker, whose dedication and hard work in representing workers everywhere has helped the growth of the United Steelworkers of America.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MOLLY  
GOODMAN

**HON. SANDER M. LEVIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Molly Goodman as she and her family commemorate the tenth anniversary of her victory against ovarian cancer.

Mrs. Goodman, like so many women stricken with this disease, never suspected that her abdominal and gastrointestinal pain concealed a Stage 3 ovarian cancer diagnosis. The cancer, which had spread from Mrs. Goodman's ovaries to parts of her abdomen, was discovered during a surgery to remove her gall bladder.

We can only imagine the worry that must accompany such a diagnosis. The five-year survival rate for Stage 1 ovarian cancer is approximately ninety percent. This figure drops, drastically and devastatingly, to a fifteen to twenty percent chance of survival once the cancer has elevated to Stage 3. Mrs. Goodman was fortunate not only to receive immediate surgery and chemotherapy to treat the

disease, but also to qualify for a limited protocol providing a second round of chemotherapy. No signs or symptoms of the cancer's recurrence have since appeared.

I commend Phil Goodman, Molly's husband, for using this ten-year milestone, one of joy and reflection, to contribute to the National Ovarian Cancer Coalition. By sharing Mrs. Goodman's story, the couple not only celebrates Mrs. Goodman's survival, but also raises awareness about the severity of ovarian cancer.

We here in Washington need to do our part to raise awareness about risk factors and early warning signs for ovarian and other gynecologic cancers. In this Congress and the last, I introduced Johanna's Law: The Gynecologic Cancer Education and Awareness Act, which would require the federal government to take action to increase early detection of gynecologic cancers and ensure that other women never have to go through what Molly Goodman did. Our bill currently has over 230 cosponsors, and we are doing everything we can to make it law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing Molly Goodman on this momentous occasion and to share in her hope that we continue to make progress in diagnosing and defeating this terrible disease.

CONGRATULATING KAYLA BARBER

**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Kayla Barber for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program in New Castle, Pennsylvania.

The Missionette Program is sponsored by First Assembly of God in New Castle, Pennsylvania. It is a national program that is equivalent to the Girl Scout program, except the Missionette Program emphasizes Biblical themes. Kayla has achieved the highest award in the program which includes twenty seven units with each unit consisting of four lessons, a memory verse, activities, and a project. They are required to read the entire New Testament and nine honor steps are to be completed which include intense memorization, and this all concludes with testing. This is not an easy achievement.

Kayla, a 5th grade student, will be honored May 7, 2006 at First Assembly of God for her outstanding accomplishment.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Kayla Barber for her outstanding accomplishments in the Missionette Program. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute such outstanding citizen such as Kayla.

HONORING BARRY PURVIS

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Barry Purvis, who was named the 2006

Pennsylvania High School Principal of the Year by the Pennsylvania Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals. Dr. Purvis has served diligently for 3 years as the principal of Chambersburg Area Senior High School.

Dr. Purvis has taken a pivotal role in changing the morale at Chambersburg Area Senior High School by improving the school atmosphere and reducing discipline problems. His vision for the school, which rests on a foundation of character-building, has vastly improved the success of Chambersburg Area Senior High School students. Regarded as a forward thinker, Dr. Purvis made major adjustments to the academic curriculum, resulting in the considerable rise of state testing scores and the graduation rate.

Prior to working as principal of Chambersburg Area Senior High School, Dr. Purvis served as principal of Chambersburg Area Middle School, which he led to earn the National Blue Ribbon School designation. He carried his success and experience over to the high school, overcoming significant challenges and earning an even more prestigious award. As the Pennsylvania High School Principal of the Year, Dr. Purvis will compete for the title of National High School Principal of the Year.

Dr. P., as he is endearingly known by his students, has made a great contribution to the betterment of our youth and will continue to enhance the education of many. The Chambersburg Area Senior High School faculty and student body are fortunate to have such a devoted leader. The citizens of Chambersburg and I would like to thank Dr. Purvis for his service and dedication to the education system and the community.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE  
HOUSE REGARDING RELIGIOUS  
PERSECUTION IN AFGHANISTAN

SPEECH OF

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 29, 2006*

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 736, a resolution to Condemn Afghan Attempts to Prosecute Converts. I share my colleagues' deep concern regarding the case of Mr. Abdul Rahman and the questions it raises regarding Afghanistan's commitment to religious freedom and human rights. I have sent a letter to Afghan President Hamid Karzai, and I submit it for the RECORD.

DEAR PRESIDENT KARZAI: I am writing to you concerning the case of Abdul Rahman, whose conversion to Christianity could have cost him his life under traditional Sharia law.

Along with many in the U.S. as well as in Britain, Germany, Italy, and Australia, I am relieved that Mr. Rahman will not be tried for exercising a right that is guaranteed to him by national and international law. I recognize that you face strong domestic opposition to this decision, but I urge the Afghan government to stand by it and to use this opportunity to demonstrate your Government's commitment to tolerance, the rule of law, and the democratic ideals that are just beginning to take root in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan's Constitution stipulates that Afghanistan shall abide by the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human

Rights, which states that "everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief." Additionally, although Afghanistan is an Islamic state, its Constitution expressly grants followers of other religions the right to freely exercise "their faith and perform their religious rites within the limits and the provisions of law." The case of Abdul Rahman highlights the need to define these limits.

Your steady and principled leadership during the uncertain post-war period earned you the admiration and trust of the citizens of Afghanistan, who chose you to defend their hard-won freedoms and rights as their first democratically-elected President. Similarly, the international community has supported your reform efforts and we congratulate you on the major social, political, economic and security improvements in Afghanistan since the defeat of the Taliban.

The strength and legitimacy of your democratically-elected Government will ultimately depend upon that government's ability and willingness to protect and promote the fundamental human rights of all Afghani citizens. While it may be permitted under Islamic Sharia law, the threatened execution of Mr. Rahman would have violated the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Afghan Constitution. We are grateful this man's life has been spared, and we hope that your government will take this opportunity to clarify the supremacy of Afghanistan's constitution within your country's legal framework.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP-  
PROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DE-  
FENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON  
TERROR, AND HURRICANE RE-  
COVERY, 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 16, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4939. Today, Congress continues its owe-as-you-go policy of borrowing and spending, burdening future generations of Americans with an additional \$92 billion in debt and at the same time embracing the Bush administration's disastrous war in Iraq. Giving this administration more borrowed money for billion dollar no-bid contracts without congressional oversight is irresponsible and a policy I can neither justify nor defend.

In a cynical maneuver, the Republican majority has linked nearly \$70 billion more for maintaining U.S. troops in the middle of an Iraqi civil war with the resources needed to assist Katrina's victims and the funds necessary to keep alive the victims of genocide in Sudan's Darfur region. I strongly support providing our fellow citizens of the gulf coast with the resources to rebuild their lives and their communities and increasing our commitment to bringing peace to Sudan. However, I cannot support an administration policy of consistently misleading the American people about the

unsustainable Federal budget deficits and the quagmire in Iraq.

It is an irresponsible budget gimmick to fund the war in Iraq through emergency spending. We are beginning the fourth year of war in Iraq. Clearly the Bush administration was aware that there would be funding needs and had the opportunity to account for those needs in the proposed budget. Instead, the entire cost of this war—over \$300 billion—is deferred to be paid for by future generations. Congress must have an honest debate about our increasing budget deficit and the implications of this debt on our country and our future.

Every American soldier and marine deserves our support, as well as a realistic and honest strategy for success from the Bush administration. They also deserve a White House and Congress with the courage to pay for this war today, not pass the cost on to the children and grandchildren of every American, including every veteran who has sacrificed so much in Iraq.

For the violence and murder to stop and the civil conflict in Iraq to end, it will require Iraqis, not Americans, willing to find solutions to bring security, stability and peace to their country. U.S. troops should never be in the position of being referees in a bloody civil war. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has no intention of drawing down U.S. troops anytime soon. The passage of this bill today will ensure, regrettably, that our troops will remain in Iraq for the foreseeable future.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BETHEL  
APOSTOLIC TEMPLE ON ITS FIF-  
TIETH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the Bethel Apostolic Temple on the occasion of its Golden Anniversary. On Saturday, April 1, 2006, the Reverend Carol Nash will lead her congregation, along with several guests, to celebrate this milestone at the Church's Humanitarian Awards Banquet to be held at the Miami Embassy Suites Hotel Grand Ballroom. This event will also honor two distinguished members of our community, former Congresswoman Carrie P. Meek, my mother, and the Reverend Dr. George E. McRae, my pastor and the pastor of Mt. Tabor Missionary Baptist Church.

Founded by the late Dr. Doris R.L. Atkins in January 9, 1956, this citadel of faith in Miami-Dade County has been an unerring witness to the spiritual revivalism that undergirds the power of fasting, faith and prayer. Dr. Atkins was the resilient leader of this church and an inspiration to a remarkable group of pastors, evangelists and bishops who are now ministering to a number of churches throughout South Florida. Dr. Michael Moss took over in 1988, and through his dynamic theological teaching and progressive preaching, Bethel Apostolic Temple experienced a period of tremendous growth. This visionary pastor led his congregation in 1997 to what has now become one of the landmark churches in South Florida.

Reverend Nash assumed the pastorate in 1998 from Dr. Moss, and under her leadership, its burgeoning membership has taken on

a tremendous renewal of faith and its outreach mission has gone above and beyond the confines of our community. With its vision of holistic empowerment, grounded in biblical principles, Bethel Apostolic Temple evokes a spirit of excellence grounded in compassion and charity not only to its members, but to all those who seek refuge and solace in its sanctuary.

With the establishment of the Bethel Temple Community Development Corporation, My Sister's Closet (a boutique for women and families going from Welfare to Work), along with the Bethel Computer Lab, the Bethel Institute for Living, Bethel Partners in Dominion, and its Youth Ministry Council, this faith institution has truly become not only an instrument of spiritual enrichment, but also a vehicle for economic development. It is in this context that I commend the tremendous work of Rev. Nash, and cherish the memory of Dr. Atkins and Dr. Moss who bequeathed to her a vibrant Church and an active congregation.

Through the longevity of its faith-action service, Bethel Apostolic Temple has truly persevered in showing us the Way and expounding for us the Truth that emanate from our knowledge of the Gospels. It is through this ministry that its role has been defined and is wisely articulated by the injunction that the genuine measure of our love for God is conditioned by our commitment " \* \* \* to the least of these."

Indeed, Rev. Nash's timely and inspiring leadership is genuinely admirable. As a servant of God and as a community leader, she has indeed earned our deepest respect and superlative commendation. This is the legacy of Bethel Apostolic Temple on its 50th Anniversary. Our entire community shares the joy of this occasion and extends best wishes for the future.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF  
WISCONSIN WOMEN'S HOCKEY

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Wisconsin women's hockey team, which on March 26 defeated the Gophers of the University of Minnesota 3-0 to claim the 2006 NCAA national championship. This is the first national championship won by the Badger women's hockey team, and in fact it is the first NCAA championship for any UW women's team since 1985. This also marks the first Division I women's hockey title won by a school outside the State of Minnesota.

The championship victory was a fitting end to an amazing year for the Badgers, which included a record 36 victories and a Patty Kazmeier National Player of the Year Award winner in junior forward Sara Bauer. The final game was also UW's fifth victory of the season in six games against the archrival Gophers, a team that had dominated the Badgers in years past.

For Badgers coach Mark Johnson, this accomplishment can stand beside his greatest as a player, including the 1977 NCAA men's championship and the "Miracle on Ice" 1980 Olympic gold medal. In each of his 4 years as

head coach, the Badgers have set a school record for victories, showing steady improvement on the way to this year's ultimate prize.

Coach Johnson's players, of course, deserve the bulk of the credit for their own success. And during this year's tournament, no Badger star shone brighter than goaltender Jessie Vetter. A freshman from Cottage Grove, Wisconsin, Jessie allowed one goal during three tournament games. Prior to this year, no goalie had ever recorded a shutout during the women's Frozen Four. Jessie earned two, in the semi-finals and the championship. It is no surprise, then, that she was named the tournament's Most Outstanding Player.

It is, however, not an individual honor but the accomplishment of a team that I wish most to recognize today. Some of the players joked after the game that they had now stolen away from their neighbors to the west the title of "the State of Hockey." Wisconsin couldn't be prouder.

CONGRATULATING FRANCES  
KOVALESKI UPON BEING NAMED  
"WOMAN OF THE YEAR" BY THE  
LACKAWANNA COUNTY FEDERATION  
OF DEMOCRATIC WOMEN

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Frances Kovaleski of Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania, who has been named "Woman of the Year" by the Lackawanna County Federation of Democratic Women.

Mrs. Kovaleski is a daughter of Marguerite Schmidt Roland and Francis Roland, of West Scranton. Her parents were active in Democratic Party politics and they impressed upon their daughter the political values they shared.

Even in high school, Frances volunteered to work in a Scranton mayoral campaign for former Democratic Mayor James J. Walsh.

Frances graduated from St. Patrick's High School in Scranton and went on to cosmetology school, after which she and a friend opened their own beauty salon.

Frances married Kenneth Kovaleski in 1971 and the couple had three sons. Several years ago, Mrs. Kovaleski worked on the campaign of Linda Munley, who was running for register of wills in Lackawanna County. Mrs. Munley won and appointed Mrs. Kovaleski to serve as her deputy.

Mrs. Kovaleski is also active in other civic endeavors. Besides serving as a member and treasurer in the Lackawanna County Federation of Democratic Women, Mrs. Kovaleski also works tirelessly for St. Joseph's Center, serving as president in 2005 and presidential advisor this year. She also served on its board of directors and many of the committees.

Mrs. Kovaleski served as president of the Society of Irish Women in 2004.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mrs. Kovaleski. Her devotion to Democratic causes and her commitment to family and community have touched the lives of many people in a positive manner and have improved the quality of life in Lackawanna County.

CONGRATULATING KIMMIE MEISSNER ON HER PERFORMANCE AT THE 2006 WORLD FIGURE SKATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kimmie Meissner, who on Saturday, March 25, won the gold medal in Ice Skating at the 2006 World Championships in Calgary, Alberta.

Kimmie was raised in Bel Air, Maryland, just a few miles from my home town of Baltimore. She began skating at age 6, and it was then that she began preparing for competition. With the help of coach Pam Gregory, Kimmie has trained at the University of Delaware Figure Skating Club since she was just 8 years old. In 2004, she won the State Farm Junior U.S. Championships. In 2005, she landed the bronze medal at the U.S. Championships and became just the second U.S. woman ever to land a triple axel.

Last February, Kimmie represented the United States at the Winter Olympics in Torino, placing sixth out of 24 competitors. Along with Sasha Cohen and Emily Hughes, she was part of the trio of Americans to finish in the top 10. Although it was her first Olympics, Kimmie performed beyond all expectations and was confident even in the company of her impressive competition.

On Saturday, however, Kimmie truly shone above all others. Her performance was simply amazing; it featured seven triple jumps, including the only two triple-triple combinations of the day. It earned her a personal best 129.7 points—more than enough to land her first place and win the admiration of thousands of fans. Although she entered the final program in third place, Kimmie did not let that discourage her. Instead, the Fallston High School student whose motto is, "Do what you enjoy; enjoy what you do," surprised everyone by winning the championship. In doing so, she became the first woman to win the World Championships in her first appearance since Oksana Baiul's victory in 1993.

Kimmie's performance was special—and I am certain that it will be remembered by her family, friends and fans for a long time. ESPN has called her victory "one of the biggest upsets in World Figure Skating Championships history." After the event, Kimmie remarked, "Standing on the podium and watching the flag . . . was such a proud moment for me." Mr. Speaker, I want Kimmie to know that she has also made Maryland and the United States proud, and I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her.

HONORING FORMER AIR FORCE  
CAPTAIN JOHN HAYES

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize former Air Force Captain John M. Hayes for receiving The Silver Beaver Award,

the highest award Boy Scouts Councils may grant to a volunteer. John is the Military and Veterans Affairs Liaison in my Irving, Texas, office.

John's devotion to the Boy Scouts of America through the years makes him well-deserving of this award. He is a District Commissioner in the Circle Ten Council and, with his wife, Mary, chaired the Circle Ten Council POW WOW for 2 years. He has also taught POW WOW at the Boy Scouts' Philmont, New Mexico, Training Center for 4 years.

A former Air Force combat pilot, he currently serves as the Senior Vice Commander of the Dallas Chapter of the Military Order of The World Wars. John is also very active in the Dallas Veterans Foundation. He will be a chairman for the Military Order of the World Wars sponsored Youth Leadership Conference in June in Fort Worth, Texas. The conference provides leadership and patriotic training for high school students.

I congratulate John on this high honor from the Boy Scouts. This country thanks him for his dedicated service—both in the military and with the Boy Scouts of America. The 24th District of Texas benefits from having a man with such valuable experience and strong allegiance to his country serve them in my congressional office.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

**HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my distinguished colleagues, Representatives EHLERS, BARTLETT, LEACH, FARR, CASTLE, and SHAYS, I am introducing legislation to reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which provides the U.S. with authority to manage fisheries in U.S. waters. Our bill would enact critical updates to our current national fishery policy management that will ensure sustainable fisheries well into the future. I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring H.R. 5051.

Both nationally and globally, our fishery resources are stretched to meet increasing demand—Americans alone now consume over 4 billion pounds of seafood annually. Fishery management has improved greatly since the enactment of the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996. Yet too often, we continue to experience overfishing and overcapacity—too many boats and too few fish—throughout our Nation's oceans—a situation that is not sustainable over time. In national policy, we must make the sustainable harvest of our living marine resources and the ecosystems on which they depend our highest priority.

I commend Chairman POMBO, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. YOUNG for their introduction of a comprehensive Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization bill, and I believe its close alignment with S. 2012 is a solid step forward in improving the health of our Nation's fisheries. However, I believe recent advances in marine science and a greater understanding of our complex ocean ecosystems can help shape an even stronger bill. Our bill proposes to move fisheries man-

agement in a positive step toward ecosystem management, incorporating our vastly increased scientific understanding of ocean ecosystems and the rapidly developing body of experience in this approach gained by the Regional Fishery Management Councils in projects around the Nation. It would require the administration to develop comprehensive guidelines, with the councils, to support the drafting of Fishery Ecosystem Plans. Science on ecosystems is very advanced, to the extent that over 200 scientists signed on to a scientific consensus statement on ecosystem management organized by the Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea (COMPASS) on March 21, 2005.

For stocks that are designated as overfished, our bill proposes to require overfishing to end by a date certain. Currently, and as a result of a ruling by a Federal district court which held that overfishing could occur during the rebuilding of the stock, overfishing is a continuing problem for stocks in many parts of the Nation. Out of 175 stocks in the Nation about which the status is known, 53 are overfished. Rebuilding time frames for some species have reached over 40 years in length, during which overfishing may continue under current law. However, the administration supports ending overfishing by a date certain, well within a time in which Regional Fishery Management Councils could act, so that rebuilding time frames become less contentious. The Pombo-Young-Frank bill extends the rebuilding time frame for fisheries from the current 10 year limit under a wide range of circumstances, but does not address overfishing at all. This approach takes us backward, not forward in ensuring sustainable use of our fisheries.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is very controversial, as my colleagues know. The Senate, in its Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization bill, requires the administration to work between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the White House Council on Environmental Quality to better integrate the process required by NEPA and the process required by Magnuson-Stevens for its Fishery Management Plan process. Given that the Resources Committee has held only one hearing on this issue, I believe this is the best approach. Providing the Secretary of NOAA with the authority to waive NEPA for Fishery Management Plans, as the Pombo-Young-Frank bill proposes, is too broad to capture potential pitfalls about which we are only beginning to understand.

Finally, the most important aspect of fishery management is the containment of annual harvest limits within boundaries that support sustainability of fishery stocks. The number of overfished stocks demonstrates our failure to achieve this important limit. The Senate has been engaged in a productive negotiation over this issue—how to establish accountability for the administration and the Councils and to support stronger science in setting and achieving such limits. The Pombo-Young-Frank bill does include many provisions to strengthen the state of fishery management science and the use of science in management decisions, but does not address the need to ensure that fisheries are not stretched beyond the scientifically established limits it provides. While I believe neither the House nor the Senate has achieved consensus on this issue, our bill includes such accountability.

It is our intention to constructively contribute to the coming debate in the House over national ocean fishery management by stressing policy to strengthen the conservation of ocean fish resources while supporting the extraordinary efforts of our administration and Regional Fishery Management Councils. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 5051 and join us in this critical policy debate.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DESIGN PIRACY PROHIBITION ACT

**HON. BOB GOODLATTE**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Design Piracy Prohibition Act.

Article I section 8 of our Constitution lays the framework for our Nation's copyright laws. It grants Congress the power to award inventors and creators, for limited amounts of time, exclusive rights to their inventions and works. The Founding Fathers realized that this type of incentive was crucial to ensure that America would become the world's leader in innovation and creativity. This truth is still applicable today. We must be sure to continue to reward our innovators with the exclusive rights to their works for limited periods of time. This incentive is still necessary to maintain America's position as the world leader in innovation.

Most industrialized nations provide legal protection for fashion designs. However, in the United States—the world's leader in innovation and creativity—fashion designs are not protected by traditional intellectual property protections. Copyrights are not granted to apparel because articles of clothing, which are both creative and functional, are considered "useful articles," as opposed to works of art. Design patents are intended to protect ornamental designs, but clothing rarely meets the criteria of patentability. Trademarks only protect brand names and logos, not the clothing itself, and the Supreme Court has refused to extend trade dress protection to apparel designs.

Thus, if a thief steals a creator's design, reproduces and sells that article of clothing, and attaches a fake label to the garment to market it, he would be violating Federal law. However under current law it is perfectly legal for that same thief to steal that same design, reproduce and sell the article of clothing if he does not attach a fake label to it. This loophole allows pirates to cash in on others' efforts and prevents designers in our country from reaping a fair return on their creative investments.

Furthermore, the production life cycle for fashion designs is very short. Once a particular design gains popularity through a fashion show or other event, a designer usually has only a limited number of months to effectively produce and market that original design. Further complicating this short-term cycle is the fact that once a design is made public, pirates can now virtually immediately offer an identical knock-off piece on the Internet for distribution. Again, under current law this theft is legal unless the thief also reproduces a label or trademark. Because these knock-offs are of such poor quality, these reproductions not only take away designer's profits, but also damage the designer's reputation.

Chapter 13 of the Copyright Act offers protection for the designs of vessel hulls. The Design Piracy Prohibition Act protects designers



by amending Chapter 13 of the Copyright Act to also include protections for fashion designs. Because the production life cycle for fashion designs is very short, this legislation similarly provides a tailored period of protection that suits the industry—3 years. This legislation further establishes damages for infringing a fashion design at the greater of \$250,000 or \$5 per copy.

As America's fashion design industry continues to grow, America's designers deserve and need the type of legal protections that are already available in other countries. The Design Piracy Prohibition Act establishes these protections, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DAVID  
WHETSTONE ON THE OCCASION  
OF HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. JO BONNER**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and real pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to a longtime friend and a lifetime public servant, John David Whetstone, on the occasion of his retirement after serving as Baldwin County District Attorney for nearly 22 years.

David Whetstone is the consummate professional. Joining the district attorney's office in 1979 as an assistant DA, David has dedicated practically all of his adult life fighting crime and standing up for the people of Baldwin County as the people's attorney. Moreover, he has served the families of Baldwin County and south Alabama with compassion, dedication and a tremendous level of professionalism.

A 1963 graduate of Greenville High School, David went on to serve in the United States Air Force during the Vietnam war era. He was honorably discharged as a sergeant in 1968, and he worked his way through college and law school using the G.I. Bill. David graduated from the University of West Florida in 1970, and from the University of Alabama School of Law in 1973.

In 1984, then-Governor George C. Wallace nominated David to the position of Baldwin County District Attorney. He was subsequently elected to his first 6-year term in 1986 and has been reelected ever since, usually with only token opposition.

Throughout his tenure, David has been a tireless advocate on behalf of all the people of Baldwin County. No one who ever called on David Whetstone didn't get a prompt, personal response.

David Whetstone is known for his powerful and intimidating presence in the courtroom and probably best known for his storytelling. Many will also remember his appearance on "The Phil Donahue Show" after filing more than 200 child support collection complaints in 1 day.

But outside of the spotlight that comes with his office, David has a heart as big as the State of Alabama and as pure as a pound of gold.

He is the type of person that empathizes with people from all walks of life and has a tremendous, caring capacity for those who are less fortunate. David Whetstone wore his title

as the "people's attorney" with pride and he never, ever let his own success in public life go to his head or prejudice his judgment; for David, doing the right thing was the only way to do business.

Mr. Speaker, in 2002, David offered his considerable talents and service to the people of south Alabama when he ran for the Republican nomination for U.S. Congress. While for obvious reasons I am personally grateful that the outcome turned out as it did, I can say with all honesty and candor that had the voters rendered a different judgment, the people of south Alabama would have been well-served by David's passion for public service and by his drive and determination to represent one and all equally.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing John David Whetstone for his tireless efforts and his tremendous contributions to the citizens of the First Congressional District and the entire State of Alabama.

The experience and enthusiasm he brought to his job and the concern and compassion he displayed for all people in Baldwin County are unquestioned and unparalleled. He has indeed been a genuine asset to the entire State of Alabama. On behalf of the thousands of men, women and children he has assisted over the past two decades, I am proud to say, "Thank you, David, for a job well done."

While I am confident David will continue to remain actively involved in the life of Baldwin County and southern Alabama for many years to come, I hope this new chapter in his life affords him a few more free minutes each day to enjoy the richness of life and the love of his wonderful wife, Lynne, as well as his fine children, Deborah, J.D. and Chris, and the newest Whetstone, grandson John David III.

On behalf of all his friends and admirers throughout Alabama, I wish to extend to David and his family all the best, now and in the future.

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL  
VISITOR CENTER ENFORCEMENT  
ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. JERRY WELLER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2006*

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, we owe our veterans a great debt of gratitude. Their sacrifices have protected the democratic ideals that are the foundation of our country, and their heroism continues to be an example for all Americans.

That is why I rise today to express my strong support of H.R. 4882, Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center Deadline Enforcement Act. This bill would ensure the proper remembrance of Vietnam veterans and the Vietnam War by designating a site for a visitor center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

I voted "no" by accident on this important bill yesterday, but strongly support it and intended to vote "yes."

Further, I praise Chairman POMBO for his leadership on this issue, and congratulate him on the overwhelming support he received yesterday on passage of the Act.

As this valuable bill has not passed the Senate yet, I encourage them to take it up as soon as possible and pass it without delay.

For the record, I have been a long time supporter of our Nation's veterans and will continue to support them in their causes and needs.

In fact, I have introduced legislation that would further honor them, H.R. 995, the Combat Military Medically Retired Veterans Act, which allows combat military medically retired veterans who received the Purple Heart to collect their prorated military retirement pay.

Many of these veterans served in the Vietnam War, and gave their all for us and should not be penalized just because they are receiving compensation from the VA. While many disabled veterans go on to enjoy happy, productive lives, many are unable to due to the severity of their wounds.

Under any doctrine of fairness it is our moral obligation to "care for him who shall have borne the battle." This bill is a good step in correcting the inequity of retirement and disability benefit to our combat disabled veterans.

Again, let me express my support for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center Deadline Enforcement Act and my gratitude for Chairman POMBO's leadership for our Nation's veterans.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN RED  
CROSS

**HON. JERRY MORAN**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as American Red Cross month. This faithful organization strives each day to carry out their motto, "There when you need us." On behalf of a grateful nation, I thank the Red Cross for their important service to those individuals in need.

This month we recognize the vital role played by this organization in communities across our Nation and abroad. Since its founding in 1881 by Clara Barton, this organization has been committed to serving America in peace and in war, during times of natural disaster and national calamity. In 1905, this organization was chartered by Congress "in accord with the military authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States and their armed forces." Since then, the Red Cross has provided communications and other humanitarian services to help members of the U.S. military and their families around the world.

Time and time again, from floods and tornadoes to diseases and terrorist attacks, the Red Cross has led the way in providing disaster relief in times of emergency. By offering clothing, food, shelter, health care, and mental health services, the Red Cross has extended a helping hand and provided comfort and encouragement to millions of people around the world.

The Red Cross is also highly regarded for their efforts in health and safety preparedness. In order to be effective in times of crisis, it is imperative to have adequate preparation. The Red Cross is instrumental in keeping the Nation's blood banks supplied, by organizing and conducting blood drives. The Red Cross has also taken the lead in providing CPR and First Aid training to countless volunteers. In times of trouble, these preparation efforts make all

the difference and embody the true spirit of the American people, which is to help out our fellow man in times of trouble.

In May, the American Red Cross will turn 125 years old. This organization, while having its roots firmly steeped in the past, is eagerly looking towards the future and overcoming the challenges that come our way. I have confidence they will succeed. The Red Cross is a vehicle for the common American to help their neighbor and that spirit will never fade. I commend the Red Cross for serving the United States and its international neighbors for 125 years.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavailable on the evening of Tuesday, March 28, 2006, and as a result, was not able to cast my vote on rollcall vote 69. The matter under consideration was passage of the Milk Regulatory Equity Act, S. 2120.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have recorded my vote on rollcall vote 69 as "yea" in support of passage for S. 2120, the Milk Regulatory Equity Act.

---

#### TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN SOLDIER

### HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a fallen soldier from the Ninth Congressional District of Florida. Army Sergeant Michael D. Rowe, from New Port Richey, Florida, was killed by a roadside bomb in Rutbah, Iraq. His death came just before his 24th birthday.

Michael's decision to join the military demonstrates his dedication and service to this nation. Following high school, our young people have many opportunities and wide open doors to pursue their dreams. Michael chose the path of the Army because he believed that it was his honor and duty to serve his nation and protect our freedom. In fact, he had told his mother that the Army would be his career and had re-enlisted for another four years of service shortly before he died. He did not choose this path because he thought that he would one day become a war hero or that this career would provide him a lucrative and extravagant life.

I know it has been a very hard and difficult time for Michael's family and friends, especially since Michael's wife, Rebecca, is expecting their first child in July. I hope they know that the nation thanks him for his service and we appreciate the sacrifices they had to make for us as well.

Let freedom ring where all can hear it and let Sergeant Michael Rowe's memory be eternal.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR ALFRED E. ALQUIST

### HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of former California State Senator Alfred E. Alquist. He is survived by his wife, State Senator Elaine White Alquist; son Alan Alquist; stepsons Peter and Bryan White; and five grandchildren.

Alfred Ernest Alquist was born in Memphis, Tennessee on August 2, 1908. He began his professional life as a railroad yardmaster and transportation supervisor, in which he dutifully served for 40 years. In his time with the railroad industry, Senator Alquist developed and cultivated a keen interest in transportation issues. With a passion for policy nested, Senator Alquist joined his local Democratic Club in San Jose, California, which proved to be a stepping stone for his political career.

Ever the dedicated citizen, Senator Alquist embarked on the campaign trail and was elected to the California State Assembly in 1962. After his years in the Assembly, Senator Alquist was elected to the State Senate in 1966 and became the first full-time Legislature that same year.

Senator Alquist's legislative legacy includes serving as Chair of the Senate's Budget Committee for 15 years. His concern for California's future earthquake preparedness led him to author landmark legislation that created the state's Seismic Safety Commission and the Energy Commission. Senator Alquist spearheaded a bill that established the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and was the pioneer in leading an almost two decade effort to build a state office in San Jose, California. When the building was completed in 1983, it was named in Mr. Alquist's honor.

Senator Alquist retired from the State Legislature in 1996. He was 88 years old when he ended his tenure and made history by becoming the State Senate's longest-serving member.

Senator Alfred Ernest Alquist passed away on Monday, March 27, 2006 at the age of 97.

I had the great pleasure of being Senator Alquist's seatmate while we served together in the Senate. Senator Alquist touched the lives of many people and his legacy will remain vivid for generations to come. His genuine concern and vision for the future have all made the state of California a much better place.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. DAN BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 59, 60, and 63, had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 44, 46, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, and 67, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GOSPEL MUSIC WEEK

### HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, beginning this weekend, more than 3,000 individuals will gather in my hometown of Nashville to celebrate one of the most exciting and fastest-growing segments of the music industry. While most people around the world think of Nashville—Music City—as the place to come to enjoy the best country and bluegrass music in the world, Nashville is also home to another powerful music force: the Gospel Music Association.

From April 1st through April 5th, Nashville will host Gospel Music Week. It is five days of concerts, worship services, performance showcases, educational seminars and exhibits, all culminating on Wednesday evening with the GMA Music Awards. Known as the Dove Awards, this year's ceremony will be held at the Grand Ole Opry House and hosted by Rebecca St. James and Kirk Franklin, both Grammy and Dove Award winners themselves. St. James and Franklin will also perform during the evening's program that will feature artists ranging from soulful gospel to guitar driven pop to powerful quartet harmonizing and more.

The sold-out event is a testimony to the popularity and power of gospel music today. Christian and gospel music sales have increased from \$381 million in 1995 to over \$700 million annually, an 80 percent increase over the last decade. Over 43.5 million units of Christian and gospel music CDs, cassettes, digital albums, and digital tracks were sold in 2005. That figure represents over 6 percent of all music sales in 2005 and ranks higher than Latin, Soundtracks, Jazz or Classical releases.

As John W. Styll, president of the Gospel Music Association has said, this growth in the Christian and gospel music isn't surprising. "The heart of gospel music may be in the lyrics, but the soul is in the passion with which these artists perform."

Clearly, the world is passionate about gospel music and the many outstanding artists who will appear in Nashville in the coming days. I salute each of these individuals, and the Gospel Music Association, as they prepare for the 37th Annual GMA Music Awards and Gospel Music Week and another year of inspiring performances that touch the hearts and souls of music lovers worldwide.

---

REGARDING RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY SEEKING DOCUMENTS CONCERNING WHITE HOUSE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL INFIRMITY OF S. 1932

### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I and a number of my colleagues are introducing legislation to investigate the White House's knowledge of the constitutional defects of S. 1932, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, at the time the President signed the bill into law.

On February 8, 2006, President Bush signed into law a version of S. 1932 that was different in substance from the version the U.S. House of Representatives passed on February 1, 2006. The House-passed version of the legislation required the Medicare program to lease "durable medical equipment," such as wheelchairs, for seniors and other beneficiaries for up to 36 months, while the version of the legislation signed by the President limited the duration of these leases to just 13 months. As the Congressional Budget Office reported, this seemingly small change from 36 months to 13 months has a disproportionately large budgetary impact, cutting Medicare outlays by \$2 billion over the next 5 years.

Under the U.S. Constitution, a bill cannot become law unless the same version is passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. It appears that the Republican congressional leadership knew that the process of enacting S. 1932 violated this principle. Now evidence is mounting that the President and his staff may have knowingly participated in this constitutionally infirm process.

As I wrote to former White House chief of staff Andrew Card on March 15, I have learned that the Speaker of the House advised the White House of the differences between the House-passed bill and the bill presented to the President before the President signed the legislation. This account was confirmed in a March 22 Wall Street Journal article, which reported that the Speaker's chief of staff "called a high ranking White House official" and "asked the Administration to delay proceedings until the problem could be addressed by the House and Senate." Nevertheless, the President signed S. 1932 into law without any action by the House and Senate to address the problem.

This information has serious constitutional implications. When the President took the oath of office, he swore to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." If the President signed S. 1932 knowing its constitutional infirmity, he would in effect be placing himself above the Constitution.

The President's decision to authorize the National Security Agency to conduct warrantless wiretaps despite Federal laws forbidding the practice has raised questions in the minds of many Americans about whether he considers himself bound by the laws enacted by Congress. The mounting evidence that the President signed the Reconciliation Act into law knowing that it differed from the legislation passed by Congress now raises the issue whether he considers himself bound by the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

Given the constitutional issues at stake, it is imperative that Congress exercise its oversight powers to examine what the President and his staff knew about the defects in S. 1932 and how they considered and acted on any such information. The resolution of inquiry I am introducing today would advance such a congressional inquiry by requesting that the White House provide Congress with all documents relating to information the White House received about the difference between the version of the bill the House passed on February 1 and the version the President signed on February 8.

#### BACKGROUND

Last fall, the House and Senate passed different versions of the Deficit Reduction Omni-

bus Reconciliation Act of 2005. During the House-Senate conference committee on the bill, a significant last-minute issue arose in the conference involving how long Medicare should pay for durable medical equipment, DME. Existing Medicare law provided for payments for DME by Medicare under a fee schedule for an unlimited period of time. In an effort to reduce Medicare spending, the conferees tentatively agreed to reduce the duration of Medicare payment to just 13 months.

This proposal, however, generated objections from a Senator and Representative from Ohio, where a major manufacturer of oxygen equipment is located. To accommodate their concerns, the conference report reduced the duration of Medicare payments for most DME to 13 months, but directed Medicare to continue to pay for oxygen equipment for 36 months. The final conference report was filed on December 19, 2005.

The House passed the conference report on S. 1932 on December 19, 2005, by a vote of 212-206.

The Senate considered the conference report on December 19, 20, and 21. During that consideration, several points of order were raised against the report and sustained as violating the congressional budget process. A motion was made to waive these points of order but that motion was defeated. The effect was to defeat the conference report in the Senate.

On December 21, the Senate passed S. 1932 with an amendment that reflected the contents of the conference report, minus the items that generated the points of order. The vote in the Senate was a tie, and Vice President CHENEY cast the deciding vote. This bill, as amended, was then sent back to the House for its concurrence.

In the process of transmitting the bill, as amended, back to the House, the Senate clerk made a significant substantive change to the legislation. This change extended the duration of Medicare payments for all DME to 36 months, the same time period provided in the Senate amendment for oxygen equipment. The Senate clerk realized the mistake, and the Republican House leadership was informed of the error in January, several weeks before final House floor action was scheduled to occur.

Such errors in formal messages between the houses are not unprecedented. They are recorded in the House precedents as having occurred as long ago as March 13, 1800, and as recently as July 12, 2005. They are typically handled by sending the legislation back to the Senate for the mistake to be corrected.

The response by the Republican leadership to the error in S. 1932, however, was without precedent. It constitutes a violation of the House Rules and of the Constitution itself.

Apparently concerned that any additional vote in the Senate could endanger passage of the legislation, the Republican leadership did not seek to correct the problem. Instead, the Republican leadership brought the legislation to the House floor on February 1 without revealing to the Democratic leadership or the body of the House that the 36-month period in the legislation before the House did not represent the legislation passed by the Senate.

On February 1, the House voted on the version of the bill, as amended, that contained the DME mistake. The vote was extremely close, 216 to 214. As a result of this vote, the

House and Senate had voted for different bills, the House having adopted a version that provided for 36 months for DME and the Senate having adopted a version that provided for 13 months.

Because the budget legislation originated in the Senate, the official version was returned to the Senate before being transmitted to the President for his signature. At this point, a Senate clerk made a second substantive change in the legislation, revising the House-passed text to reflect the original Senate-passed amendment. This change restored the 13-month period for coverage of DME other than oxygen equipment.

On February 7, the budget legislation was presented to the President. The documents transmitted to the President included an attestation by House Speaker DENNIS HASTERT and President pro tem of the Senate TED STEVENS that the legislation had been passed by both the Senate and the House.

On the morning of February 8, the White House Office of Management and Budget notified Republican congressional staff that the version of the legislation presented to the President was not the same as the version of the legislation passed by the House. This information was conveyed to the office of House Speaker HASTERT. The Speaker's chief of staff then called senior staff at the White House to advise the White House of this mistake and to request a delay in signing of the legislation.

The Wall Street Journal recently published an account of the communications between the Speaker's chief of staff and the White House. According to the Wall Street Journal, the Speaker's office "confirmed . . . that the Illinois Republican had asked the administration to delay proceedings until the problem could be addressed by the House and Senate." Indeed, the Wall Street Journal reported, "When the Speaker and Senate Majority Leader . . . went to the White House for the Feb. 8 ceremony, they expected only a 'mock ceremony'—not a real signing of the parchment that had been presented in error."

On the afternoon of February 8, despite the communications from the House Speaker, the President signed the bill. The version the President signed is the version that reflected the Senate-passed amendment, not the House-passed text.

#### THE NEED FOR THE RESOLUTION

Over 100 years ago, the Supreme Court addressed whether a bill could become law if the version signed by the President differed from the version passed by the House and Senate. In the case of *Field v. Clark*, 143 US 649 (1892), the Court held that the President could rely on the attestation of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate that the legislation before the President was the same as the legislation that passed the Congress. But the Court also recognized that the outcome would be different if there were a "deliberate conspiracy" to ignore the Constitution. As the Court wrote:

It is said that . . . it becomes possible for the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to impose upon the people as a law a bill that was never passed by Congress. But this possibility is too remote to be seriously considered in the present inquiry. It suggests a deliberate conspiracy to which the presiding officers, the committees on enrolled bills, and the clerks of the two houses must necessarily be parties, all acting with a common

purpose to defeat an expression of the popular will in the mode prescribed by the constitution.

It now appears that the possibility that a President would knowingly sign legislation that did not pass Congress is no longer "too remote to be seriously considered." In fact, this is exactly what appears to have happened when President Bush signed the Reconciliation Act.

To learn more about this matter, I wrote the President's chief of staff, Andrew Card, on March 15, seeking information on the President's knowledge of the bill's constitutional infirmity. When the Wall Street Journal reported on March 22 that Speaker HASTERT's office had informed the White House of the problems with the legislation, I joined Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI in sending a second letter to the White House. Unfortunately, there has been no White House response.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the resolution of inquiry I am introducing today. The American public deserves a detailed explanation of what went wrong with the enactment of S. 1932—and assurance that government leaders will not ignore basic constitutional requirements regarding the legislative process.

IN RECOGNITION OF RABBI DR. H.  
JOSEPH SIMCKES

**HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Rabbi Dr. H. Joseph Simckes, who has just retired after 29 years of service to the Hollis Hills Jewish Center.

As the spiritual leader of the Hollis Hills Jewish Center, Rabbi Simckes' dedication and compassion to our community has been unparalleled. I have had the great honor of knowing this intelligent, wise and kind-hearted individual, both on a personal level and as an advocate for the numerous important issues, and, particularly, support for the state of Israel, that we have worked on together.

Throughout his extraordinary career, Rabbi Simckes has been deeply and profoundly involved in the education of Jewish youth. His strong support of Jewish education was evident early in his career through his role in helping to found the first Solomon Schechter Day School in Boston. Rabbi Simckes has also led over 40 student-groups on tours throughout Israel. I have seen first hand the importance Rabbi Simckes places on education through the important work that he has done helping sculpt today's Jewish curriculum and the vast knowledge and rigor that he displays in his moving sermons. The wisdom he has shared both inside and outside of his congregation has improved and enriched the lives of thousands in the community.

Rabbi Simckes is also a trained therapist, whose compassion and guidance have comforted both old and young. Rabbi Simckes has been a pillar of strength throughout his tenure counseling, comforting, and sharing in the pain and joy of the whole community.

Rabbi Simckes has stood with the Queens Jewish Community during our most important life-cycle moments: births, bar-mitzvahs, wed-

dings, and, of course, deaths as well. Always warm, always accessible, Rabbi Simckes has guided our community as pastor and friend.

Our community has been blessed to have such a devoted and passionate leader. Though Rabbi Simckes will be missed his role as congressional rabbi, his spirit and convictions will remain as a permanent legacy for the community. The importance he placed on learning, and his deep devotion to the Jewish people and their faith, have inspired us all, and we look forward to his continued involvement in our lives.

To Chana Simckes, on behalf of the entire community, I want to thank you for sharing your husband to us so readily and for so long. Without your love and support neither he, nor we, could have made it so far, and for so long, together.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing my leader, my pastor, my guide, and my friend, Rabbi Dr. H. Joseph Simckes for his 29 years of service to the Hollis Hills Jewish Center. We send him our very best wishes in his years of well-earned retirement.

COMMENDING HAITI FOR HOLDING  
DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

SPEECH OF

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2006*

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of the Republic of Haiti for holding successful democratic elections on February 7, 2006. I would also like to congratulate their chosen successor, Mr. Rene Préval.

I commend the people of Haiti for their active commitment to and unbridled belief in democracy. On such an auspicious occasion, the best way we can honor the Republic of Haiti is by continuing to lend our support through economic and humanitarian policy that encourages development, not dependency.

While elections are the necessary first step towards democracy in Haiti, there still remains a long road ahead. It is crucial that we, the United States, do not continue to perpetuate the legacy of interference and neglect in Haitian affairs.

We must work with the newly elected President of the Republic of Haiti, Rene Préval, and we must work with Haitians in both Haiti and the U.S. to make their dreams of sustained democracy and prosperity a reality.

Several of my distinguished colleagues, myself included, have a significant number of Haitian constituents in our district. It is my sincerest hope that we will work to bring their home country out of the grips of poverty and despair once and for all so that Haiti's rich, yet tumultuous, past will finally evolve into a future of sustained success.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 16, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this opportunity to address this House to explain my vote on H.R. 4939, the Emergency War and Hurricane Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, which this chamber considered on March 16, 2006.

Despite my misgivings for the direction of our Iraq policy, I do not believe our troops, who are fighting so bravely, should be penalized for the mistakes in judgment of our civilian military leadership in the White House and the Pentagon. I also believe we need to continue our obligation to the people and states who fell victim to Hurricane Katrina. For these reasons, I supported the passage of H.R. 4929, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

The funds in this bill will enable our soldiers and marines on the ground to uparmor their vehicles. There should be more outrage from the American public that they were deployed without adequate equipment from the beginning. But they are there, and it is vital that they have the equipment necessary to protect themselves against attack. Moreover, more money is provided in this bill to help our troops detect and destroy improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

Although I disagree with the administration's conduct of the war, I do believe the one way we can bring our troops home sooner is to provide Iraqi security forces with the training and equipment they need to provide for the common defense of their own country and take the fight to the insurgency. Ultimately, the fate of their country will rise and fall on the Iraqis' ability to provide for their own security.

To further help our troops, the money in this bill will take care of the health care needs of their families and cover the projected shortfall in the defense health care account. It also honors the obligation Congress made last year to increase the military death gratuity to \$100,000 from \$12,000 and subsidized life insurance benefits that were increased to \$400,000 for the families of fallen loved ones.

The bill also helps needy families offset the high cost of heating fuel by providing an additional \$750 million for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). Finally, the bill honors what I feel is our country's obligation to help the Gulf Coast region by appropriating \$19.1 billion in disaster relief, community development and levee reconstruction monies.

These programs deserve our support. We cannot turn our backs to protecting

the safety and welfare of troops in harms way or ignore those who have gone homeless as a result of Hurricane Katrina. These people need our help and that is why I voted to support this emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

RETIREMENT OF JUANITA  
CONKLING

**HON. NICK J. RAHALL II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Juanita Conkling who, for the past 40 years, has served this esteemed body in the offices of the House Sergeant at Arms and the Chief Administrative Officer. In April of this year, Juanita will officially end her tenure working for this body and her contributions will be remembered for many years to come.

Juanita came to the House of Representatives on May 1, 1965, after working 1 year for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. She came to work initially for the House Sergeant at Arms and, most recently, has been the payroll/benefits administrator in the Office of Members' Services.

Much has changed in this body and on Capitol Hill in the 40 years Juanita has been here. Eight different Presidents, from Lyndon B. Johnson to George W. Bush, have given State of the Union addresses before Joint Sessions of Congress. Twenty Congresses have come and gone, along with countless Members and staff. All the while, Juanita has remained consistent, doing her job serving the Members of this body.

Juanita has had the responsibility of ensuring that the Members of Congress were paid on time each month. She has advised Members, new and old, on their ongoing options relative to their compensation and benefits. And she has been a friend to countless Members and their families.

I am proud to call myself a friend of Juanita Conkling. And on the occasion of her retirement after 40 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives I want to extend my deepest appreciation for her friendship and outstanding contributions to this body. May she have many wonderful and exciting years ahead fulfilling her retirement dreams.

IN TRIBUTE TO LORRAINE CARTER

**HON. GWEN MOORE**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a compassionate leader and true visionary from the Fourth Congressional District, Lorraine Carter. For over 35 years, Mrs. Carter has operated the VE Carter Child Development Center, and has served as forceful advocate for low-income children and their families.

Mrs. Carter came to Milwaukee from Nebraska in 1958, and worked as a special-education teacher before starting the VE Carter Child Development Center. Inspired by her

own upbringing, she strove to provide a loving, stable and supportive environment for the young children she encountered in Milwaukee. VE Carter Child Development Center, one of the first childcare centers owned and operated by an African-American woman in Milwaukee, has grown into a city institution, with five centers that serve almost 500 children and employ over 150 workers.

Mrs. Carter advocated for quality childcare for low-income children long before its connection to lifelong success was widely acknowledged. Her work with children has taken her deeply into the lives of the families she serves. She has a passion for working with single mothers, helping them develop stable home lives for their children and assisting them in identifying and overcoming obstacles to their own success. In addition to VE Carter Child Development Center, she also operates a social service agency that serves nonviolent offenders—many of them parents—assisting them with finding employment and supporting their families and communities.

Mrs. Carter's leadership extends throughout the State, not only as an accomplished and articulate childcare advocate, but also as an advocate of education more generally. She has served on the board of the Wisconsin Technical College System, working to ensure that education and skills development continue to be accessible to low-income parents, helping them move out of poverty and create a better life for their children.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons and many more, I am honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Mrs. Carter's numerous and profound contributions to the Fourth Congressional District. I thank her for her love of children, her commitment to their families, and her visionary leadership in Milwaukee.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND JOSE  
EUGENIO HOYOS

**HON. JAMES P. MORAN**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Jose Eugenio Hoyos, a distinguished member of our community who has dedicated his life to serving the less fortunate through his vocation in the Catholic Church.

The Rev. Hoyos began his commitment to exemplary community service over 20 years ago when he was ordained into the priesthood at the Cathedral of St. Pedro in Buga, Colombia. From there he continued his studies at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, IL, where he earned his master of divinity.

After completing his studies, he returned to Colombia where he became an associate pastor at the Parish of St. Juan De Avila in Bogotá and taught both philosophy and religion at nearby colleges. He remained in Colombia for several years until he was relocated to Northern Virginia where he is currently serving as director of the Spanish Apostolate for the Diocese of Arlington.

Since arriving in Northern Virginia 16 years ago, Rev. Hoyos has dedicated his life to serving the public community in many different ways. Beginning in 1992, Rev. Hoyos envisioned an organization with the purpose to re-

cruit and organize professionals to assist immigrants as well as the neediest people in the community. He founded Marcelino Pan Y Vino, Inc., a nonprofit organization that has earned worldwide recognition for its work with the National Institutes of Health in assisting those with leukemia, AIDS, cancer, and those in need of an organ transplant. Most recently, his organization raised \$25,000 for Katrina disaster relief in the gulf coast.

Rev. Hoyos is the founder of the radio program called "Catholic Newsletter" and the TV show called "Community and Religion Dose" a program of prayer and faith that is aimed at spreading a positive message to alcoholics, gang members, and the troubled youth. He is also a columnist for various local and international papers that reach the Hispanic community.

Not one to forget his roots, Rev. Hoyos founded and is president of Colombia Integra, an organization that gives Colombians, who have fled their native land, the tools needed to become active members of our society.

Over the years, Rev. Hoyos's deeds have not gone unnoticed by the community he cares so deeply about. He has been recognized as "Hispanic Man of the Year" by the staff of "Diario Nacion" a Washington, DC, newspaper. The Alexandria Police Department named him "True Community Hero." He has been selected as "Washingtonian of the Year" by the Washingtonian Magazine. Last, but not least, Rev. Hoyos was granted the honor to carry the Olympic torch from the Atlanta Olympics through the streets of Arlington.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Jose Eugenio Hoyos has been responsible for touching thousands of lives over the course of his career. He is truly a beacon of light putting his faith into action. For his dedication, the people of northern Virginia are genuinely grateful.

IN RECOGNITION OF RABBI DAVID  
WISE

**HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rabbi David Wise, who in August began his tenure as Rabbi of the Hollis Hills Jewish Center.

A native of Toronto, Ontario, Rabbi Wise grew up as an active member in the educational programs and youth groups of the Conservative movement. He continued his Judaic involvement at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, where he received a Masters degree and was ordained a Rabbi. Upon completion of his studies, Rabbi Wise began his rabbinical career at Temple Beth El in Somerset, New Jersey.

Rabbi Wise is tremendously dedicated to his congregation and the surrounding Jewish community. For years, he has worked to help congregants read Torah, haftarah, and to increase their skills as prayer leaders. Rabbi Wise is also active in the synagogue's educational programs, encouraging both children and adults in their exploration of Judaism. With an open door and welcoming smile, Rabbi Wise serves as a friend and mentor to any congregant seeking guidance, as well as

those who want to deepen their Jewish learning and commitment.

Rabbi Wise plays many roles in promoting the growth of a strong Jewish community and this involvement has been a staple of his career. During his years in New Jersey, Rabbi Wise taught rabbinic literature in the upper-school of the Solomon Schechter Day School of Raritan Valley. An active Zionist, Rabbi Wise also led the first ever Beth El congregational trip to Israel. As the vice president for special programming of the New Jersey Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbi Wise helped organize a spiritual retreat to the Princeton Theological Seminary after the High Holiday Season. Rabbi Wise was also a member of the steering committee for Jewish LIFE, a cooperative body of synagogues and Jewish institutions striving to bring adult learning to the community.

In addition to promoting Jewish education throughout New Jersey, Rabbi Wise has served on the boards of the Jewish Federation of Greater Middlesex County and Ramah Day Camp of Raritan Valley. Rabbi Wise also offered his services as a chaplain to the Franklin Township Police Department in New Jersey.

On behalf of the entire community, I am delighted to welcome Rabbi Wise, his wife, Judy Krinitz, and their two children, Jordana Nechama and Elijah Mordechai to our part of the Big Apple. We look forward to many years of his spiritual leadership as our pastor and our friend. Together, we will continue our efforts to make the Queens Jewish Community a place that our children and families are proud to call our home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House to join me in welcoming and honoring the new spiritual leader of the Hollis Hills Jewish Center, a man of humor, knowledge, and wisdom, Rabbi David Wise. We send him our very best wishes.

---

THE TRADE PREFERENCE  
EXTENSION AND EXPANSION ACT

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today Representative JEFFERSON, Representative MCDERMOTT and I are introducing the Trade Preference Extension and Expansion Act. There are three key aspects to this legislation.

First, the act would extend for 1 year the trade benefits provided to developing countries under the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences ("GSP") and the Andean Trade Preference Act ("ATPA"). Both of these programs currently are scheduled to expire at the end of 2006. Our trade preference programs are critical, not just to workers and businesses in developing countries, but to U.S. workers and businesses. It is important that we extend these programs immediately in order to provide our trading partners, as well as U.S. manufacturers and retailers, the predictability necessary to make business and investment decisions for the future.

I have heard some of my colleagues suggest that we should let these programs lapse in order to pressure our trading partners to agree to the demands of U.S. negotiators in ongoing bilateral and multilateral trade nego-

tiations. I agree with my colleagues that we should be seeking the best deals possible with each of our trading partners. However, I disagree with the notion that the United States should threaten all of our developing country trading partners, many of which are struggling to pull themselves out of poverty, with the elimination of current trade benefits in an ill-considered attempt to strengthen our hand at the negotiating table.

I do not mean to suggest, however, that our current trade preference programs should never be changed to reflect new realities in trade and the rules of the WTO. For that reason, the Trade Preference Extension and Expansion Act calls for only a 1 year extension of GSP and ATPA. It is important to evaluate how well these programs are working for workers and businesses both in the United States and developing countries—and to consider whether changes should be made to improve the programs. In fact, Representative MCDERMOTT, Representative JEFFERSON and I sent a letter to Chairman THOMAS today requesting that the Ways and Means Committee hold hearings as soon as possible to consider the future of GSP and ATPA, as well as the African Growth and Opportunity Act ("AGOA"). I believe it is important that the Congress and all interested stakeholders begin to investigate and consider this issue immediately, as it is likely that Congress will make changes to these programs next year in order to implement agreements negotiated as part of the Doha Development Agenda round of World Trade Organization negotiations.

The second key aspect of the Trade Preference Extension and Expansion Act is the extension and expansion of benefits provided to sub-Saharan Africa under AGOA. In the year since the expiration of global textile and apparel quotas, sub-Saharan Africa's exports to the United States of apparel fell by 16 percent, and the sector has lost as many as 100,000 jobs. Further, the textile and apparel industries in sub-Saharan Africa face many challenges beyond the elimination of global quotas, including competition from well-established and sometimes subsidized producers, such as China, and inadequate infrastructure and other supply-side constraints.

In recognition of these challenges, the Trade Preference Extension and Expansion Act would extend until December 2007, the current duty-free benefits provided under AGOA for apparel made in least developed African countries from third country fabric. If this benefit is not extended, it will be reduced in half on October 1 of this year, putting at risk the fledgling apparel industries that have provided vitally needed jobs and economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

The Act also would establish a simpler, value-added rule of origin for apparel and extend additional benefits to the textile and agricultural sectors under AGOA. These provisions are intended to enable the textile and apparel industries in sub-Saharan Africa to compete, given the current market reality in the region, which is that African textile mills cannot generally produce fabric in sufficient quantity and variety to meet the needs of African apparel producers or market demand. In addition, these provisions are intended to promote sustainable development in sub-Saharan Africa by promoting the diversification of the economies of countries in the region, particularly in the agricultural sector.

Representative MCDERMOTT, Representative JEFFERSON and I have put forward these ideas regarding the expansion of benefits for textile, apparel and agricultural products under AGOA as a way to start a discussion among other Members and stakeholders about the best way to promote sustainable economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa. We recognize that sub-Saharan Africa faces a wide variety of challenges and that there are potentially several different approaches that could be taken to promote the long-term health of the region. We look forward to working with our colleagues, interested parties in the private sector and civil society, and AGOA country governments to gather additional information about the best ways to address the challenges facing sub-Saharan Africa today, and we stand ready to work in Congress to ensure that the United States continues to play a leadership role in promoting economic development in the region.

The third key aspect of the Trade Preferences Extension and Expansion Act is a Sense of the Congress resolution calling on the President to make a determination as soon as possible regarding the extension of AGOA benefits to Liberia. The October 2005 elections in Liberia represented a key step in building peace in Liberia, following nearly two decades of civil war. Further, the election of Ms. Ellen Johnson Sirleaf as President of Liberia marks an important milestone for Africa, as President Johnson Sirleaf is the first elected female President in African history. President Johnson Sirleaf has laid out a multifaceted government agenda emphasizing security, public and private-sector led revitalization, good governance and anti-corruption efforts, regional and international cooperation, and political reconciliation and inclusiveness. President Sirleaf Johnson also has made the improvement of workers rights a high priority. In light of recent progress in Liberia and need to promote economic growth in the country, I believe it is important that the President extend AGOA benefits to Liberia as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join Representatives MCDERMOTT, JEFFERSON and me in supporting the Trade Preference Extension and Expansion Act.

---

THE COALITION FOR  
INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a Washington-based non-governmental organization—the Coalition for International Justice—will close its offices this week after 10 years of service to the cause of justice around the world.

Serving as Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission for that same period of time, I have worked closely with the Coalition and seen the effect of its work. Ten years ago, the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina was a priority in U.S. foreign policy, a conflict in which numerous war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide were committed. Many of us fought for the inclusion of basic justice as an element in our country's policy response, and an international tribunal was fortunately created for that purpose. At the time,

however, support was lukewarm at best; many saw efforts to apprehend and bring to justice those responsible for heinous crimes as too far-reaching, perhaps unachievable, and potentially detrimental to efforts to end the conflict through diplomacy.

The Coalition for International Justice was a tireless advocate of another view, one that saw no true peace, nor the resulting long-term stability, in Bosnia or anywhere else, without appropriate consideration of justice. Time has since shown how correct that view has been. Bosnia and Herzegovina has come a long way since the mid-1990s, in large part because those responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide were instead removed from positions of authority and made accountable at the tribunal located in The Hague. Many of those people might still be at large had the Coalition, among others, not advocated a tough policy toward those powers who were harboring and protecting them. Many of us can remember the State Department's hesitancy, let alone that of many European foreign ministries, to these tough measures. Today, however, the United States maintains an effective conditionality on assistance to Serbia and, along with the European Union, on Serbia's integration efforts due to the particular failure to transfer Ratko Mladic to The Hague. Similar linkages apply to another large indictee, Radovan Karadzic.

Representatives of the Coalition for International Justice participated in numerous briefings and hearings of the Helsinki Commission on this subject, and were always available to provide useful information when justice in the Balkans became part of our policy debates.

The Coalition similarly assisted the international criminal tribunal established for Rwanda in its efforts to be fair, responsible and effective in the provision of justice. Its mandate later expanded to help the investigation and prosecutions process in East Timor, to establish a tribunal for Khmer Rouge crimes in Cambodia, and to create a Special Court for Sierra Leone. It helped track the finance of such notorious figures as Charles Taylor, Saddam Hussein and the Khartoum elites, in addition to Slobodan Milosevic and Radovan Karadzic. Most recently, the Coalition has been part of the international effort not just to hold those responsible for the genocide in Darfur accountable from the crimes already committed but to protect the civilian population there from continuing to be victimized.

Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated the work of the Coalition for International Justice as a resource of accurate information, and as an advocate to a reasonable, practical approach to the sometimes controversial subject of international justice. While its board and staff may have concluded that the Coalition has largely accomplished the tasks it was created to address, they know, as do we, that horrible crimes continue to be committed against innocent people in conflicts around the world. I am confident that the dedicated individuals who made the Coalition such a success will continue, through other organizations and offices, in the struggle for international justice.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HEIGHTS  
PLAYERS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a talented and distinguished community theater group, the Heights Players, as they embark upon their 50th anniversary. It is an honor to represent the Heights Players in the House of Representatives and it behooves us to pay tribute to such an outstanding community organization that has brought the art of performance to adults and children throughout Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, the Heights Players were founded in 1956 by a small collection of theatre-lovers and successfully produced their first production, *Hasty Heart*, in February of 1957. The Heights Players eventually established themselves as a nonprofit educational corporation of New York, offering a workshop program and expanding the group to extend opportunities to new performers and directors.

For the past 50 years, the Heights Players have continued to assume an active role in the community by presenting performances for homeless groups, senior citizens and hospital-bound children. In 1962, the Heights Players moved to their current location at the historic 26 Willow Place in the basement of the Alfred T. White Community Center. The Heights Players, under their Board of Directors, continuously seek to enhance the quality of their performances, facilities, and organization.

The Heights Players now enjoy a large membership of 200 subscribers and a group mailing list of 2,500 supporters, including those from the Brooklyn Heights Community along with the tri-state area. The Heights Players also continue to provide special Theater for Children performances, traveling entertainment to Brooklyn hospitals, nursing homes, and Hale House in Manhattan, and special performances to nearly 1,000 homeless New Yorkers annually. They have been awarded for their ongoing laudable community efforts by Brooklyn Borough President Abe Stark, the Brooklyn Heights Association, the City Council, and Borough President Howard Golden, who designated April 4, 1987, as "Heights Players Day."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the achievements and committed service of the Heights Players as they continue to offer their artistic talents and performances for the benefit of the community.

Mr. Speaker, may our country continue to benefit from the actions of altruistic community leaders such as the Heights Players.

AFRICA'S LEADING LADY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, the first elected female president of Liberia, for her straightforward opinion that addresses jurisdictional control for prosecutorial legal action against

Charles Taylor, the accused butcher and mutilator of thousands of Africans during one of the deadliest and bloodiest regimes of modern day Liberia and four other African states.

I enter into the RECORD an article from the New York Daily News entitled "Africa's Leading Lady" which reveals that African women are coming to the fore, trying to right all of the wrongs put and held in place by a succession of brutal and corrupt African men. Emphasis is placed on the atrocities carried out by Taylor and his followers and mentions how Taylor's greed has "casually" reduced Liberia to a pauper state.

I personally believe that Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, also known as the "Iron Lady" for her determination and tenacity, is the very best person to lead Liberia from its dark, tormented past into a bright and productive future.

[From the New York Daily News, Mar. 30, 2006]

AFRICA'S LEADING LADY: PRESIDENT'S GUTSY MOVE VS. WARLORD TEACHES VALUABLE LESSON

(By Stanley Crouch)

When Charles Taylor, the ex-Liberian thug president, was arrested in Nigeria trying to escape the clutches of international law, he was in a car with 110-pound bags of embezzled money. Well, he was not traveling light.

Taylor had risen to power after seven years of civil war, had won an election with 75% of the vote and had casually reduced his country to a pauper state. He is accused of starting conflicts in four other African states and encouraging the chopping off of hands, feet, lips and noses in Sierra Leone so that the terrified population would not hinder the sale of stolen diamonds.

Taylor is one of those African butchers who could have modeled himself on King Leopold II, the 19th-century Belgian king. Leopold's colonial policies in the Congo resulted in countless slaughters and many mutilations in the interest of producing a profitable rubber crop.

Leopold became a pariah among European courts, but naturally black-faced variations in Africa have wielded iron-fisted power without compunction, worrying only about being overthrown by some ambitious fellow monster in the military. If given the time, these monsters have fled to another African country, or to the Arab states, or even to the French Riviera, where they have been able to cool out and impress everyone with their pilfered riches.

As the Taylor case has proven, that trend in African politics may be coming to a screeching halt. Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, the first elected female president in all of Africa, had requested that Nigeria hand over Taylor to the authorities in Sierra Leone, where he would have to face charges of individual butchery, mutilation and crimes against humanity.

African women are coming to the fore, trying to right all of the wrongs put and held in place by a succession of brutal and corrupt African men. African justice has been as porous as Swiss cheese for more than 40 years and the African people have suffered enormously while black Americans in or out of elected office, in or out of the civil rights establishment, have either ignored the horrors wrought upon the people or have figured out ways to blame it all on others.

The women of Africa are more interested in dealing with the facts than maintaining a cosmetic front of innocence. In a number of places across Africa, we see women rooting out corruption and conceiving laws that will bring them closer to a standard of human equality.

Interestingly, Oprah Winfrey, who keeps turning up, has been a model. Winfrey has inspired African women to rebel against rape and kidnap, to defy misogynistic laws and to face up to the ravages of AIDS.

It is both sobering and exciting to realize that American women, having been taught much by the civil rights movement, can inspire African women by example, and that elected or appointed African officials can lead the way through the ingrained ignorance, poverty and disease that block human fulfillment. Such human force explains the mystery of African optimism.

#### REMEMBERING HARRY PARRISH

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to remember Mr. Harry Parrish, member of the Virginia General Assembly and decorated World War II pilot from Manassas, VA, who passed away on March 28 at the age of 84.

Harry Parrish served over 50 years in elected office, including 13 terms in the House of Delegates and chairman of the Finance Committee since 2000, Manassas council member, and mayor. At the time of his passing, he was the oldest serving member of the House of Delegates. During his 12 years as town councilman and 18 years as mayor, Harry helped guide the transformation of Manassas from a small Virginia town to a thriving, lively suburb. As a member of the House of Delegates, he was known for conducting himself in a bipartisan manner, putting Virginia first. I was proud to call Harry my friend. He was a true Virginia gentleman.

Harry was also a decorated World War II pilot. As part of the British Royal Air Force he flew C-47s over the Himalayas delivering supplies, weapons and other cargo, from India to China. He received the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal for his valiant efforts. He served as a reservist in the Korean and Vietnam wars before retiring as a colonel.

I insert for the RECORD the Potomac News obituary from March 28. A northern Virginia native, Harry will be deeply missed by the people of Manassas, and at home by his family and wife, Mattie, of 62 years.

[From the Potomac News, Mar. 28, 2006]

HARRY PARRISH DIES AT 84

(By Bob Lewis)

RICHMOND, VA—Harry Parrish, who defied death as a decorated World War II pilot and headed the state's most powerful tax-writing panel in the General Assembly, died Tuesday. He was 84.

Parrish had been in intensive care at Prince William Hospital for about three weeks, suffering from pneumonia. His death was announced by Sen. John Chichester during a meeting of the Senate Finance Committee on Capitol Square.

Parrish had been in declining health for at least two years but continued a full legislative schedule, including acting as chairman of the House Finance Committee, one of the most powerful leadership positions in the General Assembly.

Last year, Parrish warded off a Republican primary challenge for his House seat—payback from his party's own conservative wing for defying its anti-tax orthodoxy during the 2004 tax battle.

Parrish, the House of Delegates' oldest member, was in his 13th term from Manassas.

He was born Feb. 19, 1922, in Fairfax County and moved as a child with his family to Manassas, then a small, rural town. He graduated from Osbourn High School in 1940 and later from Virginia Tech.

He joined the Army Air Force in 1942 and began pilot training in Alabama, but was assigned to the British Royal Air Force, where he completed his training.

He was part of an allied mission to fly lumbering transport planes laden with heavy supplies, weapons and ammunition from India into China over the world's highest mountain range, the Himalayas.

The C-47s like the one Parrish flew took off from crude, sometimes muddy airfields in the Indian jungles and struggled to heft their cargo over icy peaks that doomed many flights. Because Japan controlled land routes through Burma, the airlifts over what pilots called "the Hump" were the only way to supply the legendary Flying Tigers, which bombed Japan from bases in China.

Parrish received the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with two oak leaf clusters. He left active duty in 1946 but flew as an Air Force reservist in wars with Korea and Vietnam before retiring as a colonel and command pilot.

In 2002, as one of few remaining World War II veterans in the General Assembly, Parrish helped secure Virginia's \$334,000 contribution to the National World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C.

"I kind of regret us being the last state, but I'm glad we finally came around," Parrish said in an interview, pained that Virginia was the last state to contribute to the memorial.

Parrish was elected to the House in 1981 as part of an insignificant Republican minority. Before that, he served for 12 years on the Manassas Town Council and for 18 years as mayor. During his mayoral term, Manassas transformed from a town into a thriving, affluent city.

Through a total of 53 years in elected office, Parrish won abiding respect as a listener and problem solver from Republicans and Democrats. In 2000, when the GOP ended a century of Democratic dominance in the House, Parrish became co-chairman and later chairman of the Finance Committee, where his evenhandedness endeared him delegates and senators of both parties.

"He's my best friend," Democratic Sen. Charles J. Colgan of Prince William said in a 2004 interview. "He and I are the only Democrat and Republican in the General Assembly ever known to have held a fund raiser together."

Parrish was willing to exert his independence at times, even at the risk of his own party's wrath and his prized House leadership post.

By two votes, Parrish's committee in 2004 advanced a bill to increase taxes by about \$1.4 billion. When the bill came before the full House for a decisive vote that April, Parrish was among 17 Republicans who sided with House Democrats to pass it. The vote was critical to ending a 115-day session that divided GOP legislators.

In addition to his public duties, Parrish also is chairman of the board of his family's business, the Manassas Ice and Fuel Co.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS AMY DUERKSEN

### HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to mourn the loss and honor the life of PFC Amy Duerksen, who died the 11th day of March 2006 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Private Duerksen was no stranger to the United States Armed Forces. She was third-generation military. Her father is MAJ Douglas W. Duerksen, an Army chaplain at Aberdeen Proving Ground in Aberdeen, MD. Her grandfather, Wayne Duerksen, is a veteran of the Navy, having served in World War II. And her sister, April Duerksen, is also a member of the Army, stationed at Fort Sam Houston, Texas.

In April of last year, Amy joined the Fourth Combat Support Battalion, First Brigade, Fourth Infantry Division, based at Fort Hood, TX. Her unit was deployed on Christmas Day. On the eighth day of March 2006, Private Duerksen suffered injuries in a noncombat-related incident, and she was not able to recover from those injuries.

She is remembered as a dedicated soldier who greatly loved her country and faithfully served her fellow Americans by fighting for this great nation. Private Duerksen was full of passion and life. She possessed a strong faith and willingly shared that with others.

Private Duerksen risked her life to serve our country. She deserves our unending admiration and appreciation. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me in honoring the life of PFC Amy Duerksen. She was a remarkable soldier and patriot.

#### A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL J. CHAMBERS

### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Michael J. Chambers, and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the accomplishments of this outstanding member of the Brooklyn community.

Mr. Chambers joined the North Brooklyn Health Network in November 1998. As the senior associate executive director for the Department of Psychiatry, he is responsible for the operation of an extensive network of emergency, inpatient, and outpatient services to the residents of Bushwick, Bedford Stuyvesant, Fort Green, Williamsburg, and Greenpoint.

Prior to his service at the North Brooklyn Health Network, Mr. Chambers was the Administrator of the Department of Psychiatry at Jamaica Hospital Medical Center in Queens. He was also instrumental in the development of its new Department of Psychiatry. Before pursuing a career in hospital administration, Mr. Chambers had a distinguished 14-year career with the New York State Office of Mental Health, New York City Regional Office, where he served as director of certification for New York City. He is an associate in the American



College of Healthcare Executives and is president and CEO of Integrated Behavioral Systems, Inc., a behavioral healthcare consulting firm.

Additionally, Mr. Chambers is an adjunct faculty member of the Department of Human Services at Touro College and earned his bachelor of arts degree in psychology from the State University of New York at Albany and his masters of public administration degree from the Baruch College School of Business and Public Affairs. He is active in community affairs, particularly the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Babylon, NY.

Mr. Chambers lives on Long Island with his wife of 22 years, Peggy, and their four daughters Keri, Christine, Kimberly, and Meaghan. The Chambers family spent this past Thanksgiving at the Circle of Life Ministries in Copiague, NY, cooking and serving dinner to 600 individuals who would otherwise have had no place to celebrate the holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Michael J. Chambers, as he offers his talents for the betterment of our local communities.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY: AGAIN,  
RESIGN FOR THE SAKE OF YOUR  
COUNTRY

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce into the record an opinion piece by Eugene Robinson in the March 21, 2006, edition of *The Washington Post* entitled "The Planet of Unreality." Mr. Robinson opens his article by the statement: "This is not good." He is referring to the absolute detachment from reality evidenced by Vice President CHENEY most recently on the Sunday March 19, 2006, program "Face the Nation."

On "Face the Nation" Vice President CHENEY made the jaw-dropping statement that his earlier predictions about the war in Iraq including his infamous pre-invasion prediction that U.S. troops would be "greeted as liberators" and his more recent "the insurgency is in its last throes" were "basically accurate and reflect reality."

Let me second Mr. Robinson's statement: "This is not good." I can find nothing good about the lies, the deliberate effort made by the Vice President to connect the 9/11 attack to the war in Iraq, and the continued rosy pictures of the Iraq War the Vice President continues to make; statements that are unconnected to facts in any way. "This is not good."

The Vice President is either deliberately restating his opinions long-ago proved to be lies, or perhaps more frightening, he is now entirely in the grip of pathological self-delusion.

I believe the Vice President is continuing his lies and deceit with no care as to whether what he says is true, harmful to our country or deepens even more the profound distrust of the Bush Administration the American people have expressed. The Vice President hurts Americans in a variety of ways. This country, this shining democracy is being hurt, possibly, permanently, by just being the second in com-

mand and unaccountable to anyone in an unprecedented way. The fact that President George Bush does not fire him, hold him accountable, or contradict his false statements, creates the assumption on the part of the rest of the world that the U.S. is a rogue state with a Cheney-Bush regime bent on imposing its un-American policies of pre-emptive war, torture of prisoners, disregard of its Constitution and the will of its people. The statements and conduct of Vice President DICK CHENEY which can only be characterized as secretive, un-American and unconstitutional create the impression that the American people no longer care about their democracy. His conduct creates the impression that America is a dictatorship, or worse becoming a fascist state. The Vice President's intentional disregard of the Constitution, the Congress and the people of this great country sets the worst standard of conduct for the fledgling democracies the President states we must bring to every country in the world.

Mr. CHENEY's statements so contrary to the facts are far worse than merely confusing and dizzying; they are damaging and unmindful of the best interests of this country. Mr. CHENEY's reckless disregard for the truth is undermining the already low credibility and esteem in which our government is now held. When the Vice President undermines the credibility of our government he is also violating the Constitution of the United States which he is sworn to uphold.

It is no small thing for the Vice President of the United States to have the inglorious reputation of being the power behind the President's war conduct and treatment of prisoners, but to also be recognized as the American official who has most steadfastly insisted, contrary to the truth, that we went to war in Iraq because the attack of September 11, 2001 was carried out by terrorists trained, encouraged or given haven by Saddam Hussein.

I find the Vice President a source of deep embarrassment because of his persistent efforts on behalf of his agenda, his devotion to "the ends justify the means" mentality and his lack of acknowledgement of the deaths of 2,300 Americans, the wounding and maiming of 17,000 more and the tens of thousands of deaths and maiming of innocent Iraqi civilians.

It is clear to me that the Vice President should be removed from office if he does not have sufficient patriotism and good grace to resign for the good of the country. He is engaged in "business as usual" with no concern for how this "business" affects his country or the world.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 2006]

THE PLANET OF UNREALITY

(By Eugene Robinson)

This is not good. The people running this country sound convinced that reality is whatever they say it is. And if they've actually strayed into the realm of genuine self-delusion—if they actually believe the fantasies they're spinning about the bloody mess they've made in Iraq over the past three years—then things are even worse than I thought.

Here is reality: The Bush administration's handpicked interim Iraqi prime minister, Ayad Allawi, told the BBC on Sunday, "We are losing each day an average of 50 to 60 people throughout the country, if not more. If this is not civil war, then God knows what civil war is. Iraq is in the middle of a crisis. Maybe we have not reached the point of no

return yet, but we are moving towards this point. . . . We are in a terrible civil conflict now."

Here is self-delusion: Dick Cheney went on "Face the Nation" a few hours later and said he disagreed with Allawi—who, by the way, is a tad closer to the action than the quail-hunting veep. There's no civil war, Cheney insisted. Move along, nothing to see here, pay no attention to those suicide bombings and death-squad murders. As an aside, Cheney insisted that his earlier forays into the Twilight Zone—U.S. troops would be greeted as liberators, the insurgency is in its "last throes"—were "basically accurate and reflect reality."

Maybe on his home planet.

Donald Rumsfeld, meanwhile, was busy on *The Post's* op-ed page, abusing history. Leaving Iraq now, he wrote, "would be the modern equivalent of handing postwar Germany back to the Nazis." The bizarre analogy was immediately disputed by foreign policy sages Henry Kissinger (who noted that there was "no significant resistance movement" in Germany after World War II) and Zbigniew Brzezinski (who just called the comparison "absolutely crazy").

George W. Bush, who speaks as if he has ascended to an even higher plane of unreality, marked the third anniversary of the invasion Sunday by touting a "strategy that will lead to victory in Iraq." I know that "victory" is a word that focus groups love, but did anyone else hear an echo of Richard Nixon's "secret plan" to end the war in Vietnam? Does anyone else remember that there was no "secret plan"?

It's reprehensible when our highest elected officials act cynically, as I believe this administration has done—Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld and the rest knew the evidence for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq was less than conclusive, but they hyped it anyway to build support for an invasion they were determined to launch. It's dangerous when our leaders act cluelessly, and the Bush White House has done plenty of that as well—experts who called for a much bigger invasion force were silenced and shoved aside, assurances that Iraqi oil revenue would defray U.S. costs turned out to be a sick joke, and there was no effective plan to get the electricity turned on, much less deal with thousands of insurgents.

But cynicism and cluelessness are one thing. Actually being divorced from reality is another. Do Bush et al. really see only the democratic process they have installed in Iraq and not the bitter sectarian conflict that process has been unable to quell? Do they realize that whatever happens, there's not going to be a neat package, tied up with a bow, labeled "victory"—certainly in the 34 months (but who's counting?) that the Bush administration has left in office?

Rumsfeld, I think, gets it. "History is a bigger picture, and it takes some time and perspective to measure accurately," he wrote in his op-ed piece, the whole tone of which reminded me of Fidel Castro's famous declaration as he was being jailed after his first, failed attempt at revolution: "History will absolve me." Condoleezza Rice seems to get it, too, telling Australians the other day that "beyond my lifetime" people would appreciate what the administration had done for the Middle East.

But what about the two men at the top?

Cheney lamented this weekend that "what's newsworthy is the car bomb in Baghdad," and "not all the work that went on that day in 15 other provinces in terms of making progress towards rebuilding Iraq." Yesterday Bush recounted a successful anti-insurgent operation in one town, calling it a good-news story that people wouldn't see in their newspapers or on their television screens.

Fine, blaming the media is a time-honored tactic. I just hope they're being cynical about it. I hope they don't really believe the nonsense they're trying to sell.

CHARLES TAYLOR WILL NOW BE  
HELD ACCOUNTABLE

**HON. FRANK R. WOLF**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day for peace and justice in West Africa. Former president of Liberia, Charles Taylor, was arrested and sent to face trial at the Special Court for Sierra Leone. Charles Taylor will face 17 counts of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and violations of international humanitarian law for crimes committed against the people of Liberia and Sierra Leone. Charles Taylor committed horrific crimes during his presidency and his arrest will no doubt send shockwaves through Africa and a strong message that tyranny will not be accepted by the people and that you cannot escape justice.

I would like to commend Liberian President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf for her courage in calling on Nigeria to hand over Charles Taylor. She did this with no small risk to herself and her fragile country. It is my hope that the international community will come to Liberia's aid and help her as she rebuilds her war torn country.

This is a new dawn for West Africa. The United States and the international community stand with the people of Liberia and Sierra Leone and honor them for their courage to seek justice.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ELLIS A.  
MERCER

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Ellis A. Mercer and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the accomplishments of this outstanding member of the Brooklyn community.

Ellis A. Mercer was born on March 8, 1960 in Brooklyn, New York. He is the son of Mr. Mercer and Mamie Mercer, and the oldest sibling of Eva Maria Mercer-Andrews.

He received his education in the New York City public schools, graduating from Brooklyn Technical High School with a Regents Diploma in Mathematics and Electronics. Mr. Mercer then attended Johnson & Wales University in Providence, R.I., where he received an A.S. degree in Data Processing, A.S. degree in Accounting, and a B.S. degree in Computer Systems Management.

After receiving his A.S. degree in Data Processing, Mr. Mercer was hired as the University's Assistant Athletic Director. As the Assistant Athletic Director, he managed the University's Sports Complex and oversaw the University's Intramural Sports Program in which over 1,500 students participated. This is where his passion for youth involvement in education and sports began. In 1990 he returned to New

York and was hired as the City of New York Parks & Recreation's Brooklyn Sports Coordinator, where he coordinated and supervised various citywide programs, including Reebok's Coup de Hoop and the Junior Knicks Basketball clinics and tournaments. Mr. Mercer volunteered to recruit and coach the New York's National Youth Game Volleyball Team in Atlanta, GA. He implemented and supervised the Pro-Am NAACP's (3 on 3) and Midnight Basketball tournaments in Brooklyn. He also umpired softball games for the New York City Housing Authority. At the Brownsville Recreation Center he was employed as the After-school Director. After only three years as director, his program was recommended for use as the model program for all City of New York Parks & Recreation After-school programs. Mr. Mercer's program included extensive homework: help and tutoring that helped students sustain the academic standards set by the Board of Education. He also conducted workshops for SAT and ACT testing. He promoted local and overnight college and university tours, including tours to Howard University and Johnson & Wales University. Mr. Mercer also conducted free workshops for over 500 adult participants seeking postal employment.

Mr. Mercer is now a manager at the Jackie Robinson Recreation Center located in Harlem, New York. He also served as Chairman of the DC37, Local 299-2005 election committee.

As Worshipful Master of African 459 Lodge #63 for the past 2 years, Mr. Mercer continues to see that his lodge serves its community by sending 5 children to Camp Eureka in Upstate N.Y., issuing 3 scholarships to students enrolling in, or attending college, and continuing the lodge's annual feeding program and Christmas toy drive.

Mr. Mercer is a deacon at The Friendship Baptist Church. He also serves as the President of the Brotherhood Men's Committee at Friendship.

Mr. Mercer is married to Sandra Elaine Gibson-Mercer and they are the proud parents of one daughter, Britney Elise Mercer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Ellis A. Mercer, as he offers his talents for the betterment of our local and national communities.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. OLYMPIC  
CURLING TEAM

**HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the U.S. Olympic Curling Team for its outstanding success at the XX Winter Olympic Games in Turin, Italy.

By defeating Great Britain 8-6, the men's team, which consists of Shawn Rojeski and John Shuster of Chisholm, Minnesota, Joe Polo of Cass Lake, as well as fellow Minnesotans Pete Fenson, Scott Baird and Coach Bob Fenson, won the first Olympic medal of any kind for a curling team from the United States.

The women's team members, Courtney George of Duluth, along with Cassie Johnson, Jamie Johnson, Jessica Schultz, Maureen Brunt, and Coach Neil Doese, also dem-

onstrated great skill, determination and mental toughness during the competition in Turin.

Scottish immigrants introduced the sport of curling in North America, first to Canada in 1759 and then to America around 1832. Today, there are approximately 16,000 curlers who belong to 135 clubs in 32 states. Curling debuted as a medal sport at the 1998 Winter Olympics in Nagano, Japan. I know that the pursuit of excellence demonstrated by Team USA at the 2006 Olympic Games will inspire many people across the country to take up the sport.

Through hard work and outstanding dedication, the team succeeded on the sports world's most prestigious stage. Above all, the sportsmanship the team members demonstrated during the competition embraced the true Olympic spirit.

The curling team's bronze medal victory was truly a golden moment for the State of Minnesota and the entire nation. I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating the U.S. Curling Team and in wishing them continued success.

COMMEMORATING WOMEN'S  
HISTORY MONTH

**HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Women's History Month.

Since 1987, the month of March has been designated to give special prominence to the women who have made lasting contributions to our society.

Over the last two centuries, the achievements made by women have been nothing short of phenomenal.

During this month, we have an opportunity to recognize Rosa Parks for revolutionizing a successful movement that forced racial integration in America through her refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a public bus.

Additionally, we must acknowledge Coretta Scott King, the first Lady of the Civil Rights movement and widow of the incomparable Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who transformed her grief into an aspiration to eradicate social injustice and achieve equality for all.

We must also remember Hattie McDaniel, whose dynamic career as an acclaimed singer and actress on film, television, and radio led her to become the first African-American to win the Best Supporting Actress Academy Award in 1940. This great achievement also resulted in her becoming the 29th image to appear on the Black Heritage commemorative stamp series in January 2006.

Mr. Speaker, what makes these icons so extraordinary is that many of their actions, and sacrifices have not only added to the richness and depth of American history, but made the present better for the world.

Yet, even as we remember the famous women who have made history by traveling in space, like Mae Jemison and Sally K. Ride, or curing disease, like Marie Curie and Mary Eliza Mahoney or leading revolutions like Sojourner Truth or Alice Paul, we should also be mindful of those who have devoted their lives to the people of their communities, never seeking the spotlight of history.

Maryland Delegate Lena K. Lee, a master legislator, teacher, union leader, and a lawyer blazed a trail of distinguished public service and is one such extraordinary woman.

In 1967, Delegate Lena K. Lee began a 15-year term as the first African American female lawyer in the Maryland House of Delegates. During her tenure, she dedicated her energy and talents towards eradicating social inequalities and advocating for women's rights. Her life exemplified excellence and I am proud to say that The Lena K. Lee Post Office bill was signed into law on March 20, 2006 and a post-office in my district has officially been re-named after her.

In addition, several days ago, when I learned that Weptanomah Carter, the daughter, wife and mother of prominent ministers from my district, had died, I was reminded, once again, of just how much one determined woman can accomplish.

The spotlight of public acclaim did not fall upon Weptanomah Carter, but her achievements—as teacher, theologian, author and community-builder will forever forge a place in our hearts.

Throughout her marriage to Dr. Harold A. Carter, Sr., a friend and teacher of mine, the Carters worked together, and became a powerful team. In 1965, they brought an uplifting Gospel to the people of Baltimore—a message both spiritual and social that spoke to the hearts of people in our community.

Under their care, New Shiloh Baptist Church would grow into the 5,000-member choir for God that it has become today—a House of God that also is a social powerhouse for the betterment of its community.

Trained as an educator, she was also the driving force that created the Carter Children's Center. There, young people born into a neighborhood that others too often overlook, could receive food and clothing for their bodies, tutoring for their minds and a kind word that would uplift their souls. This manifestation of Mrs. Carter's love for the children in my District was her most compelling testament.

The church was at the center of Weptanomah Carter's life and she valued the importance of rebuilding individuals—one soul at a time. Yet, through four decades of service to the congregation and community she loved alongside her husband, she never ceased being her own woman.

This, I think, is why she and all of the other historic women are such compelling role models for the young women of today. Their lives teach all of us an important lesson—that we can achieve heights well beyond our initial expectations when we have the courage and determination to follow our true calling in life.

This is how—through service to others—that these inspiring women earned their own, honored place in history.

For their calling became a chronicle of devotion—to God, to their families and to America. I thank them and all of America's women, especially my dear Mother, who are the backbone of our nation and create their own untold histories every day.

A TRIBUTE TO CHERICE YVONNE JAMES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Cherice Yvonne James and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the accomplishments of this outstanding member of the community.

Cherice Yvonne James was born in Jamaica, Queens, NY and was very active as a youth. She attended Gloria Jackson's School of Dance from age 5 to 18 studying ballet, jazz, African and tap. She was a girl scout and a member of her school's volleyball and basketball teams. At the age of 9, Cherice joined the Prince Hall Shriner's, Abu-Bekr Court #74 Isiserettes Drill Team, where she rose up the ranks to eventually become team captain. She also represented Abu-Bekr Temple and Court by winning their "Miss AbuBekr" Talent and Scholarship pageant.

Cherice is a graduate of Jamaica High School's Gateway to Higher Learning Honors program. During high school, she received numerous awards including being named in the National Dean's List and being a winner of the NYC Board of Education's Queens borough-wide High School Desktop Publishing Contest. New Jerusalem Baptist of Jamaica, NY, recognized her during their graduates' banquet.

Cherice decided to pursue a career in hospitality and continued her education in Washington, DC at Howard University. During her college career, she was selected for the ultimate hospitality internship . . . Disney, where she spent a summer working and learning in Anaheim, CA. She received a Bachelor of Business Administration/Hospitality Management degree. After graduation, Cherice was chosen as a manager-in-training for the Grand Hyatt Washington, which led to her becoming a food and beverage manager.

She later joined the New York Marriott Marquis, Marriott's 2000 room, flagship hotel in Times Square. For the past eight years, Cherice has held various management positions in the company including the house-keeping and catering sales departments. Just this past September, she was promoted to Director of Services, at the newly constructed, Upper Eastside Courtyard by Marriott.

In her spare time, Cherice enjoys traveling, reading, television and real estate. She currently owns two properties and has aspirations of obtaining many more. She also enjoys talking to others about the possibilities and joys of home ownership. Cherice eventually plans to enjoy an early retirement due to real estate investment. She has volunteered for Habitat for Humanity, Aids Walk, NY Cares and coordinated clothing drives at work.

Cherice is thankful for the support of her family and friends, especially her mother, Phyllis Johnson, who has always supported her in all her endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Cherice Yvonne James as she offers her talents for the betterment of our local and national communities.

THE COALITION FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the fine, effective work of the Coalition for International Justice as that organization closes its offices this Friday.

Ten years ago, the world allowed genocide to occur in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Shocked by this fact, as well as the associated war crimes and crimes against humanity, many Americans both within government and among the public decided to take action. As scenes of the destruction were broadcast to homes across this country, support grew for holding those responsible for the senseless killing accountable. Some dedicated experts in the field of international justice formed the Coalition, often known as "CIJ", to help guide the development of the international tribunal established for that purpose.

While justice remains elusive, not just in the Balkans but elsewhere, the Coalition has been an indispensable part of the progress achieved in the last decade to hold more people accountable for horrible crimes, in Europe, Africa and elsewhere around the globe. The Coalition, in fact, argues not only for responding to crimes already committed but taking necessary actions to stop ongoing atrocities and to prevent future war crimes. This presents a challenge to the international community and its natural tendency to avoid taking bold and decisive action, and reflects the lessons learned from Rwanda that the international community cannot stand by as genocide occurs. I am extremely pleased that CIJ has taken a leadership role in galvanizing the international community to respond to the ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

As the Ranking member of the Helsinki Commission, most of my work with the Coalition for International Justice has been related to what is unfortunately the still unresolved issue of obtaining Serbia's full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), located in The Hague. Despite the democratic ouster of Slobodan Milosevic in late 2000 and his transfer to The Hague in 2001, Belgrade's cooperation with the tribunal has not been good. Despite Serbia's own need to break with a horrible past, and despite the obvious need for surviving victims and families to have some closure, Serbian officials have largely responded only when pressure is applied. Ratko Mladic and Radovan Karadzic, perhaps the two people most directly responsible for the slaughter of thousands of innocent people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, remain at large. It has been clear for some time that Mr. Mladic has been protected by the military. Serbia's future integration in Europe is placed at risk by this irresponsible behavior.

The Coalition for International Justice has been indispensable in tracking the developments of the tribunal, as well as following reports of where at-large indictees may be, as well as what access prosecutors have had to evidence and witnesses. The Coalition also has done excellent work in analyzing the work of the tribunal itself. This has been important.

International justice is a relatively new phenomenon, and things have not always developed smoothly. The Coalition has not been an apologist for ICTY or the other war crimes tribunals, and has brought attention to areas where improvement was needed. The Coalition should take great satisfaction that today, 10 years after genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the war crimes chamber of Bosnia's court system now has the ability to handle the emotional and controversial cases from that dark time.

The staff of the Coalition for International Justice has always been outstanding, and has provided critical assistance to myself, my personal staff, and the Helsinki Commission staff that work on these issues. CIJ staff have been more than willing and able to help those of us in Congress who have worked to ensure common concerns about international justice are appropriately reflected in U.S. foreign policy. Board members Mark Ellis, John Heffernan and Jim Hooper were involved from the earliest days, when few were certain justice would even be considered in diplomatic efforts to bring peace and stability to the Balkans. Staff past and present, including Edgar Chen, Stefanie Frease and Eric Witte, provided expertise not only on the work of the tribunals but also on the countries and conflicts the tribunals were created to address. I want to highlight in particular Nina Bang-Jessen, CIJ's Executive Director, who so effectively combined expertise and advocacy. She oversaw the Coalition as it broadened its focus to include not only the former Yugoslavia but Rwanda, Cambodia, Sierra Leone and today, Darfur.

Ongoing humanitarian catastrophes, Mr. Speaker, may frustrate us, but those who have worked at the Coalition for International Justice can take satisfaction knowing they did something about it and advanced the cause of international justice beyond where it otherwise would be. They have saved lives and brought war criminals to justice, and played a role in preventing future crimes against humanity. For that, we owe them our thanks and best wishes.

VA EXPERIENCE SHOWS BENEFIT  
OF GOVERNMENT ROLE IN  
HEALTHCARE

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one obstacle we have when we seek to address what is clearly the number one domestic problem in America today—a healthcare system that is both unduly expensive and provides too little coverage for many Americans—is the objection to what some people are quick to call “socialized medicine.” The notion that a government role in healthcare is somehow inimical to the delivery of decent healthcare has prevented rational debate on this subject from going forward. Paradoxically, as the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Jim Nicholson, recently noted in his speech at the Press Club, it is the healthcare delivery system in our country that is most completely a government operation that scores highest in consumer satisfaction. As Secretary Nicholson

noted in that speech, “For the sixth consecutive year, the American Customer Satisfaction Index reports that veterans are more satisfied with their health care than any other patients in America. VA outscored the private sector by a full 10 percentage points. And as you would expect, because of our first-rate care, veterans are now coming to us in ever greater numbers.”

Mr. Speaker, the point must be underlined: the most popular form of medical care with those who receive it according to Secretary Nicholson, speaking on behalf of the Bush Administration, is a form of medicine that is entirely government run. I find it odd that people who would denounce Medicare as a form of “socialized medicine” don't apply that dreaded epithet to the one major medical care delivery system in our country which is entirely run by the public sector—the medical care delivered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I ask that excerpts from Secretary Nicholson's speech be printed here because they are an absolutely irrefutable answer to those who claim that any increase in a government role in medical care will somehow cause deterioration in the quality of that care. The ability of some myths to survive reality is one of the most impressive and depressing features of the American political scene. But I hope that people reading Secretary Nicholson's remarks, and thinking about what they mean in the broader context, will refrain in the future from somehow arguing that an increase in a public sector role in medical care will necessarily lead to its deterioration. I join Secretary Nicholson as a Member of Congress in taking pride in the medical care we provide for our veterans. My only criticism is that we don't do it in even greater quantity—too many veterans are unable to get access to the system, and I believe that it is an area where more resources would allow us to do an even better job. But again to quote from Secretary Nicholson's speech, when the “NBC Nightly News . . . aired a story about VA healthcare, saying that it is the envy of healthcare administrators and a model for healthcare nationwide,” it ought to give pause to those who mindlessly repeat the assertion that quality medical care and a government role are incompatible.

The VA is, I think, truly one of America's good news stories. Following a decade-long healthcare transformation, the VA is now at the forefront of America's healthcare industry. And it's not just a proud secretary saying that, but a host of other organizations within and outside of the healthcare community saying that about us. For example, the Journal of American Medical Association has applauded the VA's dedication to patient safety. The Washington Monthly magazine a few months ago had a feature article calling VA health care, quote, “the best care anywhere.”

U.S. News and World Report described the VA as the home of top-notch health care in its annual best-hospitals issue. And since you're sitting down, I won't shock you unduly by telling you even The New York Times recently said that the VA is a model for our nation. And very recently, I think last week or the week before, on the NBC Nightly News was aired a story about VA healthcare, saying that it is the envy of healthcare administrators and a model for health care nationwide.

And we are a model of humanitarian service in our communities as well. Our VA employees come to the aid of their communities and their citizens—veterans and non-vet-

erans alike—in times of disasters and other emergencies. To make my point, I need only to mention the heroic effects and efforts of VA employees during Hurricane Katrina and Rita. Not only did our staffs evacuate several hundred patients out of our hospitals in the Gulf area to other hospitals without losing one, and not only did they do it quickly and efficiently, at great personal risk to themselves and at great personal sacrifice and loss. One nurse told me in Houston, where we relocated patients, that she for four days could see her house in New Orleans, and she could see only the roof and the chimney, but she went with her patients when we evacuated them, not even knowing the disposition of her own family.

And when it's all said and done, it's the millions of the men and women who we care for, though, who are our biggest supporters. For the sixth consecutive year, the American Customer Satisfaction Index reports that veterans are more satisfied with their health care than any other patients in America. VA outscored the private sector by a full 10 percentage points. And as you would expect, because of our first-rate care, veterans are now coming to us in ever greater numbers. Fully 7.7 million are now enrolled in our system.

This year VA doctors and nurses will treat over 5.3 million veterans at one of our 14 points of healthcare access. That's an increase of more than 1 million veterans coming to us since President Bush came to office. We expect this year that we will have 60 million patient encounters; that is, 60 million visits to our centers, clinics and hospitals. We have 154 major hospitals and over 900 clinics, and we dispense pharmaceutical prescriptions to over three—excuse me, over 230 million times.

We've achieved something that no other major integrated provider has ever yet been able to do, and that is that every one of these 7.7 million veterans enrolled in our system has an electronic medical record.

Time precludes me from telling you all of the advantages of safety and good medicine that that gives us, but let me mention anecdotally a couple of things.

One, a young man came through Ronald Reagan airport. He was a diabetic. His insulin was in his luggage, and they lost his luggage. And he called his father in South Carolina, panicking, and his father said, “Call the VA,” because he was a veteran.

He called our VA hospital here in north Washington. They said, “Get in a cab and come out here.” And by the time he got there, they had his medical record dialed up, knew his insulin regime, administered to him, gave him a supply and sent him on his way.

And during that relocation of hundreds of patients in Katrina, we were able in every case, after we got them resettled into another hospital, to dial up their medical record.

So electronic health records and their advantages to patient safety, for telemedicine, have put us at the forefront in health care delivery in this country, and we are very proud of that achievement. And I can say that because it didn't happen in the 14 months that I've been in the job. So I'm sitting on the shoulders of those who did make it happen. But it is a seminal achievement in health care.

Two weeks ago I announced the creation of another front of technological initiative at the VA, which has the potential for untold ramifications in health care, and that's the creation of a new Genomic Medicine Program Advisory Committee, which will be to help me establish policies for using genetic information to help improve the medical care of our veterans.

The VA's commitment to move into this realm of research, to advance our knowledge of the relationship of the genome to a host of physical and mental conditions relevant to veterans, is completely in keeping with the investigative nature of VA medicine. For 75 years our researchers and clinicians have been breaking exciting ground in virtually every aspect of medicine, with most of their work resulting in new and better ways to treat the myriad illnesses of our veterans. From Nobel Prize-winning researchers—and the VA's had three Nobel Prize winners—from Nobel Prize winners to the CAT scan to paperless records technologies, to kidney transplants, to microchip-drive prosthetics, to medical school partnerships that have trained more than half of our nation's physicians today, we are leading the world in our care for our veterans.

As I've outlined, we've done a great job so far. We are a world-class healthcare network when it comes to treating existing illnesses and disabilities. But then we ask ourselves, what if we knew how to identify the earliest possible signs of a veteran's predisposition to a particular disease? What if we knew in advance how a veteran would react to a particular drug therapy? What if we could reasonably forecast the risks a particular veteran might face with respect to some forms of cancer? What if, summing up, we could move from providing medicine that is preventative to medicine that is predictive?

With the advent of the Genomic Medicine Advisory Committee, we are positioning the VA to take a new journey, a truly great journey along the DNA trail. It is a path still not well lighted. There are so many questions of ethics and privacy that we are not going to proceed down that trail without first assessing the risks and benefits to our veterans. But we know from past experience that once we determine that a VA program is in the best interest of our veterans, we move forward with all the resources we can muster.

And when VA health care is on the move, we change the nation's healthcare landscape for the better. As medical practice incorporates the advances of science, we must harness VA's triple mission of health care, research and training to bring these advances to the veterans we serve.

I'm confident our new push down the genomic road will benefit not only our veterans, but the larger national health care community as a whole, as so much of our other research has done, such as the development of the CAT scan and the pacemaker and the first liver transplant done at the VA.

A TRIBUTE TO PARTHENIA HOLLIDAY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Parthenia R. Holliday and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the accomplishments of this outstanding member of the community.

Parthenia R. Holliday was born in Philadelphia, PA.

Her childhood years were like so many others filled with challenges, crossroads and hur-

dles that seemed uncrossable. At the tender age of 16 she knew her life long dream and desire was the wonderful art of singing. Her father and other sibling also were musically inclined and played instruments and sang, and so it was in her blood to sing and sing she did.

Ms. Holliday sang all over the world from Budapest, Hungary, Russia, Africa, and most recently in 2005 in London, England. She has also performed with Alvin Slaughter and others.

Ms. Holliday sang in many establishments in New York City and New Jersey. Unfortunately, Ms. Holliday found herself entangled in substances that were not healthy, or helpful for her continued growth and high self-esteem. Ms. Holliday's life took a wonderful change in her early 20s, hearing the promises of God, she accepted Jesus Christ as her lord and savior. The word of deliverance was preached unto her and after many trials and errors, the chains that bound her were broken and the broken pieces of her life were put back together again. Nothing became more important to Ms. Holliday than to do the will of Him who called her out of darkness to the marvelous light.

Ms. Holliday combined the fields of dentistry and elder care for a lifetime of caring and sharing. However, she believes her greatest gift is fundraising. Ms. Holliday received a certificate for great community services from the Honorable State Senator John L. Sampson for her accomplishments at the Bible Speaks Church and Christian School of Brooklyn, NY.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Parthenia R. Holliday as she offers her talents for the betterment of our local and national communities.

HONORING MR. CALVIN BELLAMY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to honor Mr. Calvin Bellamy on the occasion of his retirement as chief executive officer of Bank Calumet, where he has served the people of Northwest Indiana over the past 24 years. Throughout his time leading Bank Calumet, Mr. Bellamy has done much to improve the quality of life for everyone in Northwest Indiana. He has been an exemplary community leader as well as a successful business man, and I am proud to call him a friend.

Under Mr. Bellamy, Bank Calumet has become a crucial component for economic development in the region, with branches serving both Indiana and Illinois. Today, Bank Calumet operates in 29 locations with over 400 employees. Bank Calumet has become one of the largest locally owned bank and holding companies in Northwest Indiana with over \$1 billion in total assets. Bank Calumet has been named "one of America's best banks" by all three national rating services under Mr. Bellamy's leadership. These incredible accomplishments reflect the drive, passion, and commitment Cal Bellamy has shown to creating a world-class financial institution that invests in the communities it serves.

Cal Bellamy's contributions to the economy of Northwest Indiana are only eclipsed by his personal dedication to our community. Cal has been called on to lend his expertise and leadership to several important organizations in Northwest Indiana. Mr. Bellamy serves as chairman of the Purdue Technology Center Advisory Board, where he is involved with the center's activities to attract high-tech jobs to Northwest Indiana. He is also chairman of the Northwest Indiana Forum, the Education Committee of the Lakeshore Chamber of Commerce, the Ethics In Government Taskforce of the Lake County Community Development Committee, and cochair of Meals on Wheels of Northwest Indiana Capital Campaign.

Mr. Bellamy also serves on the Board of Directors of many organizations committed to improving the quality of life in Northwest Indiana, including the First District Pro Bono Committee, which provides legal services for low-income individuals, the Urban League of Northwest Indiana, Lake County Workforce Development, the Calumet Council Boy Scouts of America, the Northwest Indiana Minority Business Opportunity Committee, and the Northwest Indiana World Trade Council. Cal Bellamy also commits his time to educational causes throughout the area, serving as the founding director of the Hammond Education Foundation, on the Board of Advisors for Indiana University Northwest, and on the Chancellor's Council for Purdue University Calumet. Without a doubt, Mr. Bellamy has given his time and energy graciously to make Northwest Indiana a better place for future generations.

Mr. Bellamy received his B.A. with highest distinction from Indiana University, his law degree from the University of Michigan, and is a graduate of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking at the University of Delaware. I wish him and his wife, Cathy, the best of luck as they approach the exciting next steps of their life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending Cal Bellamy for his outstanding contributions to the community of Northwest Indiana. His commitment to improving the quality of life for the people of the First Congressional District of Indiana is truly inspirational and should be recognized and commended. Over the years, I have sought out Cal to seek his assistance on matters affecting Northwest Indiana. I have always found him to be trustworthy and deliberate in our conversations. As John Quincy Adams said, "If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more, you are a leader." Cal Bellamy has been a great leader for Northwest Indiana.

IN TRIBUTE TO BRAYTON WILBUR

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Brayton Wilbur, Jr., a great San Franciscan and a dear friend. One of our great civic leaders, he made immeasurable contributions to our most treasured institutions. Mr. Wilbur passed away on March 24 after a lifetime of service to the arts, the business

community, his family, and the city he called home.

A native San Franciscan, he was born on October 2, 1935, and was a graduate of Yale University and Stanford Business School. He joined his family's firm, Wilbur-Ellis Co., in 1963, becoming its president and CEO in 1988 and chairman of the Board of Directors in 2000 after overseeing an extraordinary era of expansion. He served as a director of several San Francisco institutions, including Safeway Stores and the Chronicle Publishing Company.

Through his enthusiasm for the arts, Mr. Wilbur eloquently expressed his love for San Francisco. He served as a director of the San Francisco Opera, a trustee of the Asian Art Museum, and as the 15th president of the San Francisco Symphony, presiding over the inauguration of our beloved Davies Symphony Hall in 1980.

I offer my deepest sympathy to Judy, his beloved wife of 43 years, his children, Michael, Jennifer, Edward and Claire, his mother Dita, and his sisters Lolita and Mary. As they have lost a loved one, so the city of San Francisco has lost one of its most distinguished sons.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAPA EMERGENCY WOMEN'S SERVICES

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Napa Emergency Women's Services, commonly known as NEWS, of Napa, California, as it celebrates its 25th anniversary.

Since its inception, NEWS has played a vital role in protecting and assisting women and children throughout the Napa Valley who are the victims of domestic violence. A group of concerned citizens took the initiative to address the growing problem of domestic violence and created an emergency hotline in 1979. With the dedication, leadership, and compassion of these individuals, NEWS came to fruition on October 5, 1981.

NEWS is the only organization in the Napa Valley dedicated to helping women and children lead lives free of violence. Over the past 25 years, NEWS has grown and expanded to provide numerous services to people throughout Napa County, including emergency shelter, counseling, legal advocacy, and education outreach programs. All of these services play an important role in providing women and children with the guidance and support necessary to help them overcome the physical and psychological damage caused by domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, the lifeblood of this organization is its devoted staff and volunteers who work day and night to ensure that women and children always have a safe place to seek shelter. These hardworking individuals have changed the lives of thousands of women and children in Napa County.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we take this time to thank and honor Napa Emergency Women's Services for its immeasurable service to Napa County. I congratulate NEWS on

their 25th Anniversary and wish them well as they continue their work to improve the lives of all Napa citizens.

A TRIBUTE TO LUTHER M. WRIGHT

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Luther M. Wright, and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the impressive accomplishments of this outstanding member of the community.

Luther M. Wright was born on June 2, 1942 in Louisa, Virginia, and he currently resides in Laurelton, New York.

Mr. Wright received his early education in New York City at P.S. 140. He graduated from Andrew Jackson High School and attended Queens College of the City University of New York from 1974–1977. He also attended the United States Coast Guard Engineer Program and received his license as a Chief Marine Engineer.

Mr. Wright served in the New York City Fire Department for 15 years as a Chief Engineer, retiring with 27 years of service. He served in the United States Army from 1964–1966 in active duty, as a reservist from 1969–1995 and participated in Desert Storm in 1991. Mr. Wright retired from the Army as a Master Sergeant. He is also a member of the Vulcan Society of the New York City Fire Department and Past President and Captain of the 231st Block Association.

Among his many community service projects, Mr. Wright was initiated into Tuscan Lodge No. 58 F&AM (PH) in 1978. He was elected to Worshipful Master of Tuscan Lodge No. 58 in 1986; Secretary of Tuscan Lodge No. 58 in 1987–present; Excellent High Priest of Mount Moriah Chapter No. 3 Holy Royal Arch Masons in June 2003; Ill. Commander in Chief of Long Island Consistory No. 61 AASR (PHA) in 2002 and 2003; Ill. Potentate of Abu-Bekr Temple No. 91 AEONMS (PHA) in 1994; and appointed Deputy of the Oasis for Abu-Bekr No. 91 in 2002, by Imperial Potentate William F. Crockett.

Additional leadership posts include: District Deputy Grand Master for the Second Masonic District from June 2001–2002; Worthy Patron in Fidelity Chapter No. 54 OES (PHA); District Deputy Grand Commander for the Second District; District Deputy Thrice Illustrious Master for the Royal & Select Masters and Assistant Recorder for the Grand Commandery Knights Templar State of New York.

Through these organizations, Mr. Wright has distributed toys and clothing to the needy children of East New York and Kings County Hospital, fed the homeless, and sponsored young children to attend Camp Eureka during the summers of 2002 and 2003.

Luther Wright is a member of the Good News Baptist Church of Hollis Queens, New York. He has been married to the beautiful Phyllis A. Wright for the past 34 years, and they have three grown children, all 4-year college graduates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Luther Wright as he offers his talents

for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Luther Wright's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

HONORING AUDREY YVONNE WILLSON, WHOSE LIFE JOURNEY LED HER TO BECOME YVE-I RASTAFARI

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Audrey Yvonne Willson, whose spiritual evolution led to her being known at the end of her life as Yve-I Rastafari. Yve-I was a beloved mother, wife, grandmother, friend, artist, educator and leader in our community and our world. She passed away on March 13, 2006 at the age of 63.

Born Audrey Yvonne Willson, she grew up in the Fort Greene Projects of Brooklyn, New York, where she developed the quick wit and savvy nature for which she was known throughout her life. Living in New York, she met and married Bob Law in 1962. During that period, she became an active member of the Congress for Racial Equality, and was at the forefront of the Black Cultural/Consciousness movement, identifying strongly with her African heritage as an activist of that era and throughout her life.

In the decade that followed, Audrey began a new journey, moving to Silver Spring, Maryland and obtaining her Masters Degree in Education as well as her Montessori certification. These achievements began her lifelong devotion to the education and healthy development of children, which included her own young daughters, and ultimately led Audrey to create her own educational model.

Audrey's journey of intellectual, cultural and spiritual discovery soon led her to West Africa, where she immediately fell in love with the people, their land, and their struggles. Her proficiency in the Spanish, Twi, Amharic and Arabic languages allowed her to be a teacher and a student of the people she met there, and through her travels she forged human and spiritual ties that would last a lifetime.

In the years that followed, her newfound faith of Islam led her to change her name to Ameena, and during her time in Africa she met and married her second husband, an American named Daud Malik Watts. Upon her return to the United States, she rededicated herself to her life's mission of serving our young people by opening, with Daud, the Reston Montessori School in Virginia.

As she continued her spiritual exploration in the 1980s, she was led to return to her birth name of Audrey. During that time she also traveled frequently to the west coast and split her time between working in the non-profit sector and developing her own small business selling her delicious homemade apple pies.

As she neared the conclusion of her spiritual journey, she changed her name to Yve-I Rastafari, which was a reflection of her becoming a Rastafarian. In the 1990s, when she underwent this transition, she also moved to

Hawaii, where she started Artists for Orphans, an international non-profit dedicated to providing educational, financial, physical and emotional support to orphans in Ethiopia.

After devoting herself to this bold, compassionate work for more than a decade, Yve-I left Hawaii to move back northeast to be with her ailing father, caring for him until his last day. After his passing, she returned to working with young children in Washington, D.C. before ultimately moving to California to be with and care for her youngest grandchildren.

Yve-I gave of herself easily and was wonderful with children. I witnessed time and time again, as she was the mother-in-law to my son, and along with me, was a grandmother to Simone the daughter of my son and her daughter. Whether we were together at family gatherings on special occasions or simply spending time with our children and grandchildren, Yve-I's generous and loving spirit brought a sense of comfort and togetherness to our family which has not only nurtured our youngest members, but has strengthened the ties between us all.

Throughout her life, Yve-I was fully dedicated to complete spiritual and human development and her devotion to becoming the most complete and aware person that she could was evidenced by her constant growth and personal evolution. At the end of her life it became her goal to return to Ethiopia to live out her days so that she could continue the work of Artists for Orphans and practice her religion at an age-old founding church of her faith, and that is what she did, being laid to rest on March 17, 2006 in Shashamene, Ethiopia, where she was known as Mama Love. She is survived by her life partner, Menelek Fitzgerald, her children Aisha Patrice, Abina, Yasmina, Memuna, Bilqis, Nasir, Mahmud, and Netanya; her siblings Adrienne, Donald and Wayne; thirteen grandchildren; her nephews; and numerous cousins, colleagues and friends.

Today the family and friends of the woman who journeyed from Audrey to Yve-I come together to celebrate her life and the countless ways in which her bright and compassionate spirit touched lives of others, no matter what name they knew her by during her lifetime. Her giving nature and deep wisdom was known to and cherished by all, and will continue to lift up the lives of our young people and all who knew her for generations to come. On behalf of California's 9th U.S. Congressional District, I am proud to add my voice to the countless others who have united in thanks, appreciation, and joy to remember this very special, remarkable and loving woman, Yve-I Rastafari.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF ERMA BYRD

**HON. RUSH D. HOLT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the memory of Erma Byrd, the wife of the senior Senator from West Virginia. We mourn the death of this great lady.

Here in this chamber it is important that we acknowledge the importance of the spouses of those who serve in the U.S. Congress. There

is no more distinguished member of the legislative branch than the Senator from West Virginia, and certainly none who has served so effectively for so long. Surely, some of the credit for this distinguished service should go to Erma Byrd.

My family and I have known the Byrds for much longer than half a century. Senator BYRD and his wife have been devoted to each other for almost 69 years. She has been his closest companion and, I believe, his closest advisor. When they first married, he turned over to her his wallet and the family finances. He relied on her for everything domestic. For decades, in the evenings after his superb legislative and political work on Capitol Hill, when other members of Congress set off for receptions and social functions, Senator BYRD returned home to sit with Erma and read, often to each other.

Erma Byrd has been a dear friend of my mother. The daughter of a coal miner, Erma Byrd was a woman who showed great consideration for other people. She was a woman with a backbone and what we would call West Virginia gumption. The whole country of the United States knows Senator BYRD as a great legislator and great orator who can be counted on as the most adamant defender of our Constitution and a champion of the honor and traditions of the Congress, especially the U.S. Senate. What many Americans may not know is the man who has given devotion to and, until her death last week, received devotion from his honorable and capable wife. I join others here in expressing my sympathies to this great colleague.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ERMA BYRD

**HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 30, 2006*

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, hearts are heavy in West Virginia this week as we mourn the loss of a very special woman: Mrs. Erma Byrd, the beloved wife of our distinguished senior Senator.

ROBERT C. BYRD and Erma Ora James met as students at Mark Twain Grade School in Raleigh county. They married in 1937, at the tender age of 19. In that simple ceremony, a lasting bond was forged, and an incredible journey was begun.

Their journey took them from the coalfields of southern West Virginia to the halls of this great Capitol. At every point along the way, Erma Byrd was a constant source of strength, support and inspiration—whether in raising their wonderful family or anchoring the incredible career of her devoted husband.

In his words, she was a “priceless treasure, a multifaceted woman of great insight and wisdom, of quiet humor and common sense.”

What a wonderful tribute to a wonderful woman.

On the sad occasion of her passing, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing heartfelt condolences to Senator BYRD and his family. Our thoughts are with them as they say goodbye to Erma Byrd and cherish the memory of her caring kindness and love.

COLLEGE ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

**HON. RUSH D. HOLT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 29, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 609) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to reiterate and reinforce my remarks yesterday during the debate on the McMorris-Holt amendment. I restate my commitment to work with those who want to see improvements in the adjunct teacher corps.

As I said in my previous comments, having been a professor of physics at the university level, I am well aware that knowledge of a subject is only one part of helping students learn. Being an effective teacher is much more than that. Pedagogy is both an art and a science, and pedagogical training is a critical part of being an educator.

Placing an Adjunct Teacher directly into the classroom without any pre-service training would be unfair to the Adjunct Teacher and to the students he or she would be teaching. To raise the level of performance in the classroom, Adjunct Teachers must undergo advanced training. This training must not be cursory, and should include pedagogy and the most recent research on how students learn science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It should also include practical experience with real students in classroom settings.

I want to emphasize that the Adjunct Teacher Corps program is not about replacing teachers. As the word “adjunct” signifies, these teachers would be an additional supplement to school facilities. Schools applying for these grants will tailor their Adjunct program to suit their unique needs, and in doing so, they must include parents and teachers in the planning process. This program will particularly help those educational agencies facing dire teacher shortages, or levels of achievement so low that no one teacher can solve it on his or her own. As it currently stands, many of our high-need school districts do not have enough people who are currently qualified under No Child Left Behind to teach math, science and foreign languages. While we increase those ranks, we can also supplement them with adjunct teachers with subject matter expertise. Specifically, this amendment requires adjunct teachers to possess, at a minimum, a bachelor's degree and demonstrated expertise in mathematics, science, or a critical foreign language as defined by No Child Left Behind. Every school, in every town, should have a diverse faculty with pedagogical and subject matter expertise.

I also want to state that the size of this program is very small. This program will be competing for funding with five others for a share of a \$41 million authorization.

It is my hope that this program will have long-term beneficial results. Before it was introduced, I wanted to ensure that the amendment includes provision for pre-service training and continued mentoring of these content specialists. Just as Teach for America has been a valuable asset to many school districts, I believe that these content specialists can make

valuable contributions to schools. After participating in the adjunct teacher program, I hope that many of these individuals will decide to stay in their school districts and serve as certified teachers.

Notably, our focus is on the most dire needs first. The amendment requires that those who apply for the funds demonstrate the need for, and expected benefits of, using adjunct teachers in the participating schools. This may include information on the difficulties that participating schools face in recruiting qualified faculty in mathematics, science, critical foreign language courses. They must also demonstrate measurable objectives for the project, including the number of adjunct teachers the eligible entity intends to place in classrooms, and academic gains that the students should make.

As pleased as I am with the amendment's progress so far, I also recognize that more work needs to be done in conference. Specifically, I am most concerned with perfecting the "Use of Funds" section to make clear that reimbursement of outside entities for the costs associated with allowing an employee to serve as an Adjunct Teacher must comply with collective bargaining agreements. I believe we can do that by spelling out that section 2(F)'s requirement that applicants demonstrate their compliance with existing contractual obligations includes collective bargaining agreements. That is my current reading of the amendment, but it could not hurt to tighten the language.

In closing, I want to thank my colleagues for the bipartisan support they have given to this amendment. I want to especially thank my Republican colleagues on the House Education and Workforce Committee for accepting some of my changes and working with me to improve the amendment from where it started. I look forward to ensuring this amendment's continued progress in conference with the Senate.

BUDGET CUTS HARM WOMEN AND CHILDREN

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2006

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join my colleagues in highlighting the detrimental effects the President's fiscal year 2007 budget will have on women.

From health and education, to the protection and development of women and girls internationally, this administration intends to cut funding in programs that are vital to women's well-being and development.

Worse still Mr. Speaker, many of the programs that the President intends to cut disproportionately impact minority women negatively.

For example, in the area of health, the fiscal year 2007 budget cuts \$1 million out of the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities. This is a critical facility that directs money and technical assistance to organizations working with minorities on diseases that disproportionately kill women, such as heart disease, diabetes and obesity.

Additionally, the President's budget would cut funds from the minority HIV/AIDS initiative which actively seeks to address the prevention and treatment needs of minority communities heavily impacted by HIV/AIDS.

The budget cuts the Office of Minority Health by a staggering \$11 million and the Office on Women's Health would receive a significant cut.

It's not just health that is slashed in the President's budget.

The President proposes cutting funding for education initiatives for homeless children and youth by \$600,000 and cut Pell grants by a whopping \$430 million—with an award cap of \$4,050.

Furthermore, the President has proposed a \$1 million decrease to fair housing assistance programs for our most needy.

Mr. Speaker, I could stand here all night and list the outrageous cuts in health, education, and housing programs the President's budget would inflict, but I would be remiss if I didn't also highlight the cuts to programs that

guarantee the safety of women domestically and abroad.

One of the most successful programs to prevent violence against women while funding the prosecution of those who have committed those crimes, the Violence Against Women Act or VAWA, will face a potential \$39.5 million cut.

Additionally, women's health is the President's proposed \$2 million cut to the United Nations Development Fund and a \$9 million cut to the United Nations Population Fund will jeopardize the health and safety of women around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our budget is a moral document. It reflects the values of our Nation. I'm sad to say these aren't the values that my sisters in Congress and across the country hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to think about what a budget like the one the President has proposed means to each and everyone of their constituents. You can't tell me we can't do better.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNSON COUNTY MOVERS AND SHAKERS AWARD WINNERS OF 2006

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2006

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note an important event in the Third Congressional District of Kansas. On April 24, 2006, the Volunteer Center of Johnson County in Overland Park, KS, will honor outstanding youth volunteers. One hundred and eleven young people have been nominated by school personnel and nonprofit organizations for their dedication and service to the community. Eight of these youth are being recognized for their efforts toward receipt of the Congressional Award. Youth volunteerism continues to grow and be a strong force in Johnson County. These 111 youth exemplify the true meaning of volunteerism and giving back to their community. It is my honor to recognize each student volunteer and their schools by listing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Name	School	Age	Grade	CA medal	City
Katie Agnew	Bishop Miege High School	18	12		Roeland Park
Dana Alamis	Indian Trail Jr. High	15	9		Olathe
Molly Allison-Gallimore	Home School	16	10	Silver Medal	Spring Hill, Prairie Village, Olathe
Clare Amey	Bishop Miege High School	17	11		Olathe
Avery Arjo	Oregon Trail Junior High	13	8		Olathe
Simmi Arora	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Lenexa
Sydney Ayers	Barstow High School	15	9	Gold Medal	Leawood
M. Celeste Banks	Trailridge Middle School	14	8		Shawnee Mission, Overland Park
Annie Belle	California Trail Jr. High	14	9		Overland Park
Anne Bellis	Pembroke Hill	16	10		Fairway
Carlene Bolton	Mill Valley High School	17	12		Shawnee
Steven Burnett	Olathe North High School	18	12		Olathe
Rebecca Byron	Bishop Miege High School	18	12		Shawnee
Caitlin Carter	Westridge Middle School	14	8		Shawnee Mission, Overland Park
Jenna Christensen	Shawnee Mission North High School	17	11	Silver Medal	Olathe
Jill Christensen	Shawnee Mission North High School	15	10	Silver Medal	Olathe
Lee Clemon	Olathe South High School	18	12		Olathe
Sara "Kat" Conoley	Shawnee Mission West High School	18	12		Shawnee Mission, Olathe
Benjamin Eggers	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Olathe
Caitlin Ellison	Mill Valley High School	17	12		Shawnee
Christopher Fairchild	Midland Adventist Academy	14	8		Shawnee
Rindy Fairchild	Midland Adventist Academy	16	10		Shawnee
Ashlan Fisher	Shawnee Mission East High School	17	11		Leawood
Jennifer Garren	Westridge Middle School	14	8		Overland Park
Kate Garrett	Shawnee Mission West High School	17			Lenexa
Kevin Garrett	Shawnee Mission West High School	14			Lenexa
Michael Garrett	Westridge Middle School	13	7		Shawnee Mission
Will Gates	Shawnee Mission East High School	18	12		Fairway
Rachel Gittinger	Bishop Miege	17	12		Overland Park
M. Caroline Goehausen	Shawnee Mission East High School	18	12		Leawood
Orriah Graves	Bishop Miege	16	11		Overland Park
Chanel Griffin	Westridge Middle School	13	8		Lenexa
Kristen Nicole Harper	Mill Valley High School	17	12		Shawnee



Name	School	Age	Grade	CA medal	City
Kelsey Hayden	Olathe East High School	16	11		Overland Park.
Alyssa Haynes	Olathe Northwest High School	16	11		Lenexa.
Emily Holmes	Bishop Miege	16	11		Overland Park.
Holly Hrabik	Olathe North High School	16	10		Olathe.
Lisa Imgrund	Trailridge Middle School	14	8		Shawnee Mission.
Betsy Jensen	Shawnee Mission East High School	17	11		Leawood.
Mark Johnson	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Olathe.
Christie Jones	Olathe East High School	18	12		Overland Park.
Molly Jones	Olathe North High School	18	12		Olathe.
Atena Kamali	Olathe North High School	18	12		Olathe.
Kalie Karnes	Olathe East High School	17	12		Overland Park.
Jadhken Kerr	Olathe South High School	16	10	Gold Medal	Olathe.
Jadhon Kerr	Olathe South High School	17	11	Gold Medal	Olathe.
Sarah Kidder	Bishop Miege	18	12		Shawnee.
Hunter Kiely	Blue Valley West High School	17	11		Overland Park.
Paul Kirk	Bishop Miege	18	11		Overland Park.
Kathryn Kisthardt	Bishop Miege	18	12		Shawnee.
Katie Lindner	Olathe Northwest High School	18	12		Lenexa.
Adam Love	Shawnee Mission Northwest High School	17	12		Merriam.
Sarah Martin	Westridge Middle School	13	8		Overland Park.
Stephanie Mathews	Bishop Miege	17	11		Overland Park.
Magdalena May	Olathe North High School	16	11		Olathe.
Emerald McAdams	Santa Fe Trail Junior High	12	7		Olathe.
Mimi Mebarek	Shawnee Mission West High School	18	12		Shawnee Mission.
Eric Min	Blue Valley High School	17	12		Overland Park.
Jovana Mirabile	St. Thomas Aquinas	16	11		Leawood.
Amanda Monica	Olathe North High School	15	9		Olathe.
Peri Montgomery	Westridge Middle School	13	8		Overland Park.
Tim Mourlam	Bishop Miege	17	11		Shawnee Mission.
Kate Murphy	Prairie Trail Jr. High	13	8		Olathe.
Marcus Myer	Spring Hill	18	12		Spring Hill.
Emily Nixon	Olathe South High School	18	12		Olathe.
Ashley Nur	Barstow	15			Leawood.
Cailan O'Grady	Shawnee Mission East High School	18	12		Prairie Village.
Annie Oliver	Bishop Miege	17	11		Prairie Village.
Anish Patel	Olathe Northwest High School	16	11		Olathe.
Melissa Peck	Bishop Miege	18	12		Olathe.
Matthew Pennington	Rockhurst	15	9		Shawnee.
Andrew Peterson	Shawnee Mission East High School	18	12		Prairie Village.
Meagan Pick	Blue Valley North High School	18	12		Overland Park.
Ellen Poulouse	Bishop Miege	16	12		Shawnee.
Caitlin Powell	Olathe North High School	18	12		Olathe.
Catherine Queen	Pembroke Hill	17	11		Prairie Village.
Katie Rabovsky	Blue Valley Northwest High School	12	8	Gold Medal	Overland Park.
Matthew Ramirez	Prairie Trail Jr. High	13	8		Olathe.
Cassie Rhodes	Spring Hill High School	15	9		Spring Hill.
Chris Rhodes	Spring Hill High School	18	12		Spring Hill.
Katie Richardson	Bishop Miege	16	11		Overland Park.
Amber Roan	Shawnee Mission North High School	18	12		Shawnee.
Cindy Rupp	Mill Valley High School	18	12		Shawnee.
Courtney Russel	Olathe South High School	18	12		Olathe.
Kathryn Sanders	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Lenexa.
Matthew Schulte	Shawnee Mission East High School	18	12		Prairie Village.
Michael Simpson	Blue Valley High School	17	11		Stillwell.
Scott Simpson	Blue Valley High School	17	11		Stillwell.
Colin Simalley	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Olathe.
Elaina Smith	Prairie Trail Jr. High	14	8		Olathe.
Victoria Solorzano	Blue Valley North High School	18	12		Overland Park.
Jennifer Sommerfeld	Trailridge Middle School	13	8		Shawnee Mission.
Sara Sorensen	Bishop Miege	16	11		Overland Park.
Jessica Stack	Olathe Northwest High School	16	12		Lenexa.
Jonathan Stahl	Home School	17	11		Overland Park.
Stephen Stahl	Home School	17	11		Overland Park.
John Steinmetz	Pleasant Ridge Middle School	13	8		Overland Park.
Kayte Steinmetz	Blue Valley West High School	16	11		Overland Park.
Amy Stephens	Olathe South High School	18	12		Olathe.
Jason Steuber	California Trail Jr. High	14	9		Overland Park.
Melissa Stone	Shawnee Mission Northwest High School	18	12		Shawnee.
Alyssa Strange	Oxford Middle School	12	6		Overland Park.
Alex Szczygiel	St. Ann	14	8		Prairie Village.
Paige Taylor	Prairie Trail Jr. High	14	8		Olathe.
Ben Terwilliger	Olathe South High School	17	12		Olathe.
Laura Thomas	Bishop Miege	17	12		Prairie Village.
Hannah Wallace	Bishop Miege	17	12		Leawood.
Nate Warner	Olathe North High School	16	11		Olathe.
Nate White	Home School	16	11	Gold Medal	Leawood.
Jessica Yeung	Shawnee Mission South High School	16	11		Overland Park.
Daniel Zeligman	Olathe Northwest High School	17	12		Overland Park.

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 609, to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S2547–S2675*

**Measures Introduced:** Six bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2481–2486 and S. Res. 415. **Pages S2602–03**

#### Measures Reported:

S. 65, to amend the age restrictions for pilots, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 109–225)

S. 829, to allow media coverage of court proceedings.

S. 1768, to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings. **Page S2602**

**Securing America's Borders Act:** Senate continued consideration of S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2553–94**

#### Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. 83), Frist Amendment No. 3191 (to Amendment No. 3192), to require the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to collect statistics, and prepare reports describing the statistics relating to deaths occurring at the border between the United States and Mexico. **Pages S2575–76**

#### Pending:

Specter/Leahy Amendment No. 3192, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2562**

Kyl/Cornyn Amendment No. 3206 (to Amendment No. 3192), to make certain aliens ineligible for conditional nonimmigrant work authorization and status. **Pages S2584–85, S2590–94**

Cornyn Amendment No. 3207 (to Amendment No. 3206), to establish an enactment date. **Pages S2585–89**

Bingaman Amendment No. 3210 (to Amendment No. 3192), to provide financial aid to local law enforcement officials along the Nation's borders. **Pages S2589–90**

Alexander Amendment No. 3193 (to Amendment No. 3192), to prescribe the binding oath or affirmation of renunciation and allegiance required to be naturalized as a citizen of the United States, to encourage and support the efforts of prospective citizens of the United States to become citizens. **Page S2590**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, March 31, 2006. **Page S2675**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Report to accompany Protocol of 1997 Amending MARPOL Convention (Treaty Doc. 108–7) (Ex. Rept. 109–13). **Page S2602**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Daniel L. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs for a term of four years.

Gary D. Orton, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Foreign Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. **Page S2675**

**Nominations Withdrawn:** Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

Daniel P. Ryan, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, which was sent to the Senate on February 14, 2005. **Page S2675**

**Messages From the House:** **Page S2600**

**Enrolled Bills Presented:** **Page S2600**

Executive Communications:	Pages S2600–02
Executive Reports of Committees:	Page S2602
Additional Cosponsors:	Pages S2603–04
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:	Pages S2604–12
Additional Statements:	Pages S2597–S2600
Amendments Submitted:	Pages S2612–73
Authorities for Committees to Meet:	Pages S2673–74
Privileges of the Floor:	Page S2674
Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—83)	Pages S2575–76

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 7:49 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, March 31, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2675.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from P. Lynn Scarlett, Deputy Secretary, R. Thomas Weimer, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, and Pamela K. Haze, Co-Director, Office of Budget, all of the Department of the Interior.

### APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Energy and Water concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Energy's Supply and Conservation account, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability account, Office of Nuclear Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Office of Environmental Management, Office of Fossil Energy Research and Development, and Office of Science, after receiving testimony from David K. Garman, Under Secretary for Energy, Science, and Environment, and Raymond L. Orbach, Director, Office of Science, both of the Department of Energy.

### APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies

concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Keith Collins, Chief Economist, J.B. Penn, Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Mark E. Rey, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Eric M. Bost, Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Richard A. Raymond, Under Secretary for Food Safety, and Charles Lambert, Acting Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, all of the Department of Agriculture.

### FLAT FEDERAL INCOME TAX

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine the potential effects of a flat Federal income tax in the District of Columbia, after receiving testimony from Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer for the Government of the District of Columbia; and Terence C. Golden, Federal City Council, Washington, D.C.

### DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the proposed defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007, focusing on reserve component personnel policies, after receiving testimony from Thomas F. Hall, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, USA, Chief National Guard Bureau; Lieutenant General Clyde A. Vaughn, USA, Director, Army National Guard; Lieutenant General Daniel James III, USAF, Director, Air National Guard; Lieutenant General James R. Helmly, USA, Chief, Army Reserve; Vice Admiral John G. Cotton, USN, Chief, Navy Reserve; Lieutenant General John W. Bergman, USMC, Commander, Marine Forces Reserve; and Lieutenant General John A. Bradley, USAF, Chief, Air Force Reserve.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, to strengthen Government review and oversight of foreign investment in the United States, to provide for enhanced Congressional oversight with respect thereto.

### MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation concluded a hearing to examine S. 1801, to amend the

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to reauthorize the Act, and provide for consolidation of HUD's homeless programs, after receiving testimony from Roy A. Bernardi, Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Philip F. Mangano, Executive Director, U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness; Gail Dorfman, County Commissioner, Hennepin County, Minnesota; Steven R. Berg, National Alliance to End Homelessness, Washington, D.C.; Charles W. Gould, Volunteers of America, Alexandria, Virginia; Anthony Love, Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County, Inc., Houston, Texas; and Dennis P. Culhane, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

#### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee ordered favorably reported S. 2389, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the unlawful acquisition and use of confidential customer proprietary network information, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

#### POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITES

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Subcommittee on Disaster Prevention and Prediction concluded an oversight hearing to examine National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, which provide data and imagery that are used by weather forecasters, climatologists, and the military to map and monitor changes in weather, climate, the oceans, and the environment, after receiving testimony from Gary E. Payton, Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force for Space Programs; David A. Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; Gregory W. Withee, Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; David L. Ryan, Northrop Grumman Corporation, Redondo Beach, California.

#### COMPETITION AND CONVERGENCE

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of competition and convergence in the telecommunications industry, after receiving testimony from Kyle McSarrow, National Cable and Telecommunications Association, Earl Comstock, COMPTel, Walter McCormick, US Telecom, Steve Largent, CTIA-The Wireless Association, and Mark Cooper, on behalf of Consumer Federation of America, Free Press, and Consumers Union, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jerry Ellig, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia.

#### WATER PROJECTS

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 1577, to facilitate the transfer of Spearfish Hydroelectric Plant Number 1 to the city of Spearfish, South Dakota, S. 1962, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise certain repayment contracts with the Bostwick Irrigation District in Nebraska, the Kansas Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, the Frenchman-Cambridge Irrigation District, and the Webster Irrigation District No. 4, all a part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, S. 2028, to provide for the reinstatement of a license for a certain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project, S. 2035, to extend the time required for construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Idaho, S. 2054, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the State of Vermont, S. 2205, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit, James Division, South Dakota, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands and the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential leaseholders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission, and H.R. 3812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a feasibility study with respect to the Mokelumne River, after receiving testimony from Senator Thune; John Keys III, Commissioner of Reclamation, and Catherine L. Hill, Northeast Regional Hydrologist, U.S. Geologist Survey, both of the Department of the Interior; J. Mark Robinson, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy; Mayor Jerry Krambeck, Spearfish, South Dakota; Laurence R. Becker, Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation, Waterbury; C. Mel Lytle, San Joaquin County, Stockton, California, on behalf of the Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority; and Darla Pollman Rogers, Riter, Rogers, Wattier and Brown, LLP, on behalf of Preferential Leaseholders with the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal.

#### COST OF OIL

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the hidden cost of oil, focusing on the externality costs of U.S. dependence on fossil fuels, after receiving testimony from Milton R. Copulos, National Defense Council Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia; Hillard Huntington, Stanford

University Energy Modeling Forum, Stanford, California; and Gary W. Yohe, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

### NUCLEAR AND RADIOLOGICAL THREAT

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations resumed hearings to examine securing the global supply chain relating to neutralizing the nuclear and radiological threat, focusing on programs that form the defense against nuclear terrorism including the Container Security Initiative, the Megaports Initiative, the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, and the role of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, a new office created within DHS to coordinate global nuclear detection architecture, receiving testimony from Senators Graham and Schumer; Michael P. Jackson, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security; Christopher L. Koch, World Shipping Council, Washington, D.C.; Gary D. Gilbert, Hutchison Port Holdings, Oakton, Virginia; and John P. Clancey, Maersk, Inc., Charlotte, North Carolina.

Hearings recessed subject to the call.

### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT VETERANS' PREFERENCE

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Government's implementation of veterans' preference in the hiring of employees, including an evaluation of the laws designed to protect and promote the employment of veterans, the impact of workforce flexibilities on veterans, and how veterans' redress mechanisms are working, after receiving testimony from Dan G. Blair, Deputy Director, Office of Personnel Management; Charles S. Ciccolella, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training; James McVay, Deputy

Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel; Richard Weidman, Vietnam Veterans of America, Silver Spring, Maryland; and Joseph C. Sharpe, Jr., The American Legion, and Brian E. Lawrence, Disabled American Veterans, both of Washington, D.C.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1768, to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings;

S. 829, to allow media coverage of court proceedings; and

The nominations of Michael A. Chagares, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Patrick Joseph Schiltz, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, Gray Hampton Miller, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Sharee M. Freeman, of Virginia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, and Jeffrey L. Sedgwick, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, both of the Department of Justice.

### VETERANS' LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine legislative presentations of certain veterans' organizations, after receiving testimony from George Basher, National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs, Albany, New York; Gerald S. Harvey, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Arlington, Texas; John Rowan, Vietnam Veterans of America, Silver Spring, Maryland; and Edward W. Kemp, AMVETS, Lanham, Maryland.

### INTELLIGENCE

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

---

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 23 public bills, H.R. 5050–5072; and 12 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 371–375; and H. Res. 746–752 were introduced.

**Pages H1388–90**

**Additional Cosponsors:**

**Pages H1390–91**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Privileged Resolution:** The House agreed to table H. Res. 746, relating to a question of the privileges of the House, by a recorded vote of 216 ayes to 193 noes with 7 voting “present”, Roll No. 76.

**Pages H1334–35**

**College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005:** The House passed H.R. 609, to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 by a recorded

vote of 221 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 81. Consideration of the bill began yesterday, March 29th.

**Pages H1326–34, H1335–63**

Agreed to:

Biggert amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) allows unaccompanied homeless youth to be considered as independent students upon verification of their living situation by a McKinney-Vento Act school district liaison, a shelter director, or a financial aid administrator;

**Pages H1335–36**

Larsen of Washington amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) expresses the sense of Congress that student exchange and language education programs should focus on Chinese and Arabic, in light of the global importance of China and the Middle East;

**Page H1341**

Souder amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) removes language in the bill that prohibits schools from denying transfers of credit based solely on the accreditation of the sending institution. The amendment maintains the requirement that schools publicly disclose their transfer policies, and would also require a school to disclose any policy that would deny transfers of credit solely on the accreditation of the institution where the credit was earned;

**Pages H1341–42**

Gohmert amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) strikes certain reporting requirements for colleges and universities within Sec. 131(f). The amendment also strikes Sec. 495(a)(1) that would allow states to apply to the Secretary of Education to become recognized accreditors (by a recorded vote of 418 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 77); and

**Pages H1336–37, H1360**

Kennedy of Rhode Island amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) makes child and adolescent mental health professionals eligible for loan forgiveness for high need professions under Sec. 421 of the bill (by a recorded vote of 380 ayes to 38 noes, Roll No. 78).

**Pages H1337–38, H1360–61**

Rejected:

King of Iowa amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) that sought to require institutions that receive any federal funding (including grants and scholarships) to submit to the U.S. Department of Education an annual report answering two questions. First, the report must state whether race, color, or national origin is considered in the student admissions process. If race, color, or nation origin is considered in the student admissions process, then the report must contain a subsequent analysis of how these factors are considered in the process (by a recorded vote of 83 ayes to 337 noes, Roll No. 79); and

**Pages H1338–41, H1361–62**

Miller of California amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 109–401) in the nature of a substitute that

sought to lower student loan interest rates; establish a new Predominantly Black Serving Institution program to boost college participation rates of low-income, black students; establish a new graduate Hispanic Serving Institution program; provide for year-round Pell grants; and repeal the Single Lender rule (by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 80).

**Pages H1342–54, H1362**

Committee of the Whole proceeded with a pro forma amendment for the purposes of an additional 10 minutes of debate.

**Page H1360**

H. Res. 742, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 75, after agreeing to order the previous question without objection.

**Pages H1326–34**

**Calendar Wednesday:** Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, April 5, 2006.

**Page H1365**

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 3rd, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 2006, for Morning Hour debate.

**Page H1365**

**Congressional Award Board—appointment:** The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional Award Board: Representative Chocola.

**Page H1365**

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate today appears on pages H1363–64.

**Senate Referrals:** S. 2349 was held at the desk.

**Page H1364**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** One yea-and-nay vote and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1331–34, H1334–35, H1360, H1361, H1361–62, H1362 and H1363. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

## *Committee Meetings*

### **RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

*Committee on Agriculture:* Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research held a hearing to review the Rural Development Programs. Testimony was heard from Thomas C. Dorr, Under Secretary, Rural Development, USDA; Mark Drabenstott, Vice President and Director, Center for the Study of Rural America, Federal Reserve Bank,

Kansas City, Missouri; Cheryl L. Cook, Deputy Secretary, Marketing and Economic Development, Department of Agriculture, State of Pennsylvania; and public witnesses.

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT,  
FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Research, Education, and Economics. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA: Merle D. Pierson, Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education and Economics; Edward B. Knipling, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service; Colien Hefferan, Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service; Susan Offutt, Administrator, Economic Research Service; R. Ronald Bosecker, Administrator, National Agricultural Statistics Service; and W. Scott Steele, Budget Officer.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on Avian Influenza. Testimony was heard from Bruce Gillen, MD., Director, National Vaccine Program, and Jesse Goodman, M.D., Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, both with the Department of Health and Human Services; and the following officials of the USDA: Mike Johanns, Secretary; Ron DeHaven, M.D., Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and W. Scott Steele, Budget Officer.

**DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Defense met in executive session to hold a hearing on Navy/MC Budget/Acquisition. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Donald C. Winter, Secretary, ADM Michael G. Mullen, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and GEN Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HHS,  
EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION,  
TREASURY, AND HUD, THE JUDICIARY,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND  
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on OMB. Testimony was heard from Joel Kaplan, Deputy Director, OMB.

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT,  
AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on DOE, National Nuclear Security Administration. Testimony was heard from Linton F. Brooks, Under Secretary, Nuclear Security and Administrator for National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

**HOMELAND SECURITY**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Preparedness. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: George Foresman, Under Secretary, Directorate of Preparedness; and Tracey Henke, Assistant Secretary, Office of Grants and Training.

**INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Native American Issues. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**SCIENCE, THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE,  
JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies held a hearing on NASA. Testimony was heard from Michael D. Griffin, Administrator, NASA.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on FTC. Testimony was heard from Deborah P. Majoras, Chairman, FTC.

**NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND ACQUISITION**

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Projection Forces held a hearing on the Department of the Navy's Fiscal Year 2007 shipbuilding acquisition strategy and how it supports the Navy's long-range fleet plan. Testimony was heard from Paul L.

Francis, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, GAO; the following officials of the CBO: J. Michael Gilmore, Assistant Director; and Eric J. Labs, Principal Analyst, both with the National Security Division; the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Delores M. Etter, Assistant Secretary, Research, Development and Acquisition; VADM Lewis W. Crenshaw, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Resources, Requirements and Assessments (N8); LTG James N. Mattis, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command and Deputy Commandant for Combat Development; RADM David Architzel, USN, Program Executive Officer for Carriers; RADM Charles S. Hamilton II, USN, Program Executive Officer for Ships; and RADM William H. Hilarides, USN, Program Executive Officer for Submarines, all with the Naval Sea Systems Command; Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in National Defense, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and a public witness.

#### ARMY/MARINE CORPS EQUIPMENT AND ROTOCRAFT

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Readiness and the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a joint hearing on Army and Marine Corps reset strategies for ground equipment and rotorcraft. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: LTG David F. Melcher, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, U.S. Army; MG Jeanette K. Edmunds, USA, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4, U.S. Army; and LTG Emersonardner, Jr., Deputy Commander of the Marine Corps, Programs and Resources, U.S. Marine Corps; and William Solis, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management Team, GAO.

#### COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet held a hearing on the Communications Opportunity, Promotion, and Enhancement Act of 2006. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

#### OVERSIGHT—HUD

*Committee on Financial Services:* Held an oversight hearing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Department's budget request for fiscal year 2007. Testimony was heard from Alphonso Jackson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

#### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Government Reform:* Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 4368, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building"; HR. 4561, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, as the "Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building"; H.R. 4586, Benjamin Franklin Tercentenary Commission Act of 2005; H.R. 4646, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7320 Reseda Boulevard in Reseda, California, as the "Coach John Wooden Post Office Building"; H.R. 4811, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 West Industrial Park Road in Harrison, Arkansas, as the "John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Building"; H.R. 4995, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7 Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, as the "Ronald Bucca Post Office"; H.R. 518, Honoring professional surveyors and recognizing their contributions to society; and H. Res. 737, Supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

#### DISASTER RESPONSE INFORMATION-SHARING

*Committee on Government Reform:* Held a hearing entitled "The Need To Know: Information-Sharing Lessons for Disaster Response." Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Peter F. Verga, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Homeland Defense; and Linton Wells II, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Networks and Information Integration; Vance Hitch, Chief Information Officer, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

#### BRIEFING—AIRLINE PASSENGER PRESCREENING WATCHLIST

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Met in executive session to receive a briefing on the Transportation Security Administration airline passenger prescreening watchlist. The Committee was briefed by Donna Bucella, Director, Terrorist Screening, FBI, Department of Justice; and Michael Resnick, Chief, Terrorist Identities Group, National Counter Terrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

#### SAFE PORT ACT

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity approved for full committee action, as amended, H.R. 4954, SAFE Port Act.



### SHOULDER-FIRED MISSILES TERRORIST THREAT

*Committee on International Relations:* Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation held a hearing on The Terrorist Threat From Shoulder-Fired Missiles. Testimony was heard from John Hillen, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State.

### LATIN AMERICA COUNTERNARCOTICS STRATEGIES

*Committee on International Relations:* Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing on Counternarcotics Strategies in Latin America. Testimony was heard from Anne W. Patterson, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State; Michael A. Braun, Chief of Operations, DEA, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

### OVERSIGHT—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held an oversight hearing on the 10th anniversary of the Congressional Review Act. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Mihm, Managing Director, Strategic Issues, GAO; Morton Rosenberg, Specialist in American Public Law, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; John V. Sullivan, Parliamentarian, U.S. House of Representatives; and a public witness.

### DEATH PENALTY REFORM ACT OF 2006

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing on H.R. 5040, Death Penalty Reform Act of 2006. Testimony was heard from Margaret P. Griffey, Chief, Capital Case Unit, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

### OVERSIGHT—WORK VISA INCREASES

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims held an oversight hearing on Should Congress Raise the H-1B Cap? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Resources:* Subcommittee on National Parks held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2134, Commission To Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of the American Latino Community Act of 2005; H.R. 3961, 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 Grand Canyon

National Park; and H.R. 4294, Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Becerra, Ros-Lehtinen, Renzi, and Porter; Michael Soukup, Associate Director, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and a public witness.

### LOBBYING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

*Committee on Rules:* Held a hearing on H.R. 4975, Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006. Testimony was heard from Representatives Shays, Buyer, Kirk, Schmidt, Obey, Frank of Massachusetts, Cardin, Price of North Carolina, Meehan, Blumenauer, Doggett, Allen, Baird, Emanuel, and Bean.

### K-12 SCIENCE AND MATH EDUCATION

*Committee on Science:* Held a hearing on K-12 Science and Math Education Across the Federal Agencies. Testimony was heard from Margaret Spellings, Secretary of Education; Arden Bement, Director, NSF; John J. Kelly, Deputy Under Secretary, Oceans and Atmosphere, NOAA, Department of Commerce; and James Decker, Principal Deputy Director, Office of Science, Department of Energy.

### SBA PROCUREMENT ASSISTANCE

*Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight held an oversight hearing on the procurement assistance programs of the SBA. Testimony was heard from Anthony Martoccia, Associate Deputy Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, SBA; and public witnesses.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; GSA'S FY 2007 CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND LEASING PROGRAM

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management approved for full Committee action the following: GSA's Fiscal Year 2007 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; H. Con. Res. 360, Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; H. Con. Res. 359, Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; and H. Con. Res. 349, Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, 10 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the General Services Administration's Fiscal Year 2006 Capital Investment and Leasing Program. Testimony was heard from David L. Winstead, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, GSA.

**OVERSIGHT—BARRIERS TO CLEANUP OF ABANDONED MINE SITES**

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held an oversight hearing on Barriers to the Cleanup of Abandoned Mine Sites. Testimony was heard from Benjamin H. Grumbles, Assistant Administrator, Water, EPA; and public witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT—ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY/AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS**

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held an oversight hearing on policy and operational issues facing Arlington National Cemetery and the American Battle Monuments Commission. Testimony was heard from John C. Metzler, Jr., Superintendent, Arlington National Cemetery; and John W. Nicholson, Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission.

**SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER HIGH-RISK ISSUES**

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Social Security continued hearings on Social Security number (SSN) high-risk issues. Testimony was heard from Representatives Dreier and Reyes; Cynthia M. Fagnoni, Managing Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, GAO; Joel Winston, Associate Director, Division of Privacy and Identity Protec-

tion, Bureau of Consumer Protection, FTC; and public witnesses.

**INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007**

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Met in executive session and ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 5020, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

---

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,  
MARCH 31, 2006**

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

**Senate**

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Uttam Dhillon, of California, to be Director of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, and Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission, 10 a.m., SD-342.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* to hold hearings to examine the call to censure the President, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

**House**

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings entitled "The Silicosis Story: Mass Tort Screening and the Public Health," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, March 31

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, April 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 2454, Securing America's Borders Act.

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

### HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E476, E477  
 Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E471  
 Bilirakis, Michael, Fla., E474  
 Bonner, Jo, Ala., E473  
 Boren, Dan, Okla., E474  
 Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E471, E483  
 Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E474  
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E474  
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E465, E467  
 Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E482  
 Ehlers, Vernon J., Mich., E463  
 Frank, Barney, Mass., E484  
 Gilchrest, Wayne T., Md., E472  
 Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E472  
 Hart, Melissa A., Pa., E463, E464, E465, E466, E468, E469

Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E476  
 Holt, Rush D., N.J., E487, E487  
 Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E471  
 Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E476  
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E464, E468, E469  
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E486, E488  
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E469  
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E464, E465, E466, E467, E470  
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E471  
 Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E470  
 Mollohan, Alan B., W.Va., E487  
 Moore, Dennis, Kans., E488  
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E477  
 Moran, James P., Va., E477  
 Moran, Jerry, Kans., E473  
 Musgrave, Marilyn N., Colo., E474  
 Oberstar, James L., Minn., E482  
 Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E485

Porter, Jon C., Nev., E465, E467  
 Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E477  
 Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E478, E479, E481  
 Ross, Mike, Ark., E463, E466, E468  
 Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E480  
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E470  
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E469  
 Skelton, Ike, Mo., E464, E467  
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E478  
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E486  
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E479, E480, E482, E483, E485, E486  
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E485  
 Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E474  
 Weller, Jerry, Ill., E473  
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E464, E466, E468  
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E480, E482



## Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at [www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess](http://www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess). Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at [swais.access.gpo.gov](http://swais.access.gpo.gov), or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: [gpoaccess@gpo.gov](mailto:gpoaccess@gpo.gov); Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.