The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Johnny Isakson, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the fountain of joy, we thank You for our legislative leaders. We are grateful for their dedication to freedom’s cause, for their desire to do Your will, and for their faith in Your sovereign leading.

Bless and keep them in their varied endeavors. Give them patience to achieve, humility to listen, wisdom to decide, diligence to lead, and love to act with compassion. Keep them alert to the needs of our times.

And, Lord, bring peace to our world. We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Johnny Isakson 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Stevens).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:


To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS, President pro tempore.

Mr. ISAKSON thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we will have a period for the transaction of morning business this morning. Senators are reminded that we will begin the stem cell debate on Monday. Last night, we reached an agreement to allocate debate time in blocks, alternating back and forth between the majority and minority sides of the aisle. We will begin that debate on Monday at 12:30 p.m. and continue through Tuesday afternoon. Then we will proceed to votes on those bills—as a reminder, we have three bills and each of those three bills will have a 60-vote threshold—beginning at 3:45 p.m. on Tuesday. Those will be the first votes of the week.

The issue of stem cell research is one this body has debated in the past, but what I hope we have been able to structure, in consultation with the Democratic side of the aisle, is a way to have a very good debate on what is a very complicated issue, both from a science standpoint and from an ethical and moral standpoint. It really does cause and force, in some ways, each of us as American people—to go back and address an issue which is the first major moral, ethical, and scientific dilemma, challenge before us in the 21st century. And it is a tough issue. It is something, as a physician, as a scientist, I have spent a lot of time with, as a transplant surgeon when we are moving tissues around all the time—a heart, a lung, which I routinely transplanted before coming here.

It is a tough issue. It involves issues of life and death and promises of new cures for diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's. We have been prone, in this body and every legislative body, to overstatement, overpromising. I am very hopeful that the debate, the way we have it structured and giving people
time to prepare for it, will help educate this body, help educate the American people on an issue that is not going to go away—not just stem cells but as we look at the various challenges that are opened by the Human Genome Project, a very successful project 15 years ago, finishing just 5 years ago. It's all over this floor—and opens up all concerns of ethical debates. No matter whether people like it, no matter how hard it is. It is very important that this body come very comfortably dealing with issues advancing science and the great progress, the new opportunities we can make, whether it is addressing our 60 percent dependence on foreign sources of oil or looking at the great advances in health care and capturing the hopes and promises of new therapies. Whether it is genetic, biological stem cells, or the like means, we are going to have to do a good job in educating ourselves, developing that understanding, being comfortable talking about advances in science.

Science used to advance like this, then this, and in the 21st century, science is advancing like this. We, representing the American people, have that responsibility to define that advancing science and where it crosses with ethics and morality.

It is going to be a challenging debate, a good debate. I think the American people will pay attention, and I know our colleagues are working very hard on that particular issue.

Last night in closing, I proposed a unanimous consent agreement on the Water Resources Development Act, the so-called WRDA Act, a bill I feel very strongly we do need to bring to the floor. Chairman INHOFE has done a tremendous job in packaging the bill so that we can address the various issues with, I believe, nine amendments in the unanimous consent request. The Democratic opposition rejected that request, but I am very hopeful we will be able to address that agreement later today.

MEDICAL BREAKTHROUGH

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me comment on one other issue before yielding the floor. It has to do with medicine again. It has to do with an issue which is very close to my heart, which is who is going to take care of elderly patients before 1981, before I ever thought about getting into politics or running for the Senate. It has to do with my personal experience with ethics and morality.

Looking back over the 25 years, as we did yesterday, I recalled the same story. I just told: 25 million people have died on our watch, over my lifetime as a physician. As recently as 5 years ago, less than $1 billion was spent by the world. If we put together all the world's resources, today it is more than eight times that—eight times the amount we spent over half of this floor—and opens up all concerns of ethical debates. No matter whether people like it, no matter how hard it is. It is very important that this body come very comfortably dealing with issues advancing science and the great progress, the new opportunities we can make, whether it is addressing our 60 percent dependence on foreign sources of oil or looking at the great advances in health care and capturing the hopes and promises of new therapies. Whether it is genetic, biological stem cells, or the like means, we are going to have to do a good job in educating ourselves, developing that understanding, being comfortable talking about advances in science.

Science used to advance like this, then this, and in the 21st century, science is advancing like this. We, representing the American people, have that responsibility to define that advancing science and where it crosses with ethics and morality.

It is going to be a challenging debate, a good debate. I think the American people will pay attention, and I know our colleagues are working very hard on that particular issue.

Last night in closing, I proposed a unanimous consent agreement on the Water Resources Development Act, the so-called WRDA Act, a bill I feel very strongly we do need to bring to the floor. Chairman INHOFE has done a tremendous job in packaging the bill so that we can address the various issues with, I believe, nine amendments in the unanimous consent request. The Democratic opposition rejected that request, but I am very hopeful we will be able to address that agreement later today.

MEDICAL BREAKTHROUGH

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me comment on one other issue before yielding the floor. It has to do with medicine again. It has to do with an issue which is very close to my heart, which is who is going to take care of elderly patients before 1981, before I ever thought about getting into politics or running for the Senate. I first saw this particular issue in the early 1980s. Nobody had seen it in this country until 1981. Nobody had seen it before 1981, which is not that long ago, 25 years ago, but since that time, it killed 1 person, 3 people, 10 people, 1,000 people, 1 million people, 5 million people, 10 million people, 20 million people—25 million people have died since I first saw it; that is, HIV/AIDS, a tiny virus. You can't see it, touch it, taste it. We didn't have it in America. We didn't know what it was, and then it hit. Now 25 years later, 25 million people around the globe have died from that little, tiny virus. We don't have a cure for it yet. We don't have a vaccine for it yet, but we have made huge medical progress over the last 10 years.

Two days ago, the FDA announced that they had approved the world's first single-pill, once-a-day HIV/AIDS treatment. The bill combines three FDA-approved drugs into a single dose. The impact on HIV/AIDS patients will be profound.

It wasn't that long ago that patients had to take 20 pills a day and then 10 pills a day to control the virus, this little tiny virus, not to get rid of it totally but to keep it down so it doesn't have its ravaging impact on the human body. Some pills you have to take with food, some at 8 o'clock, some at 2 o'clock, some at 6 o'clock, some at 10 o'clock. Some people say it is not that big a deal; it is lifesaving. It is a big deal. If you are a patient having to do it or a physician taking care of a patient who is taking this regimen, it is hard to comply with that regimen long term. It is inconvenient, it disrupts life, and now it is combined into one pill.

By the end of next week, people will be able to control the virus with one pill. Not only does it simplify the prescription regimen of HIV/AIDS patients, but to quote a fellow commissioner, Acting Commissioner of the FDA, Andrew von Eschenbach:

Compliance with therapy is as important as the therapy itself for a successful outcome.

To have a successful outcome, HIV/AIDS patients have to take at least 95 percent of their pills or the treatment doesn't take. It isn't as if you can take 2 or 3 of the 15 pills and it will work. You have to really take just about all of them. Only one pill a day increases the likelihood of a patient meeting that threshold. That one pill will do the trick. Not only does improved compliance keep HIV/AIDS patients healthy, but it helps slow down that emergence and transmission of strains of virus that have become drug-resistant. The drugs you take over a period of time—the virus is smart, it is cagey, it moves around, and it will develop resistance to those drugs as it comes in. As it gets accustomed to the drugs, the virus will lead to death.

Scientists hail this as a medical breakthrough for good reason. Wednesday's announcement approving the new pill was timely. Yesterday, the CSIS Task Force on HIV/AIDS hosted a conference to examine the sustainability of United States-led efforts in combating the virus. I have cochaired the CSIS task force along with my colleague, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD. I had the opportunity, as did Senator FEINGOLD, to deliver opening remarks to that conference.

Looking back over the 25 years, as we did yesterday, I recalled the same story.
new trend. I think the computer industry learned this collaborative effort a long time ago, and I am pleased that the pharmaceutical industry is catching on to it, as demonstrated today.

I will close with that final thought because it does remind me how important it is to put the patient first. They did this yesterday by developing this pill, having the FDA to approve this particular pill. We need to do that throughout our health care system. We do have a health care system that is chaotic in terms of its organization; it is not really even a system; it is more of a sector.

If we can go back to that principle of putting the patient first, putting the patient in the center, we can weed out the waste and weed out the inefficiency and lower the cost and make a very optimistic future for our health care system.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today’s Executive Calendar: No. 735, No. 736, and No. 761.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION


Jon Wellinghoff, of Nevada, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2010.

Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I see none of my colleagues on the floor at this juncture who want to speak, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I came to the floor of the Senate and announced everything in my power to block consideration of the major communications overhaul legislation until it includes language that specifically ensures what is called Net neutrality.

Now, since this is a new concept, and certainly much of the country probably has not heard these words before and Senators have been asking questions about it, I am going to begin this morning, and intend on other instances to continue this discussion, to start talking about why Net neutrality is so important and why I will do everything in my power to block legislation, major communications legislation, unless it ensures that Net neutrality is preserved.

The bottom line about this concept is pretty simple. It means there will not be discrimination on the Internet. Today, after you pay your access charge, your Internet access fee, you get to take your browser and you get to go where you want, when you want, and everybody is treated the same: the mightiest person in the land, the most affluent, and somebody, say, in rural Georgia, or rural Oregon who does not have a lot of power and does not have a lot of wealth.

The Internet has been a huge step forward, in my view, for democracy, for the proposition our country is based on which is everybody a fair shake, where everybody is treated equally. It has meant a real bonanza for our citizens in areas such as education, health, business—a whole host of fields. There needs to be a clear policy preserving the neutrality of the Internet. And without tough sanctions against those who would discriminate online, in my view, the Internet would be changed forever, for the worse. I intend to do everything in my power to keep that from happening.

Since I came to the floor to announce that I will do everything I can to block this legislation in its current form, the phone companies and the major communications lobbies in this country have launched an all-out advertising blitz. They are now spending millions of dollars trying to win passage of this legislation that does not include protection for Net neutrality. They are spending millions of dollars, so they can make billions of dollars when they implement a two-tiered system online.

They have been telling Wall Street about their plans for some time. The Wall Street Journal, for example, outlined this past week, the phone companies and the cable companies have been talking about in a fairly open kind of fashion.

All this discussion suggests there is something of a looming shortage of bandwidth. Of course, bandwidth is the speed at which all the information on the Web travels to the user. But what has not been given enough attention thus far, and which I will talk about this morning and in the days ahead, is that the real Net neutrality fight is not primarily over bandwidth but who is going to call the shots in this country about content on the Web. Content is all the information that is out there on the Web. It includes music, movies, e-mails, newspaper articles and Web sites.

Bandwidth speeds are getting faster and faster, allowing all this content to reach the users faster. But bandwidth without content is akin to a swimming pool without water. It is there, but you cannot do anything with it. So the real Net neutrality fight is going to be about content.

Now, those who control the pipes—the way you get to the Internet—also want to control the content. The reason for that is because content is king. What good is one gigabyte Internet connection if you cannot get to the Web sites you want to visit? Legislation that does not include neutrality protections will mean the American people will face discrimination in content.

The Internet has thrived precisely because it is free of discrimination. It has thrived because it has not been dominated by some huge cable or phone company, get to choose what they want to see and how quickly they get to see it. I do not think there is anything odd about fighting against a bill that will take control of the Internet away from the American people.

What the cable and phone executives propose is that instead of providing equal access for everyone to the same content, at the same price, they are going to be in a position to cut sweetheart deals, to give somebody they favor a better break than somebody whom they do not look upon in the same way. Those who own the pipes do not want to be told they cannot discriminate. They do not want to be told by the Congress, or anybody else, that they cannot control the Internet.

What I have done is tried to look at the Senate Commerce Committee legislation and compare it to the kinds of concerns I think the American people are going to have with the legislation in its current form. So what I would like to do now is outline three examples of what could happen in our country if communications legislation that allows discrimination on the Internet was allowed to go forward.

The first example involves what I am calling the Barns family. The Barns family owns a struggling electronics store. Sales have been hammered lately because a new "big box" electronics store opened up down the road. George Barns’ son Mike came up with an idea to save the store. He said: We can reach new customers. We will start a Web...
site to sell our products on the Net. In a world with Net neutrality, the Barns family would pay to access the Internet, create a Web page, and they would be off to the races with their business and looking for opportunities.

Under the Commerce Committee bill, in order for the Barns family to launch their Web page in the fast lane so they could get priority access to customers, they could have to pay an additional fee to hundreds, if not thousands, of Internet access providers across the land. Priority access fees are a drop in the bucket for that “big box” store that is already hurting the sales of that small business run by the Barns family. If the Barns family can’t pay the extra fees, they lose their business to the “big box” store, both offline and online. You see how small businesses and people who are trying to make a contribution to the economy compete in the free markets; you are going to see how they are going to have difficulty under this legislation.

The second example involves somebody whom I am calling Joe Green. Joe wants to get Internet broadband in his new apartment. Local cable is the only choice for broadband access, and it charges $32.99 for a 1.5-megabyte-second connection. In a world with Net neutrality, when Joe buys his connection from local cable, he gets to visit any Web site he wants, when he wants, how he wants. If Joe wants to upload a song, say, from iTunes for a buck, he can do that. If he wants to search the Web using Google or buy a DVD player online, Joe can do that, too. But under the legislation that came from the Commerce Committee, Joe may not be able to do any of those things unless he pays a new priority access charge on top of the $32.99 Internet access charge he is paying already. Unless he pays the additional priority fee, a Web search at Google could take 5 minutes to load because local cable is not paying the extra fee to local cable for priority access. Downloading a song—say the download Joe wants to make at iTunes—could cost him more than the buck he is paying because iTunes is passing on the cost of paying local cable the priority access fee that you could charge if the Commerce Committee bill goes forward as written. Joe wants to switch to another broadband provider but guess what. In a lot of communities, he has no choice. Joe is stuck. This is example No. 2 of how the American people are going to get hampered if discrimination is allowed online under this legislation.

Let me offer a third example I have developed as I looked at the Commerce Committee bill on overhauling our communications law. The third example involves somebody I have been calling Sally Smith. She is a young computer programmer. She has a great new algorithm for a Web browser that is going to help people access information on the Net faster and in a more user-friendly way. In a world with Net neutrality, Sally can get her idea all over the tech Web sites that exist across the country, and people are going to be able to test it out. If all the people out there in the tech world like Sally’s idea, word of her innovation would spread over the Web, across the land, and across the world. Millions of people could use this new Web browser. But under the legislation coming from the Commerce Committee, Sally Smith could be stymied.

In addition to what she is already paying over the Internet, Sally is going to have to come up with yet more money to pay for priority access to the Internet fast lane that she so desperately will want in order to test her idea. If she wants her browser to succeed, she is going to be forced to fork over new priority access fees because she knows no one is going to go looking in the slow lane for a good new Web browser.

I came to the floor—I have already announced my hold on this legislation, so I will do this bill until it ensures that the Net in the future will be free of discrimination—because I wanted to go beyond my original statement to talk about how, under this bill, those who own the pipes to the home and the cable people, could extend their reach under this legislation to put a stranglehold on Internet content. According to the business plans, plans that have been published in the Wall Street Journal, that is the direction in which we are headed.

Without Net neutrality, the people in these examples I have highlighted—a struggling entrepreneur, somebody getting started in their new home or apartment, a young computer programmer—are going to have real problems getting access to the Web and being able to afford the services that are now within their reach.

The big cable and phone lobbies want the put net neutrality is what they call a lose-lose proposition. My view is, no Net neutrality will be the real loss for consumers. It will mean double-barrel discrimination, discrimination in Internet content, and higher prices for the consumers. That is why scores of groups all across the country, all across the political spectrum—groups and people who, I dare say, disagree almost always—are united behind the proposition that the Internet should be free of discrimination.

We are going to hear a lot about this issue in the days ahead. We are going to be told constantly that the phone and cable people will not build out the network unless they can sock the consumer and the small businesses with higher access charges. The way the system works today, where there is a true free marketplace, where the mightiest is treated online in the same way as the weakest, is the way it should be. Net neutrality is the best way to grow the network, to expand communications opportunities, preserve the free marketplace so that people, after they pay that Internet access charge, can go where they want, when they want.

Certainly a lot of our competitors around the world, people with whom we will be competing in the marketplace, treat everybody the same online. I want to be competitive in the global marketplace if we start singling out, as I have described in the examples, the small businesses and entrepreneurs for what amounts to two-tiered communications services. They are not going to be able to compete. I want to be sure that somebody who is in a garage, say, in Texas, Oregon, or some other part of the country has the same opportunity to compete against people who are dreaming big in countries around the world.

As we discuss this communications issue, there will be a lot of talk about how this is a battle between big communications lobbies—say, the Verizon company and Google. It is sometimes portrayed as a fight between these overdogs, people who have a lot of clout and want to divide up the pie and get more for themselves. Verizon and Google can take care of themselves. They have deep pockets. They have lots of clout. But what I am concerned about are the future Googles, the people who are dreaming, the people with the startups, the people with innovative, cutting-edge ideas who have been able to go online and, as a result, have been successful. That is what the American dream is all about. That is what has made the Internet so exciting. It has created opportunities for those people who are a long way from major financial markets and who don’t have deep pockets.

I do not want to see the American people face double-barrel discrimination and higher prices on the Net. I don’t want to see them not have what they have today, which is a fair shake for all. Equal content gets equal treatment. I am going to stay at it with respect to this legislation as one Senator until we get true fundamental principles in the communications bill, until we ensure that the Net is free of discrimination.

The reason Net neutrality has become such a lightning rod in the debate about communications is that the Internet is the ball game. The 1996 tele-communications bill barely touched on the Net. In 2006, the Net neutrality debate on the Internet is the ball game because the Internet is how we are going to get all our communications in the future. It means we are going to look first to the Internet, and because it is so central to the future of communications, the Senate ought to insist that the Net be kept free of discrimination. We have done that in the area of taxation. I and other colleagues have the American people wave a lot of discriminatory taxes on the Internet. We ought to make darn sure that it is done in this area as well so that
consumers don’t get wallowed with un
necessarily high prices and deterio-
rating service.
I will continue the fight to hold up
this legislation until, for all time, the
Net is free of discrimination.
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cor-
yn), The Senator from Georgia.

IMMIGRATION
Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, for a
moment I wanted to address the sub-
ject of immigration before we leave for
the weekend.

About 2 months ago, I offered an
amendment to the Senate immigration
bill which at the time was referred to
as a deal-breaker. I want to suggest that
it is now being referred to as a
deal-maker. I wish to offer some sug-
gestions constructively for the Senate
to consider and others who are in-
volved in this debate.

I want to repeat, for the benefit of
everyone, what the amendment I of-
fered and the distinguished Presiding
Officer supported, as well as many
other Members of the Senate—not
enough but enough—we simply said: That no program contained in the
act that granted legal status to some-
one who was in America illegally could
take effect until the Secretary of
Homeland Security certified that all of
the border assurances proposed in the
act in title I and section 232 of
title II were in force, funded, and oper-
ational.

It has become known as a trigger be-
cause it said that any guest worker
program or any other reform that took
place could only take place after we
had done the job the American people
suggested we should do.

A lot of people said: We can’t secure
our border. If we can transplant hearts
and fly to the Moon, we can secure our
border. What we have needed is resolve.
I have been pleased to see just this
week countless articles in countless
newspapers where all of the players in
the debate, from the White House to
the Senate, the House of Representa-
tives, have now opened themselves to
discuss a trigger in the immigration re-
form bill to ensure that when we have
immigration reform, it is truly com-
prehensive because I would suggest to
them that in the absence of border se-
curit, there can be no comprehensive
reform.

Only when people know that the door
is closed will they cooperate with not
only the spirit but the letter of the law
and the reforms that we make.

Just to remind us in the Senate, we
were very specific in title I. The spe-
cifics of title I said we will train the
6,000 Border Patrol agents and put
them online. That takes 2 years to do.
It said we will build the barriers where
necessary geographically and the roads
where necessary. That is doable in 2
years. We will deploy the 27 UAVs, the
eyes in the sky, to surveil the entire
2,000-mile southwestern border. That is
doable, and it is doable within a year.
We will build the detention facilities to
end the catch-and-release practice and
to begin to have true enforcement on
the border. And we will have a
verification program for guest workers
that is fully verifiable and not forgable.
That takes 2 years. So as a
practical matter, as people have
backed up from the original debate,
they have looked forward. They now
are seeing through the forest to look at
the trees, and they say, yes, if we se-
cure the border, it will take 2 years,
but it is going to take 2 years to imple-
ment whatever else we would do on
worker reform as well.

So folks are coming together. People
are beginning to talk, and I am pleased
with that—pleased with that because
I am the grandson of an immigrant who
came to this country, became a natu-
rized citizen, and I honor our immi-
gration process. I am glad to see that
because we depend on a workforce that
is vibrant and alive. As I am
pleased to hear that because I believe
the American people consider our bor-
der an emergency. And now that all the
players are beginning to talk, hope-
fully, we can close the deal.

Mr. President, I offered the distin-
guished Senator from Alabama, Mr.
Sessions, offered two amendments to
the Homeland Security bill. Although
they failed, they laid the groundwork
for what I think is an important step
for us to take: that is, to go ahead
and move forward with what all of us
agree are the necessary steps for border
security. That is the foundation upon
which we can reach the final agree-
ments on guest worker, on green cards,
on quotas, and on citizenship, but only
after the American people are con-
vinced we have made the commitment
to secure our border will the American
people want us to make any deal on re-
form of immigration.

We proposed emergency supplementals
for various things in this body. We have
done it in response to Katrina; we have
done it in response to Iraq. I submit
the American people would tell you
there is no greater emergency than se-
curing our border. If the White House
sent an emergency supplemental to
this Senate for the money to fund the
UAVs, the 6,000 Border Patrol agents,
and the rest of title I, I doubt we would
see maybe one or two dissenters be-
cause everyone knows it is an emer-
gency, they know it needs to be done.
And if it is, in fact, correct, that border
security first is the trigger for com-
prehensive reform which is necessary,
then let’s declare it an emergency.
Let’s put it the proposal for the
floor, let’s do it now, and let’s fund it,
so as the year progresses, as the hear-
ings are done, as we come back in ses-
ion in September, we in this Congress
can deal with comprehensive reform
built on the foundation of comprehen-
sive border security.

Mr. President, I appreciate your co-
operation and that of all the colleagues
in this body as we work dealing with a
very difficult and complicated but a
very doable reform of our immigration
laws. I appreciate the commitment of
those so far in border security first,
and I think in the end all of us to-
gether—the executive and legislative
branches—can come together on com-
prehensive reform that is built on se-
curing our border to ensure the reforms
we make are lasting and agreed to.

I yield the floor and suggest the ab-
scence 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 728

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will soon
ask for several unanimous consent re-
quests and then probably go back into
a quorum call for a bit, and I will
have a statement on stem cells that
will be very brief.

Mr. President, as I mentioned this
morning, there has been an objection
to proceeding on the unanimous con-
sent request of last night, or late yest-
eryard afternoon, on the Water Re-
sources Development Act. At this
point, I want to turn my attention to
that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent that at a time to be determined by
the majority leader, in consultation
with the Democratic leader, on Tues-
day July 18, the Senate proceed to the
immediate consideration of Calendar
No. 93, S. 728.

I further ask that the committee-re-
ported amendments be withdrawn and
the managers’ substitute amendments
at the desk be agreed to as original
text for the purposes of further amend-
ment and that the only other amend-
ments in order be the following, the
text of which is at the desk, with the
specified time agreements equally di-
vided in the usual form:

Boxer, Folsom Dam, 1 hour; Feing-
gold-McCain, mitigation standards, 1
hour; Feingold-McCain, peer review, 4
hours; Inhofe-Bond, independent re-
views, 1 hour; Inhofe, fiscal trans-
parency, 1 hour; McCain-Feingold,
prioritization report, 2 hours; McCain-
Feingold, chief of engineers, 1 hour;
Nelson of Florida, water projects, 1
hour; Specter, Federal hopper dredges, 1
hour.

I ask unanimous consent that there be
2 hours of general debate on the bill,
and that following the disposition of
amendments and the use or yielding
back of time, the bill, as amended, be
read the third time and the Senate pro-
ceed with the consideration of Calendar
No. 166, H.R. 2864, the House com-
panion, and that all after the enacting
clause be stricken, and the text of S.
728, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage, and S. 728 be returned to the Senate calendar. I further ask that no points of order be waived by virtue of this agreement.

The acting President pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, I understand there was an inadvertent clerical error in Chairman Inhofe’s statement in the Congressional Record last night. I ask unanimous consent that the correct statement be printed in the Congressional Record at this point and that the permanent Record reflect this correction.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if the unanimous consent request goes through, we will be able to move to the Water Resources Development Act of 2006, WRDA. We have not done that since the year 2000. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have been working on this for 3 years. We have had incredible cooperation, as everybody in the Chamber knows. It is always difficult to get something like this through, but it is necessary to keep this country moving.

All members of the Environment and Public Works Committee: Senators Thune, DeMint, Vitter, Warner, Isakson, Chafee, Murkowski, Senator Voinovich, Jeffords, Baucus, Lieberman, Boxer, Carper, Clinton, Lautenberg, and Obama have been particularly helpful. Senator Bond, who is chairman of the subcommittee, has been very helpful, along with Senator Voinovich who has a concern for maintaining our Nation’s infrastructure.

The big four in this case, of course, would be Senators Bond, Baucus, Jeffords, and myself. We have worked closely together to overcome some of the obstacles. Early on, there were problems on this bill because it is complicated. It is one that almost is of the magnitude of the Transportation reauthorization bill. But we had several people who have worked with them, including Senator Snowe, who was nice enough to help us with some of the facets she had objections to; Senator Sessions; Senator McCain. Everybody was there working together. It was quite an undertaking to get us to the point where we are today.

I will single out several others. Senator Gregg had some concerns also. Probably one of the persons I was really grateful to work with is Senator Feingold, the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank him for his cooperation. He had a number of amendments that I thought would be more than we could really handle. We had to get the number down to a certain number that is workable so we could have a time agreement to get this bill passed. I thank Senator Feingold for his cooperation and for agreeing to offer limited amendments under short time agreements. If he wasn’t willing to get along with, he could have had long agreements and this would have gone into many nights. He didn’t do that. He agreed to short time agreements, which it is not easy to do. It is possible to use his willingness to work with us is very much appreciated by me.

Over the past few months, he consistently has been helpful and responsive in working on the WRDA bill. For anyone to suggest that Senator Feingold has not been helpful in keeping things moving would be wrong. He has been a great partner with me in moving things forward and I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his cooperation.

We have a lot that we need to authorize the Corps of Engineers to do in navigation, flood control and environmental restoration. This bill will allow us to do that. I thank everybody for his or her cooperation. Let’s go forward.

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, especially Chairman Inhofe, for, as I mentioned this morning, doing an outstanding job in putting together a package, a mechanism by which we can develop this important water resources development bill. It is a very important bill which affects the United States, our economy, our infrastructure, in a very dramatic way.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. Feingold. Because all amendments that can be considered to S. 728, the Water Resources Development Act of 2006, had to be filed prior to the bill coming to the floor, I would like to inquire of the bill managers whether or not they would agree with me that reasonable modifications by the authors to their amendments would be acceptable as a matter of practice.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator is correct. We asked Senators to agree to a procedure that limits amendments and have requested that they file them in advance. Because these amendments have been filed prior to floor consideration, I would agree that it may be necessary to modify them once we are given floor time.

Mr. Jeffords. Mr. Chairman, I see that as a possibility and would, with the concurrence of the four bill managers, support reasonable modifications to be allowable.

Mr. Bond. As the subcommittee chairman and co-sponsor of two amendments to be considered, I foresee that possibility and would not object to reasonable modifications to the filed amendments.

Mr. Baucus. I agree with my fellow bill managers.

Mr. Feingold. I thank the managers and agree with them.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. Dodd. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill. The Senate passed this measure yesterday unanimously and I voted in support of it.

I would like to begin by thanking the principal authors and managers of this legislation: Senator Grassley and Senator Byrd. It is no easy task to write a bill that provides for our domestic security needs. I commend both of our colleagues and their staffs for the hard work they put into crafting this legislation.

The bill that passed the Senate funds our country’s homeland security activities at $32.8 billion for the upcoming fiscal year. These activities include port security, rail security, truck security, aviation security, emergency first responders, customs and border patrol, immigration, the Coast Guard, and counterterrorism research. Taken together, these initiatives form the foundation upon which our country depends for its internal security.

In an age when terrorism continues to be a growing threat to our Nation, one would think that the Congress of the United States would be doing everything it could to shore up that foundation—to make it as impregnable as possible against those who wish us harm. Yet when we look at the legislation passed by the Senate, I do not believe it does enough to protect our people from terrorism. We are simply not investing the resources that are required to make this Nation as safe as possible. Instead of filling in the gaps that continue to exist within our homeland security foundation, we are letting those gaps and cracks grow in several critical respects.

One does not have to look further than protecting our critical infrastructure and funding our emergency first responders. These two areas arguably form the backbone of our efforts to prevent and effectively respond to terrorist attacks at home. They encompass protecting our ports, our railroads, our transit systems and our commercial vehicles. They encompass quickly and effectively responding to real or perceived threats in all parts of our country.

The bill that passed the Senate spends roughly $4 billion to protect our critical infrastructure, and funding our emergency first responders, an assist local governments in planning and coordinating their homeland security activities. While this may seem like a large number to many Americans, it has been cited by numerous national security and public health experts, along with first responders themselves, as being wholly inadequate to meet the homeland security demands of the 21st century. Furthermore, the number is actually less than what has been provided in the past. While on par with what was provided last year, it is approximately $500 million less than what was provided 2 years ago and approximately $700 million less than 3 years ago. Clearly, we are heading in the wrong direction—doing less to protect our country adequately when we ought to be doing more.

As we have seen in Madrid 2 years ago, in London last year, in India earlier this week, and in Iraq almost every week, terrorists have become adept at exploiting weaknesses in our infrastructure, particularly transportation systems. I question what it will take for us to realize that we need to
be investing more in our domestic critical infrastructure and in our first responders.

Although we have taken steps to boost our homeland security since the attacks on September 11, our critical infrastructure has largely endured and our emergency first responders are spread too thin. Our port authorities have identified $8.4 billion for meeting Federal security requirements; transit agencies have identified $6 billion for making subways and buses safer for passengers; and firefighters have identified over $4 billion for performing their critical duties safely and efficiently.

As the Senate considered this legislation, I was offered an amendment that increased resources to our Nation’s firefighters by $25 million above the bill’s allocation of $655 million. This amendment was cosponsored by colleagues, Senators DeWine, Mikulski, and Snowe, and was agreed to by unanimous consent.

I also offered an amendment that would have increased critical infrastructure security and first responder funding by $16 billion to a total of $20 billion. My amendment would have codified a recommendation made 3 years ago by our former colleague, Warren Rudman, along with a distinguished panel of national security, intelligence, military and public health officials.

Regrettably, this measure—along with other measures I supported seeking to raise resources for critical infrastructure protection and first responders—were not adopted. Members who spoke in opposition to these amendments argued that we could not afford the extra cost. Ironically, many of the Members who opposed these amendments have supported permanent tax cuts for the most affluent of Americans—tax cuts that have been projected to cost $1 trillion over the next 15 years. If we can afford to give $1 trillion in a generous tax break to the few thousand wealthiest Americans, then why can we not afford adequately to safeguard 281 million Americans from terrorist attacks at a mere fraction of that cost?

We are living in extraordinary times. Never before in our history has there been a prolonged period of time when the threat of harm to Americans on their own soil has been so high. While it has almost 5 years since terrorists attacked the World Trade Center, the more recent attacks in Madrid, London, and Mumbai tell us that we must remain vigilant about our domestic security. They tell us that we must renew and redouble our efforts to prevent and respond to terrorism here at home.

On balance, I voted for this legislation because the funding it appropriates does take important steps towards meeting our domestic security needs. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming years to find and provide the necessary resources that can make our Nation as safe and strong as it can possibly be.

FEMA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, earlier this week, I voted with a bipartisan majority of Senators to strengthen FEMA while leaving it in the Department of Homeland Security. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the woeful response of the Federal Emergency Management Administration, I was prepared to remove FEMA from the Department of Homeland Security. At the time, it was clear that FEMA had been stripped of necessary resources and leadership, and that, as a result of these choices, it had failed the citizens of the gulf coast.

I changed my mind and voted to strengthen FEMA for three important reasons. First, the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee conducted extensive hearings and overwhelmingly rejected the proposal to strip FEMA of its identity, the Administration, I was told by the catastrophe of Katrina and how to fix this systemic failure. They conducted a 7-month investigation, including 23 hearings, heard testimony from 65 witnesses, interviewed 325 individuals, and reviewed 18,000 pages. They obviously did their homework.

Second, as a result of this exhaustive research, they made substantive proposals to strengthen the role of FEMA within the Department of Homeland Security. These changes will provide new statutory protections to ensure that the Administrator had direct access to the President, that it restores authorities to work directly with State and local agencies, and that it strengthens regional authorities by creating teams to foster cooperation and joint training for local emergency managers and first responders.

The final, and most important, reason that I decided to vote to strengthen FEMA as a component of the Department of Homeland Security is because of the position of local law enforcement and first responders. The bottom line is that I have spent my career working with the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Troopers Coalition, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the Major Cities Chief, and local first responders. I strongly value the opinions of these individuals, and if they believe that this is the right approach to help them in their efforts to save lives, I am willing to give it a shot.

I hope that the changes voted for by the vast majority of Senators earlier this week will return FEMA to its vaunted status of the 1990s. The American people deserve no less.

RECENT ATTACKS ON ISRAEL

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to offer my full support of Israel’s decision to defend itself. I also commend U.N. Ambassador John Bolton for vetoing the U.N. Security Council resolution addressing the situation in the Middle East, because of its unbalanced approach to the situation.

Unfortunately, due to the kidnapping of Israeli soldiers by Hamas and the continued rocket attacks by Hamas and Hezbollah against Israeli towns and villages, the Israeli Government was forced to defend itself. There is no doubt that the Governments of Syria, Lebanon, and Iran are responsible for these attacks. These Governments provide the military equipment, training, and financing for Hamas and Hezbollah to carry out their terror campaigns. Their continued support for these terrorist organizations has left the Israeli Government with no other option than to defend itself by pursuing terrorist safe havens in Gaza and Lebanon.

Israel continues to be one of America’s closest allies, and in this period of terror against the Israeli people it is essential that we support Israel’s decision to defend itself against these terrorist attacks. I ask that the worldwide community join in solidarity with Israel as it takes necessary steps to provide security to its people and dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas and in southern Lebanon.

Israel was attacked for one reason—these terror organizations and some governments in the region believe Israel does not have a right to exist as a country, much less peacefully as a country. The unprovoked missile launches against Israel citizens, suicide bombings of women and children, and the kidnapping and torture of Israeli soldiers is the result of Iran, Syria, and certain factions of the Lebanese Government’s inaction towards these terrorist organizations in their country.

The cycle of violence can only end if these countries dismantle these terrorist groups by funding and prohibiting terrorist organizations from participating in their governments. Otherwise, Israel will be required to continue defending itself against terrorist strongholds, and innocent civilians will suffer greatly—all of this because certain extreme elements remain bent on destruction rather than reconciliation.

Israel is a sovereign country that deserves to live in peace. Israel deserves to live in peace, free from the attacks of those who prey upon its open and democratic society. Unfortunately, innocent civilians are ones who pay the price on both sides of the conflict. Yet, Israel is able to stand up against the Iran nuclear program, missile attacks, kidnappings, and suicide bombers the unfortunate reality is that suffering will continue.

Mr. President, I believe that the United States should and must support Israel’s right to defend itself. I hope that my colleagues will join me in expressing their support for one of our closest allies.
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to express my outrage at the terrorist actions of Hezbollah that we have seen in recent days.

As my colleagues are aware, this terrorist group conducted raids across Israel's border, kidnapping two Israeli soldiers, and also killed eight other Israeli soldiers. The stability in the region has been significantly compromised because of these terrorist actions.

These attacks on the sovereign nation of Israel are reprehensible, they are unacceptable, and they are not going unanswered. Israel has said it will not negotiate with terror organizations, and has demanded the release of its soldiers.

The United States must stand by Israel as it defends itself against such cowardly attacks. Israel has not only the right, but the responsibility to defend its citizens.

And there is certainly no doubt that Syria and Iran support the terrorist actions of Hezbollah. In fact, the latest State Department report on terrorism identifies Iran and Syria as state sponsors of terrorism. We will continue to wage the global war on terror, to do our best to rid the world of terrorists and those who support them.

But when acts of terrorism are perpetrated against sovereign nations, the international community must recognize that such nations will protect themselves and their citizens, as it is their right to do.

I extend my sympathy to the families of the Israeli soldiers who have been killed in these attacks and pray for the safe return of those captured.

TRIGGER LOCKS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, safe storage and child access prevention laws are crucial steps in the effort to reduce the occurrence of accidental shootings and suicides involving guns. Such tragedies have claimed the lives of thousands of young people and destroyed thousands of families, even though many of these occurrences could have been prevented by commonsense legislation.

A study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that the application of responsible gun storage measures can significantly reduce the risk of unintentional shooting or suicide by minors using a gun. According to the study, when ammunition in the home is locked up, the risk of such injuries is reduced by 61 percent. Simply storing ammunition separately from the gun reduces such occurrences by more than 50 percent.

According to the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, teenagers and children are involved in more than 10,000 accidental shootings in which nearly 800 people die each year. Reducing the number of accidental shootings involving children and teenagers requires that commonsense gun storage measures be adopted.

In 2005, Congress passed a law, which the President signed, requiring that all handguns sold by a dealer come with a child-safety lock. It was a clear bipartisan effort to protect the youth of this country and their parents. Unfortunately, last month the House of Representatives adopted legislation to repeal effective enforcement of this requirement as part of its Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The Senate has not yet voted its version of the appropriations bill.

Sarah Brady, wife of Jim Brady, who according to the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, was the White House aide who had his skull fractured in the 1981 assassination attempt on President Reagan, responded to last month's vote by saying:

In a nation where gun violence takes such an enormous toll, this vote is disturbingly backward. Every year more than 30,000 Americans are killed by guns, including more than 2,800 young people. Every day, we lose a classroom of children to gun violence. So many health advocates, law enforcement officials, and others have urged Americans to more safely secure and store guns. But in the millions of American homes where children and firearms are present, 40 percent had at least one unlocked firearm.

While the problems of youth suicide and accidental shooting clearly cannot be completely legislated away, trigger locks and other sensible gun safety measures can help limit access to firearms by children, and there can be no doubt that reducing access by our kids to firearms can save many lives.

REGULATING PAYROLL TAX DEPOSIT AGENTS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I have previously introduced a bill to regulate payroll tax deposit agents. This bill will help to protect small businesses from payroll tax fraud. It will provide them with greater confidence when working with payroll service providers that are registered with the Internal Revenue Service and bonded or audited.

In the fall of 2003, small businessman Roger Cyr, the owner of the Lily Moon Cafe in Saco, ME, learned that he was the victim of payroll tax fraud and owed $52,000 in back taxes. He was one of a number of small business owners in Maine who were forced to pay their payroll taxes twice after an unscrupulous payroll provider ran off with their required payments to the IRS.

Unfortunately, I know that this type of payroll fraud is not unique to Maine and has also occurred in Utah, Iowa, as well as elsewhere. When payroll tax fraud occurs, many small manufacturers, mom-and-pop companies, and other businesses are forced to pay their payroll taxes twice. This additional and unexpected expense can drive many of these companies out of business.

These payroll fraud cases obscure the fact that most small businesses use payroll providers that are honest, meticulous, and trustworthy. The majority of payroll tax agents pay their clients' taxes accurately and on time, provide outstanding service, and help their clients with a range of complicated tax and accounting issues. In order to protect small business owners from the few dishonest payroll providers, and to protect the honest small payroll providers from the bad actors in their industry, I have introduced the payroll tax deposit agent's bill.

The bill contains several provisions designed to guard small business owners against fraud by increasing the IRS' oversight of the payroll service providers. The bill creates a separate section of the Internal Revenue Code that will govern the payroll industry. It defines the responsibilities of payroll tax deposit agents, and requires all agents to register with the IRS or be penalized. The bill requires payroll agents to inform their clients of the clients' continued liability for all payroll taxes and the clients' need to periodically verify that the payroll tax is paid in full. The bill penalizes payroll providers that collect but fail to make required payments by extending section 6672 penalties to all payroll tax agents.

These provisions also provide some reasonable flexibility to small payroll service providers. The bill provides a choice between obtaining a surety bond or submitting to a third party audit that verifies if a payroll company's books are solid and well managed.

Many small payroll service providers prefer audit option, which confirms that the payroll agent is making their client's tax deposit completely and on time, over bonding—as surety bonds can be very difficult for many small businesses to obtain. Additionally, small payroll agents argue that a third party audit actually gives their clients more protection against fraud than bonding because the audit verifies the payroll agent's sound financial practices while a surety bond only provides a limited reimbursement in cases of wrongdoing.

Many of these payroll tax agent provisions were already approved by the Senate Finance Committee as part of the Good Government Act. The Good Government Act was approved by the Senate Finance Committee and passed the Senate by unanimous consent agreement in May of 2004. Unfortunately, the Good Governance Act never made it out of conference. Now, as I introduce this bill, I am hoping that we can help protect our small businesses by seeing that these necessary payroll protections become law.

I urge my colleagues to help protect our small businesses from devious payroll tax agents by increasing IRS oversight and protections as contained in this bill.
IMPROVING OUTCOMES OF CHILDREN AFFECTED BY "METH"
ACT OF 2006

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Senate has passed an important bill, Chairman GRASSLEY’s Improving Outcomes for Children Affected by Meth. This legislation will reauthorize the Safe and Stable Families Program and target $40 million in new funding to programs to help children affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction.

West Virginia, like all too many States, is facing severe problems with a methamphetamine epidemic. There is by all reports a rapid spread and growth of this pernicious addiction. SAMHSA reports that methamphetamine abuse has increased more than 420 percent for persons 12 years and older during the past decade. And according to a well-cited National Association of Counties survey, the epidemic is no longer targeting rural States like my own. Much to my dismay we are finding addicts in suburban high schools as well as urban areas. Addicts are white and blue collar workers and the unemployed who are in their twenties. Use is equally divided among males and females.

The legislation offered today is part of the reauthorization for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Programs. Our child welfare system relies on the principles and services mandated by Safe and Stable Families Programs. I have wholeheartedly worked on this program since its inception in 1993. I have continued over the years to support modifications that fit the changing needs of the children.

It is essential that our most vulnerable children remain safe and that they not become the victims of our criminal justice system. As one newspaper wrote, "what the system needs is a child advocate who will take the role of the child's best friend and will have the authority to intervene on behalf of the children." And that is what we are offering today.

This bill creates new competitive grants to support regional partnerships that provide services to children who are affected by their caretakers’ methamphetamine abuse. And it reserves $40 million to fund these grants.

I know that these grants are not a cure-all, but this legislation is a firm step in the right direction in several ways. First, regional demonstration projects can further identify intervention models that are showing some good results. We also are on the mark when we encourage community health care providers, law enforcement agencies, judges, and statewide child welfare agencies to work together to form more coherent and efficient partnerships. These grants can target innovative prevention programs that reach at-risk children before out-of-home placements are necessary. Finally the grants are available for innovative family-based programs, comprehensive long-term treatment services, and counseling for the children. It is good that the Senate has passed this legislation, and we need to work with the House to secure passage of a final bill that can be signed into law by the President this year.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, a serious and, at times, deadly form of physical and emotional interpersonal violence is alarmingly pervasive in our Nation today. It transcends race, socio-economic condition, and community size. It is domestic abuse, and it happens every day in teen dating relationships. Like domestic violence to which it is a precursor, teen dating violence is something our society is finally talking about openly. A major driver of this public conversation is visual media, specifically, television.

I am proud to say that a high school in Eagle, ID, on the leading edge of this awareness effort, Organizers of a teen dating violence awareness and prevention summit in Boise reached out to the Office of the Hole Media Department asking for its participation in the summit. Taking up the challenge, media instructor Jim Seaney and his students produced a series of public service announcements, PSA, dealing with the crime of teen dating violence from the perspective of teens.

I featured one of the five segments on my monthly live townhall meeting, Capitol Watch, and at a national press conference in February kicking off National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week. Well-scripted, professionally produced, and riveting in their directness and simplicity, each PSA confronts the viewer with the reality of teen dating violence. The message is clear: teen dating violence exists—and in relationships and places you would never suspect.

Without any further acclaim, these productions stand as a tremendous accomplishment. But, I am pleased to say that they were recently selected as the winning entry to the 2005-2006 National Student Television Award for Excellence, Hubbard Family Public Affairs/Community Service/Public Service Project. I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Jim Seaney and his students, Bethany Ross, Cody Bolken, Robert O’Neal, Tommy Sauriol, Sabra Wiltanen, John Adkins, Natalie Volarich, Chase Gronowski, Vianey Conchas, Abby Sauriol, Jeremiah Mitchell, and Jim’s daughter Aubree who also acts in one of the segments. I thank them for the time and effort they took to make the crime of teen dating violence something that families, schools, communities and a nation talks about. These conversations open the door to truth and healing now and healthy, respectful relationships for life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE LIFE OF FRANK ZEIDLER

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I join the city of Milwaukee and the entire State of Wisconsin in mourning the loss of Mayor Frank Zeidler. When he passed away on July 7, Wisconsin lost one of its most principled and progressive leaders.

Mayor Zeidler was born in 1912 in Milwaukee, WI, and lived there throughout his life. He grew up in the Merrill Park neighborhood on the city’s west side and attended Marquette University and the University of Chicago. In addition to his long career in public service to the city of Milwaukee, Zeidler read relentlessly, loved statistics, collected fossils, and rewrote Shakespeare.

Mayor Zeidler served in public office for more than 20 years and is widely known as Milwaukee’s last socialist mayor. His career in public service began in 1938 when he was first elected to public office as county surveyor, and he then went on to serve for 7 years on the Milwaukee School Board.

Then in 1946, he was elected to serve as mayor of the city of Milwaukee, a position he would hold for over a decade. When he took office, his goal was...
MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 14, 2006, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:
S.J. Res. 40. An act authorizing the printing and binding of a supplement to, and revised edition of, Senate Procedure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on the Budget, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:
S. 3521. A bill to establish a new budget process consisting of an annual executive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process (Rept. No. 109-283).

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. BENNETT (for himself, and Mr. JOHNSON):
S. 3660. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to establish a new disclosure statement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. PRYOR):
S. 3663. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the maximum amount for international trade loans, to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to assign an international finance specialist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. PRYOR):
S. 3664. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve assistance after a major disaster, to authorize emergency bridge loans, to increase bridge loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:
S. 3665. A bill to extend temporarily the suspension of duty on certain ceramic knives; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. NELSON of Florida:
S. 3666. A bill to amend the Florida National Forest Land Management Act of 2003 to authorize the conveyance of an additional tract of National Forest System land under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
By Mr. JIST (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BROWNBACK):
S. 3667. A bill to promote nuclear non-proliferation in North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:
By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANS, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. FRIED)
S. Res. 320. A resolution calling on President George W. Bush and other leaders attending the 2006 Group of Eight (G-8) Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia, to engage in a frank dialogue with the President of Russia concerning actions of the Russian Federation that appear inconsistent with the Group’s objectives of protecting global security, economic stability, and democracy, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.
By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BOND, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. TALENT, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. CANTWELL): S. Res. 331. A resolution urging the President to appoint a Presidential Special Envoy for Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. ISAKSON): S. Res. 332. A resolution encouraging the adults of the United States to support, listen to, and encourage children so that they may reach their potential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 484 At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civil servants and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.
S. 2354 At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2354, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage gap in prescription drug coverage under part D of such title based on savings to the Medicare program resulting from the negotiation of prescription drug prices.
S. 2392 At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2392, a bill to promote the empowerment of women in Afghanistan.
S. 2465 At the request of Mr. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes.
S. 2491 At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal to Byron Nelson in recognition of his significant contributions to the game of golf as a player, a teacher, and a commentator.
S. 2992 At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware...
(Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2592, a bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve the nutrition and health of schoolchildren by updating the definition of "food of minimal nutritional value" to conform to current nutrition science and to protect the Federal investment in the national school lunch and breakfast programs.

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3656, a bill to provide additional assistance to combat HIV/AIDS among young people, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3656, a bill to require notice of security breaches, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3666, a bill to provide additional assistance to combat HIV/AIDS among young people, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 494, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the creation of refugee populations in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region as a result of human rights violations.

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Russian Federation should fully protect the freedoms of all religious communities without distinction, whether registered or unregistered, as stipulated by the Russian Constitution and international standards.

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Russian Federation should fully protect the freedoms of all religious communities without distinction, whether registered or unregistered, as stipulated by the Russian Constitution and international standards.

At the request of Mr. BROWNACK, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, supra.

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 599, a resolution designating July 13, 2006, as "National Summer Learning Day".

STATMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 3663. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the maximum amount of long-term, fixed-rate, collateralized export loan guarantees to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to assign an international finance specialist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the gulf coast has made good progress in rebuilding after last year's hurricanes. Our small businesses and entrepreneurs have led the way in this recovery. As all of my colleagues know small businesses are the engines of our economy driving innovation and growth.

Following Katrina and Rita, one problem for our business owners in the gulf coast has been access to long-term, fixed-rate, collateralized export loans to rebuild facilities and purchase equipment.

The Small Business International Trade Enhancement Act of 2006 is an important step to help our exporters compete in the global market. It now seems that the gulf coast has made good progress in rebuilding after last year’s hurricanes.

Mr. President, I realize that the need for export financing is not just limited to the gulf coast. There are small businesses throughout the country looking to find markets overseas. One tool that they can use is the SBA’s International Trade Loan, ITL, program. International trade loans can help exporters develop and expand overseas markets; upgrade equipment; and assist exporters that are being hurt by import competition. Exporters can borrow up to $2 million, with $1,750,000 guaranteed by SBA.

However, as currently structured these loans are not user-friendly to lenders or borrowers and, as a result, are underutilized. Let me explain what I mean. First, the $250,000 difference between the loan cap and the guarantee represents borrowers who take out a second SBA loan to take full advantage of the $2 million guarantee. ITLs can only be used to acquire fixed assets and not working capital, a common need for exporters. Furthermore, ITLs do not have the same collateral or refinancing requirements as SBA 7(a) loans. Because of these issues, lenders do not use these loans.

My legislation will reduce the paperwork by increasing the maximum loan guarantee to $2,750,000, with a loan cap to $3,670,000 to bring it more in line with the 7(a) program. This bill also creates a more flexible ITL by setting out that working capital is an eligible use for loan proceeds, in addition to making the ITL consistent with regular 7(a) loans by allowing the same collateral and refinancing terms as with 7(a).

The SBA international trade and export loans are valuable tools for exporters but they are useless if there is no one to assist borrowers with identifying which loans are right for them. Local lending institutions that specialize in export financing can help but an over supply of these institutions. The current group of finance specialists has obtained bank financing for more than $10 billion in U.S. exports since 1999. The $10 billion in export sales financed by these specialists has helped to create over 140,000 new, high-paying U.S. jobs.

The Small Business International Trade Enhancements Act of 2006 is an
important first step, not just for exporters in the gulf coast, but also for small businesses nationwide who are looking to open markets overseas. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation since it will help our exporters in the gulf coast recover and also give small businesses worldwide more options when they are seeking export financing.

I thank the Chair and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record, along with the accompanying material.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3683

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 "Small Business International Trade Enhancements Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "Administration" and "Administrator" mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof, respectively.

SEC. 3. INTERNATIONAL TRADE LOANS.

(a) INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS INTERNATIONAL TRADE ENHANCEMENTS.—Section 7(a)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking "$1,750,000, of which not more than $1,250,000" and inserting "$2,000,000, of which not more than $1,500,000"; and

(b) WORLDCAPITAL.—Section 7(a)(16)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(16)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "in—" and inserting "—);

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by inserting "in" after "(ii)"; and

(B) by striking "or" at the end;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) by inserting "in" after "(ii)"; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting "; or"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:


(1) by striking "Each loan" and inserting the following:

"(i) In General.—Except as provided in clause (ii), each loan;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) Exception.—A loan under this paragraph may be secured by a second lien position on the property or equipment financed by the loan or on other assets of the small business concern, if the Administrator determines such lien provides adequate assurance of the loan; and

(d) REFINANCING.—Section 7(a)(16)(A)(ii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(16)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting "), including any debt that qualifies for refinancing under any other provision of this subsection" before the period.

SEC. 4. GULF COAST EXPORT ASSISTANCE.

(a) INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS INTERNATIONAL TRADE STAFF.—The Administrator shall assign 1 additional full-time international finance specialist to the Office of International Trade and the Administration.

(b) LOCATION AND SERVICE AREA.—The international finance specialist assigned under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be based in New Orleans, Louisiana United States Export Assistance Center; and

(2) help to carry out the export promotion efforts described in section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649); and

(3) provide such services in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended by striking at the end the following:

"(b) In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall ensure that the number of full-time equity financing employees of the Office assigned to the one-stop shops referred to in section 2301(b) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721(b)) is not less than the number of such employees so assigned on January 1, 2006.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS INTERNATIONAL TRADE ENHANCEMENTS ACT OF 2006

Exports and international trade are important to the U.S. economy and will be key to the long-term recovery of the Gulf Coast. You take advantage of increased demand for products from the Gulf Coast, particularly Louisiana and Mississippi, small businesses in the Gulf require access to export financing through the Export-Import Bank, the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA), and in some cases, the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The SBA employs International Finance Specialists which work with borrowers and lenders to navigate the various Federal government export financing facilities.

Problem #1: Gulf Coast Export Financing Needs. Despite the increased need for export financing in the Gulf Coast, there is currently no International Finance Specialist located in any of the hardest hit states of Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana. Instead there is one specialist in Texas with responsibilities for Arkansas and Louisiana and one specialist in Georgia responsible for Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi. Due to the extensive territory and limited travel budgets of the staff, these specialists must divide their time and cannot focus on the needs of Gulf Coast small businesses. It is essential to have a Finance Specialist located on the Gulf Coast with a responsibility for the Gulf Coast.

Problem #2: Export Sales. Exporters for SBA International Finance Specialists. At a cost of less than $2 million per year, the current group of Finance Specialists has obtained over $50 billion in U.S. sales since 1999. The $10 billion in export sales financed by these specialists helped to create over 140,000 new, high-paying U.S. jobs. Despite these figures, this program is experiencing record staffing lows.

In particular, there are over 100 U.S. Export Assistance Centers nationwide, however as of July 10, 2006 there were only 15 Finance Specialists nationwide. This figure is the lowest staff levels ever for the program and is down from a peak of 22 Finance Specialists in January 1999.

Problem #3: International Trade Loan Prog. The SBA’s International Trade Loan Program (ITL) program is used by exporters to expand output, develop equipment or facilities to improve competitive position, or to assist exporters currently hurt by import competition. As currently structured, however, ITLs are not user friendly or relevant. This is because, with a maximum guarantee amount of $1.75 million and loan cap of $2 million, ITLs require the SBA to make a second loan to the borrower to make use of the maximum guarantee. These loans are also restricted for use for fixed assets and not working capital, which is a common need for exporters.

The Landrieu Small Business International Trade Enhancements Act of 2006 addresses these problems:

Gulf Coast International Finance Specialists. To help our exporters access export financing, this bill provides for an International Finance Specialist in the New Orleans who would be responsible for Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

International Trade Loans: To make this loan program more responsive, this bill increases the maximum loan guarantee amount to $2.75 million and specifies that the loan cap for ITLs is $3.67 million, as well as sets out that working capital is an eligible use for loan proceeds. The bill also makes ITLs consistent with regular SBA 7(a) loans in terms of allowing the same collateral and refinancing terms as with regular 7(a) loans.

International Finance Specialist Downsizing: To ensure that all smaller exporters nationwide will continue to have access to export financing, this bill establishes a floor of 16 International Finance Specialists.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 3694. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve assistance for exporters, to authorize emergency bridge loans, to extend disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
enhance SBA’s disaster assistance programs. In every disaster, the SBA Disaster Loan program is a lifeline for businesses and homeowners who want to rebuild their lives after a catastrophe. When Katrina hit, our businesses, and on our other bridges loans to hold them over until SBA was ready to process the tens of thousands of loan applications it received.

That is why this legislation provides the SBA Administrator with the ability to make emergency bridge loans of up to $150,000 to affected small businesses in a declared disaster area. These bridge loans will allow businesses to make payroll, begin making repairs, and address other immediate needs while they are awaiting insurance payouts or regular SBA disaster loans. However, I realize that every disaster is different and could range from a disaster on the scale of Hurricane Katrina or 9/11, to an ice storm or drought. My legislation gives the SBA additional flexibility and authority to provide the kinds of relief they can offer a community. When a tornado destroys 20 businesses in a small town in the Midwest, SBA can get the regular disaster program up and running fairly quickly. However, in a storm such as Katrina, SBA needs to move quickly and not make grant loans in this instance. But if you know that SBA’s resources would be overwhelmed by a storm—just as they were initially with Katrina—bridge loans would be very helpful.

My legislation also would expedite disaster loans for those businesses in a disaster area that have a good, solid track record with the SBA or can provide vital recovery efforts. We had many businesses in the gulf coast that had paid off their SBA loans, were major sources of employment in their communities, but had to wait months for decisions on their disaster loan applications. I do not want to get rid of the SBA’s current practice of reviewing applications on a first-come-first-served basis, but there should be some mechanism in place for major disasters to get expedited loans out the door to specific businesses that has a positive record with SBA or those that could serve as major economic engines that are not able to get access to other assistance. These grants will only go to business owners that certify their intent to reopen in the disaster area and pursue technical assistance to continue their operations.

Following Katrina, it is clear that disaster situations need to be updated to reflect current business needs and the average cost of housing today. The bill raises the cap on SBA disaster loans for businesses from $1.5 million to $2.25 million; the cap on SBA personal property loans from $50,000 to $250,000; and the cap on real property homeowner loans from $200,000 to $250,000. This bill also makes an important modification to the collateral requirements for disaster loans. The SBA cannot disburse more than $10,000 for an approved loan without showing collateral. This is to limit the loss to the SBA in the event that a loan defaults. However, this disbursement amount has not been increased since 1998 and these days, small businesses need to get a business up and running.

I was surprised to learn that the SBA did not have a full-time disaster planner on board before Katrina, nor did it have a comprehensive disaster response plan in place. While SBA is not a first-responder disaster agency like FEMA, they do hit the ground within days of a disaster strike. As the only Federal nonagricultural disaster lender, SBA should have an analytical, proactive plan in the event of a disaster. I pushed to get language in the recent hurricane supplemental appropriations bill to require SBA to develop a disaster plan and report to Congress on its contents by July 15, 2006. I look forward to this report. But writing a plan and making it work are two different things. SBA needs a full-time staff in place to ensure that this plan is implemented properly. My legislation directs the SBA to hire a full-time disaster planner to maintain this disaster response plan and to assist the SBA with its overall disaster preparedness, including coordination with other disaster response agencies like FEMA.

As we reflect next month on the 1 year anniversary of the worst natural disaster to hit our nation, now is the time for action—not words or empty promises. I want to be able to go back to my constituents and reassure them that if, God forbid, another natural disaster should hit my state or another part of the country, that the Small Business Administration is better prepared and more responsive to the needs of those impacted.

The Small Business Disaster Recovery Assistance Improvements Act will provide essential tools to make the SBA more proactive, flexible, and most important, more efficient during future disasters. In the coming weeks, I look forward to working with both Chairwoman Snows and Ranking Member Kennedy and the Small Business Committee to ensure that the SBA has everything it needs to meet these goals.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined on this legislation by the rank-

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE
This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Disaster Recovery Assistance Improvements Act of 2006”.

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS

Congress finds that—

(A) following the 2005 impact of Hurricane Katrina and Rita of 2005, due to initial Administration response issues, as well as extensive destruction in the region and wide distribution of affected business owners around the country—

(i) administration loan approvals took longer than 3 months, on average, for homeowner disaster loans, and longer than 2 months, on average, for business disaster loans; and

(ii) closings on disaster loans added an additional month to the process;

(B) the Administration requires new tools and authority to be more effective in responding to major disasters and to be responsive to the needs of affected small business concerns and homeowners, and to provide immediate operations.

(C) following the 2005 hurricanes in Florida, the Florida State Bridge Loan Program was a successful program in providing immediate capital to struggling businesses, providing 1,679 small business concerns with $35,400,000 in bridge loans;

(D) following the 2005 impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the Louisiana State Bridge Loan Program was a successful program in providing immediate capital to struggling businesses, providing 407 small business concerns with $9,750,000 in bridge loans;

(E) following the 2005 impact of Hurricane Wilma on the Florida Gulf Coast, the Florida State Bridge Loan Program was a successful program in providing immediate capital to struggling businesses, providing 593 small business concerns with $12,900,000 in bridge loans;
shall certify the intent of such borrower to participate in technical assistance consultation (either with a local small business development center or other technical assistance provider approved by the Administrator) before the borrower may utilize funds received under the loan.

(19) USE OF FUNDS.—A loan under this subparagraph as the Administrator determines appropriate to an eligible small business concern, to assist such small business concern in recovery from a major disaster.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO MAKE EXPEDITED 7(A) DISASTER LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(e)) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (2) the following:

"(7) in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina of 2005 and Hurricane Rita of 2005, small business development centers had difficulties entering and utilizing disaster recovery centers established by the Federal Government, resulting in delays of technical assistance service to affected businesses; and

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—After issuing guidelines under subsection (c), the Administrator may guarantee loans made under an approved State Bridge Loan Program.

(b) APPROVAL.—

(1) APPLICATION.—A State desiring approval of a State Bridge Loan Program shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Administrator may require.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Administrator may approve an application submitted under paragraph (1) based on such criteria as the Administrator may establish under this section.

(c) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall establish criteria under which a proposal for a State Bridge Loan Program shall be considered by the Administrator.

(2) THE GUIDELINES.—The Administrator shall provide, in consultation with such local small business development centers as the Administrator determines appropriate, a report on the use of funds under this subparagraph as the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out this paragraph.

(3) REPORT.—

The Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, guidelines regarding approved State Bridge Loan Programs.

"(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

"(I) EXPEDITED LOANS.—The term 'expedited loan' means a loan made in cooperation with a bank or other lending institution, the lender shall document for the Administrator how the borrower was directly adversely affected by the major disaster.

"(II) REPORTS.—

"(I) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—For any major disaster, not later than 6 months after the date on which such disaster is declared, the Inspector General of the Administration shall submit a report to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives regarding loans described in clause (vii) including verification that the program is being administered appropriately and that such loans are being used for purposes authorized by this subparagraph.

"(II) GAO.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which a final report for a major disaster is submitted by the Inspector General of the Administration, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the loan program authorized under this subparagraph and report to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives concerning loans of the review and any recommendations.

"(III) BUSINESS RECOVERY GRANTS.—

"(I) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'qualified small business concern' means a small business concern—

(1) in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States, the District of Columbia, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any territory, commonwealth, possession, or island area of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(2) that has been declared by the President to be a disaster area.

(3) in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina of 2005.

(4) in the aftermath of Hurricane Rita of 2005.

(5) is 18 months after the date on which such disaster is declared, and every 6 months thereafter until the date that is 18 months after the date on which such disaster is declared.

(6) that has been declared by the President to be a disaster area.

(7) in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina of 2005.

(8) Not later than 12 months after the date on which a final report for a major disaster is submitted by the Inspector General of the Administration, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the loan program authorized under this subparagraph and report to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives regarding loans of the review and any recommendations.

"(C) BUSINESS RECOVERY GRANTS.—

"(I) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'expedited loan' means an expedited loan made in cooperation with a bank or other lending institution, the lender shall document for the Administrator how the borrower was directly adversely affected by the major disaster.

"(II) REPORTS.—

"(I) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Administrator shall certify the intent of such borrower to participate in technical assistance consultation (either with a local small business development center or other technical assistance provider approved by the Administrator) before the borrower may utilize funds received under the loan.

"(II) USE OF FUNDS.—A loan under this subparagraph as the Administrator determines appropriate to an eligible small business concern, to assist such small business concern in recovery from a major disaster.

"(III) AUTHORIZATION.—The Administrator may make a grant in an amount not more than $25,000 under this subparagraph.

"(IV) DOCUMENTATION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—An eligible small business concern shall provide to the Administrator documentation indicating that such small business concern received technical assistance support through a small business development center or other technical assistance provider determined appropriate by the Administrator.

"(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration such sums as are necessary to carry out this paragraph.

SEC. 5. STATE BRIDGE LOAN GUARANTEE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—After issuing guidelines under subsection (c), the Administrator may guarantee loans made under an approved State Bridge Loan Program.

(b) APPROVAL.—

(1) APPLICATION.—A State desiring approval of a State Bridge Loan Program shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Administrator may require.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Administrator may approve an application submitted under paragraph (1) based on such criteria as the Administrator may establish under this section.

(c) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall issue to the appropriate economic development officials in each State, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, guidelines regarding approved State Bridge Loan Programs.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidelines issued under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify appropriate uses of funds under an approved State Bridge Loan Program;

(B) set terms and conditions for loans under an approved State Bridge Loan Program;

(C) address whether—

(1) an approved State Bridge Loan Program may charge administrative fees; and

(2) loans under an approved State Bridge Loan Program shall be disbursed through local banks and other financial institutions; and

(D) establish the percentage of a loan the Administrator will guarantee under an approved State Bridge Loan Program.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO MAKE EXPEDITED 7(A) DISASTER LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) EXPEDITED LOANS.—

"(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

(i) the term 'disaster area' means an area for which a major disaster was declared, during the period of such declaration;

(ii) the term 'major disaster' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122); and

(iii) the term 'essential small business concern in good standing' means a small
business concern that the Administrator, in consultation with appropriate officials in districts of the Administration determines has the ability to repay the subject loan, may increase the maximum amount that may be outstanding and committed to borrowers under this paragraph to $10,000,000.

(b) LOAN AUTHORIZATION.—Withholding any other provision of law, the Administrator may make a loan under this section to a business concern that the Administrator, in consultation with appropriate officials in districts of the Administration determines has the ability to repay the subject loan, may increase the maximum amount that may be outstanding and committed to borrowers under this paragraph to $10,000,000.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator for each fiscal year such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 7. MAXIMUM LOAN AMOUNTS.

(a) In General.—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking "$1,500,000" and inserting "$2,250,000".

(b) Disaster Loans.—Section 7(c)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(c)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking "$500,000" in each place such term appears and inserting "$2,250,000"; and

(2) by striking "$100,000" and inserting "$250,000";

and

(3) by striking "$300,000" and inserting "$500,000".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Chapter I of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Relief From the Major, Widespread Flooding in the Midwest Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-75; 107 Stat. 740) is amended by striking "Flooding in the Midwest Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-75; 107 Stat. 740) is amended by striking "subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)" and inserting "clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv)"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) in the case of a catastrophic regional or national disaster declared under subparagraph (A)(v) of this paragraph, the Administrator may increase the amount that may be outstanding and committed to borrowers under this paragraph to $10,000,000."

SEC. 10. FULL-TIME DISASTER PLANNING STAFF.—The Administrator shall hire a full-time disaster planning specialist in the Office of Disaster Assistance of the Administration.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The disaster planning specialist hired under subsection (a) shall be responsible for:

(1) creating and maintaining the comprehensive disaster response plan of the Administration;

(2) ensuring in-service and pre-service training procedures for the disaster response staff of the Administration;

(3) coordinating Administration training exercises for disaster response responses, with other Federal agencies; and

(4) other responsibilities, as determined by the Administrator.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 11. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR DISTRICT OFFICES OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) General Authority.—Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (4), as added by this Act, the following:

"(5) USE OF DISTRICT OFFICES.—In the event of a major disaster (as that term is defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), the Administrator may authorize a district office of the Administration to process loans under paragraph (1) or (2)."

(b) C ONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(c)) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (1)(v), as added by this Act, the following:

"(v) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

"(A) by inserting after "small business concern" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organization,’’; and

"(B) by inserting after "the concern" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organization.’’;

and

(2) in clause (v), by inserting after "small business concerns" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organizations.’’;

(c) PERSONAL EXPENSES.—Section 7(c)(v)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(c)(v)(E)) is amended by inserting the word "personal" after "business expenses", and by inserting "organization", after "business expenses".

SEC. 12. ECONOMIC INJURY DISASTER LOANS TO NONPROFITS.

(a) In General.—Section 7(b)(2)(A) of the Small Business Act, as redesignated by this Act, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

"(A) by inserting after "small business concern" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organization,’’; and

"(B) by inserting after "the concern" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organization.’’;

and

(2) in clause (v), by inserting after "small business concerns" the following: ‘‘, private nonprofit organizations.’’;

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(c)) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (5)(C), as inserted by this Act, the following:

"(viii) an estimate of how long the available funding for such loans will last, based on the spending rate.

and

(9) an estimate of how long the available funding for such loans and expenses will last, based on the spending rate.

SEC. 13. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER PORTABILITY GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—In the event of a major disaster (as that term is defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), the Administrator may waive the maximum amount of $100,000 for grants under subparagraph (C)(viii), and such grants shall be made available for small business development centers assisting small businesses adversely affected by such major disaster."

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the 5th business day of each month during the applicable period for a major disaster, the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the operation of the disaster loan program authorized under section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) for such disaster during the preceding month.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORTS.—Each report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) the weekly average lending volume, in number of loans and dollars, and the percent by which each category has increased or decreased since the previous report under subsection (b); and

(2) the weekly average lending volume, in number of loans and dollars, and the percent by which each category has increased or decreased since the previous report under subsection (b); and

(3) the amount of funding spent over the month for loans, both in appropriations and program level, and the percent by which each category has increased or decreased since the previous report under subsection (b); and

(4) the amount of funding available for loans, both in appropriations and program level, and the percent by which each category has increased or decreased since the previous report under subsection (b); and

(5) an estimate of how long the available funding for such loans will last, based on the spending rate.

(6) an estimate of how long the available funding for such loans and expenses will last, based on the spending rate.

(7) the amount of funding spent over the month for administrative costs, and the percent by which each category has increased or decreased since the previous report under subsection (b); and

(8) the amount of funding available for salaries and expenses combined, and the percent by which each such funding has increased or decreased, noting the source of any additional funding; and

(9) an estimate of how long the available funding for salaries and expenses will last, based on the spending rate.

SEC. 15. DISASTER LOANS AFTER MAJOR DISASTER.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR LENDERS TO PROCESS DISASTER LOANS AFTER MAJOR DISASTER.—The Administrator may enter into an agreement with a qualified lender, as determined by the Administrator, to make disaster loans under the Small Business Administration disaster loan program, under which the Administrator shall pay the lender a fee for each loan processed.
“(7) AUTHORITY FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR TO CONTRACT WITH LENDERS FOR LOAN LOSS VERIFICATION SERVICES.—The Administrator may enter into an agreement with a qualified external loan loss verification professional as determined by the Administrator, to verify losses for loans under this section, under which the Administrator shall pay the lender, or any loan loss verification professional a fee for each loan for which such lender or verification professional verifies losses.”

SEC. 16. WAIVER OF GEOGRAPHIC RESTRICTIONS ON SBDC COUNSELORS.

Section 21(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) WAIVER OF GEOGRAPHIC RESTRICTIONS ON SBDC COUNSELORS.—

“(A) In general.—The Administrator shall authorize any small business development center, regardless of location, to provide advice, information, and assistance, as described in subsection (c), to a small business concern located in an area in which the President declared a major disaster (as defined in section 102 of the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), during the period of such declaration.

“(B) Contingency of services.—A small business development center that provides counselors to an area described in subparagraph (A) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure continuity of services in the State it currently serves.

“(C) Access to disaster recovery facilities.—For purposes of providing recovery assistance under this paragraph, the Administrator shall permit small business development center personnel to use any site or facility designated by the Administrator for use for such purpose.”

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3666
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By Mr. NELSON of Florida:

S. 3666. A bill to amend the Florida National Forest Land Management Act of 2003 to authorize the conveyance of an additional tract of National Forest land and land under and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that helps the U.S. Forest Service protect sensitive and precious forest by selling developed land in Leon County, in order to purchase at-risk land in the heart of our national forests.

Specifically, this bill allows for the sale of tract W-1979, which is 114 acres in Tallahassee, the proceeds of which are specifically designated to purchase private holdings in the Apalachicola National Forest. The Forest Service believes that W-1979 has lost its national forest character and is unmanageable. The land will be sold to Leon County, where it will help the continued advancement of Blueprint 2000, a series of community initiatives to improve Tallahassee and Leon County. By selling this land on the outskirts of the Apalachicola National Forest, the U.S. Forest Service can acquire precious land deep in the forest that could be lost to development.

This legislation also gives the U.S. Forest Service in Florida the same flexibility to manage lands and capital that we have in all other states. Previously, whenever National Forest land was sold, the funds could only be used to purchase more land, while many important infrastructure projects went undone. With passage of this bill, projects currently identified as “non-green” lands can go towards capital improvements, such as administrative facilities that help the Forest Service manage the Ocala, Apalachicola and Osceola National Forests. Thesenon-green lands have already been developed, and no longer align with the goals of the U.S. Forest Service.

Congressmen CRENSHAW and BOYD have introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives. I hope that we can quickly pass these bills in both the Leon County and the Forest Service.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3666

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

S. 3666
If the U.N. Security Council fails to act, the United States must fulfill its responsibility to protect the American homeland from the North Korean threat.

These items in the hands of Kim Jong II pose a direct threat to the American people, the people of the region, and peace and security in East Asia.

If we are in earnest about protecting the American homeland, then it is imperative that we prevent the North Korean regime from acquiring these dangerous materials. I thank Chairman LUGAR, as well as Senators INOUYE and BROWNBACK, for cosponsoring this bill, and I urge the rest of my Senate colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3667

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 “North Korea Nonproliferation Act of 2006.”

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

In view of North Korea’s manifest determination to proliferate missiles, nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction in violation of international norms and expectations, it should be the policy of the United States to impose sanctions on persons who transfer such weapons, and goods and technology related to such weapons, to and from North Korea in the same manner as persons who transfer such items to and from Iran and Syria currently are sanctioned under United States law.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO IRAN AND SYRIA NONPROLIFERATION ACT.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2 of the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “, NORTH KOREA,” after “IRAN”; and

(ii) by inserting after “Syria” the following: “; or on or after January 1, 2006, transferred to or acquired from North Korea” after “Iran”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran”.

(b) CONFIRMING AMENDMENTS.—Such Act is further amended—

(1) in section 1, by inserting “, NORTH KOREA,” after “IRAN”;

(2) in section 5(a), by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran” both places it appears; and

(3) in section 6(b)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran”; and

(B) by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran” each place it appears.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

Congress urges all governments concerned about the threat of proliferation involving North Korea to impose measures on persons involved in such proliferation that are similar to those imposed by the United States Government pursuant to the Iran, North
Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act, as amended by this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 530—CALLING ON PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH AND OTHER LEADERS ATTENDING THE 2006 GROUP OF EIGHT (G-8) SUMMIT IN ST. PETERSBURG, RUSSIA, TO ENGAGE IN A FRANK DIALOGUE WITH THE PRESIDENT OF RUSSIA CONCERNING ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION THAT APPEAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE GROUP'S OBJECTIVES OF PROMOTING GLOBAL SECURITY, ECONOMIC STABILITY, AND DEMOCRACY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARRANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. FRIST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 530

Whereas the leaders of 6 major industrialized democracies including France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, gathered in June 2002 at a summit meeting in Rambouillet, France and for annual meetings thereafter under a rotating presidency known as the Group of Six (G-6);

Whereas the G-6 was established based on the mutual interest of its members in promoting economic stability, global security, and democracy;

Whereas, in 1976, membership of the G-6 was expanded to include Canada;

Whereas, in 1996, the G-6 members agreed with the G-7 share a commitment to promote security, economic stability, and democracy in their respective nations and around the world;

Whereas Russia was integrated into the Group in 1998 at the behest of President William Jefferson Clinton as a gesture of appreciation to then-President of Russia Boris Yeltsin for his continuing support by assuming a neutral position with respect to the eastward expansion of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);

Whereas, in 2002, Russia was selected to hold the rotating presidency of the G-8 and to host the Summit of the G-8 in 2006;

Whereas on June 26, 2002, in Kananaskis, Canada regarding the selection of Russia as host of the 2006 Summit stated that the decision reflected "the remarkable economic and democratic transformation that has occurred in Russia in recent years and in particular under the leadership of President Putin";

Whereas in the intervening 4 years since Russia was selected to host the 2006 G-8 Summit, the Government of the Russian Federation has pursued policies that raise serious concerns about the commitment of the Government of the Russian Federation to upholding democratic values both at home and abroad;

Whereas the United States Department of State 2005 Country Report on Human Rights Practices noted that trends in Russia, including the "centralization of power in the executive branch," continuing corruption and selectivity in enforcement of the law, political pressure on the judiciary, and harassment of some non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have resulted in an erosion of the accountability of government leaders to the people" in Russia;

Whereas, in 2005, the independent non-governmental organization Freedom House re-classified Russia from "partly free" to "not free" in its global survey of political rights and civil liberties;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has placed onerous restrictions and monitoring requirements on non-profit organizations in Russia that limit the ability of both Russians and non-Russians to create a vibrant civil society in the country;

Whereas the freedom of the media in Russia has been seriously compromised due to the Government of the Russian Federation's controlling centralization of major mass media outlets and efforts to obstruct the reporting of independent journalists;

Whereas, in 2004, the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation have reportedly threatened radio stations with revocation of their broadcast licenses if they continue airing material from the Voice of America (VOA) and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFERL), thereby precipitating the largest decrease in the number of outlets for VOA and RFERL reporting since the Cold War;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has sought to interfere in the electoral processes and democratic governance of neighboring countries including Georgia and Ukraine;

Whereas Russia was the only member of the G-8 to applaud the outcome of fraudulent elections in Belarus that were characterized by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as evidencing "a disregard for the basic rights of freedom of assembly, association, and expression";

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom and other international observers have reported increased evidence of racism, anti-Semitism, nationalism, and xenophobia among segments of Russian society;

Whereas, in late 2004, Gazprom, a company majority owned and operated by the Government of the Russian Federation, insisted on a more than four-fold increase in the price charged for natural gas sold to Ukraine and subsequently shut off gas supplies to Ukraine, causing cascading energy shortages in many countries throughout Europe;

Whereas, on June 30, 2004, the Government of the Russian Federation suspended gas supplies to Georgia and Moldova;

Whereas the March 2006 report of the Independent Task Force on Russia of the Council on Foreign Relations stated that "to protect the credibility of the G-8 at a time when many are questioning Russia's chairman-ship, the United States should make clear that this role does not exempt Russian policies and actions from critical scrutiny";

Whereas, in May 2006, the United States Congress and it affiliates in Russia seized the opportunity and applauded the proud history of achievement, creativity, and sacrifice of the people of Russia;

Whereas the United States seeks the development of Russia as a strong, responsible, democratic partner in promoting global peace and security; and

Whereas the United States believes that both the people of Russia and the Government of the Russian Federation will be shackled in their efforts to build a strong society domestically and contribute to the work of the international community so long as the Government of the Russian Federation fails to fully embrace the values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) in order to preserve the integrity of the G-8 and as an erosion of the accountability of government leaders to the people" in Russia;

(2) the United States and other democratic countries should reaffirm their support for civic and non-governmental organizations to promote democracy and the rule of law in Russia;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation should take action to ensure that it guarantees the full range of civil and political rights to its citizens, as it is obligated to do under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(4) consistent with its obligations under the International Covenant, the Government of the Russian Federation should take steps to cease its interference with foreign news organizations, including the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty;

(5) the Government of the Russian Federation should take action to combat rising racism, anti-Semitism, and xenophobia in Russian society; and

(6) the United States and countries of the G-8 should reaffirm their support for new democracies on the borders of Russia and, where applicable, expedite their integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions to provide a bulwark for democracy in eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

SENATE RESOLUTION 531—Urging the President to Appoint a Presidential Special Envoy for Sudan

Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. BURNS, Mr. REID, Mr. BOND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LUTENBERG, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. TALENT, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 531

Whereas, on July 22, 2004, the Senate and House of Representatives declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan are genocide;

Whereas, on September 9, 2004, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate: "When we reviewed our policy, our policy was supported by the United States and the [Janjaweed] bear responsibility—and genocide may still be occurring.

Whereas, on September 21, 2004, in an address before the United Nations General Assembly, President George W. Bush affirmed the finding of Secretary of State Powell and stated, "At this hour, the world is witnessing in Darfur the suffering and the humiliation that the people of Sudan are enduring.

Whereas numerous nongovernmental organizations have estimated that up to 400,000 people have died in Darfur from combat, hunger, and disease since February 2003; and

Whereas prominent human rights groups, think tanks, and members of Congress have called for the appointment of a Presidential Special Envoy for Sudan;

Whereas Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick, who had acted as the negotiator and coordinator for the United States Government toward Darfur, resigned from that position on June 19, 2006;

Whereas Ambassador Kristich was instrumental in securing the peace agreement among the Government of Sudan and rebel
So, Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 530) calling on President George W. Bush and other leaders attending the 2006 Group of Eight (G–8) Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia to engage in a frank dialogue with the President of Russia concerning the Government of the Russian Federation that appear inconsistent with the Group's objectives of protecting global security, economic stability, and democracy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 530) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 530

Whereas the leaders of 6 major industrial democracies including France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, gathered in 1975 for a summit meeting in Rambouillet, France and for annual meetings thereafter under a rotating presidency known as the Group of Six (G–6);

Whereas the G–6 was established based on the mutual interest of its members in promoting economic stability, global security, and democracy;

Whereas, in 1976, membership of the G–6 was expanded to include Canada;

Whereas in 1978, the members of the G–7 share a commitment to promote security, economic stability, and democracy in their respective nations and around the world;

Whereas Russia was integrated into the Group in 1992 at the behest of President William Jefferson Clinton as a gesture of appreciation to then-President of Russia Boris Yeltsin for pursuing reforms and assuming a neutral position with respect to the conflict in neighboring Chad, the lack of security that prevents multilateral organizations and nongovernmental organizations from providing assistance to the most vulnerable displaced persons of Darfur, the reluctance by the Government of Sudan to allow a robust United Nations presence in that country, and the difficulties involved in assisting the African Union Mission in Sudan and transitioning that body into a United Nations force:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day—

(1) to encourage adults to support, listen to, and encourage children throughout the United States;

(2) to reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children; and

(3) to recognize that strong, healthy families play an integral role in the quality of life and the development of children.

CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER LEADERS TO ENGAGE IN FRANK DIALOG

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 530, introduced earlier today by Senator BIDEN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 532) calling on President George W. Bush and other leaders attending the 2006 Group of Eight (G–8) Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia to engage in a frank dialogue with the President of Russia concerning the Government of the Russian Federation that appear inconsistent with the Group's objectives of protecting global security, economic stability, and democracy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 532) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 532

Whereas the Senate of the United States is its children; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day—

(1) to encourage adults to support, listen to, and encourage children throughout the United States;

(2) to reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children; and

(3) to recognize that strong, healthy families play an integral role in the quality of life and the development of children.

senators from the United States Department of State to Sudan and to end the violence in Darfur; and

Whereas the crisis in Darfur, and generally Sudan, continues to command urgent attention due to the lack of any displacement of roughly 2,500,000 people, the continuing instability in the region, the fragility of the May 5, 2006, peace accord, the spread of the conflict to neighboring Chad, the lack of security that prevents multilateral organizations and nongovernmental organizations from providing assistance to the most vulnerable displaced persons of Darfur, the reluctance by the Government of Sudan to allow a robust United Nations presence in that country, and the difficulties involved in assisting the African Union Mission in Sudan and transitioning that body into a United Nations force:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day—

(1) to encourage adults to support, listen to, and encourage children throughout the United States;

(2) to reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children; and

(3) to recognize that strong, healthy families play an integral role in the quality of life and the development of children.

SENATE RESOLUTION 532—ENCOURAGING THE ADULTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT, LISTEN TO, AND ENCOURAGE CHILDREN SO THAT THEY MAY REACH THEIR POTENTIAL

Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. Res. 532

Whereas research shows that spending time together as a family is critical to raising strong and resilient children;

Whereas strong, healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children;

Whereas it is essential to celebrate and reflect upon the important role that all families play in children's lives and their positive effect for the future of the United States; and

Whereas the greatest natural resource of the United States is its children: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day—

(1) to encourage adults to support, listen to, and encourage children throughout the United States;

(2) to reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children; and

(3) to recognize that strong, healthy families play an integral role in the quality of life and the development of children.
Whereas the March 2006 report from the Independent Task Force on Russia of the Council on Foreign Relations stated that “to protect the credibility of the G-8 at a time when many are questioning Russia’s chairmanship, the United States should make clear that this role does not exempt Russian policies and actions from critical scrutiny”;

Whereas the G-8 nations recognize that the United States has the responsibility to urge the Russian Federation to ensure full protection of freedom for all religious communities; and

Whereas the United States has urged the Russian Federation to respect the fundamental rights of individuals to profess and practice their faith, alone or in community with others, to enjoy the protection of the rule of law in Russia; and

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ActingPresident pro tempore.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) in order to preserve the integrity of the G-8 as a forum of the leading industrialized democracies of the world, President George W. Bush and other heads of state attending the summit should extend to the Russian Federation a strong, clear, and honest commitment to democracy and the rule of law in Russia;

(2) the United States and other democratic countries should reaffirm their support for civic and non-governmental organizations working to promote democracy and the rule of law in Russia;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation should take action to ensure that it guarantees the freedom of civil and political rights to its citizens, as it is obligated to do under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(4) consistent with its obligations under the International Covenant, the Government of the Russian Federation should take steps to cease its interference with foreign news organizations, including the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty;

(5) the Government of the Russian Federation should take action to combat rising racism and anti-Semitism, and xenophobia in Russian society; and

(6) the United States and the countries of the G-8 should reaffirm their support for new democratic movements in Russia, where applicable, expedite their integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions to provide a bulwark for democracy in eastern Europe—

Expressing the Sense of Congress Regarding the Russian Federation

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 500.

The ActingPresident pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk reads as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 500) expressing the sense of Congress that the Russian Federation should fully protect the freedoms of all religious communities without distinction, whether registered or unregistered, as stipulated by the Russian Constitution and international standards.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ActingPresident pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 500) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 500

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and has freely committed to fully respect the rights of individuals, whether alone or in community with others, to profess and practice religion or belief;

Whereas the 1989 Vienna Concluding Document calls on OSCE participating States to “take effective measures to prevent and eliminate discrimination against individuals on the grounds of religion or belief” and to “grant upon their request to communities of believers, practicing or professed, to register under the constitutional framework of their States, recognition of the status provided for them in the respective countries”;

Whereas Article 26 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation declares that “everyone shall be guaranteed the right to freedom of conscience, to freedom of religious worship, including the right to profess, individually or jointly with others, any religion” and Article 8 of the 1997 Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations provides for registration for religious communities as “religious organizations,” if they have at least 10 members and have operated within the Russian Federation with legal status for at least 15 years;

Whereas religious freedom has advanced significantly for the vast majority of people in Russia since the collapse of the Soviet Union;

Whereas many rights and privileges afforded to religious communities in the Russian Federation remain contingent on the ability of the communities to obtain government registration;

Whereas some religious groups have not attempted to register with government authorities due to concerns about the costs of registration, and other communities have been unjustly denied registration or had their registration improperly terminated by local authorities;

Whereas many of the registered communities in the Russian Federation today were never registered under the Soviet system because they refused to collaborate with that government’s policies and they are now experiencing renewed discrimination and repression by authorities of the Russian Federation;

Whereas over the last 2 years there have been an estimated 10 arson attacks on unregistered Protestant churches, with little or no effective response by law enforcement officials to bring the perpetrators to justice;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation reacted swiftly in response to the January 2006 attack on a Moscow synagogue, but there have been numerous other anti-Semitic attacks against Jews and Jewish institutions in the Russian Federation, and there is increasing tolerance of anti-Semitism in certain sectors of Russian society;

Whereas there has been evidence of an increase in the frequency and severity of oppressive actions by security forces and federal and local officials against some Muslim communities and their members;

Whereas there are many cases involving restrictions on religious property seized by the Soviet regime that remain unresolved;

Whereas in some areas of the Russian Federation law enforcement personnel have carried out acts of violence against members of religious communities peacefully practicing their faith and local officials have put overly burdensome restrictions on the ability of religious communities to engage in religious activity; and

Whereas the United States has sought to protect the fundamental and inalienable rights of individuals that practice their faith, alone or in community with others, according to the dictates of their conscience, and in accordance with international agreements committing nations to respect individual freedom of thought, conscience, and belief; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should—

(1) urge the Government of the Russian Federation to ensure full protection of freedoms for all religious communities without discrimination, whether registered or unregistered, and end the harassment of unregistered religious groups by the security apparatus and other government agencies, thereby breaking religious communities made over the past 15 years in promoting religious freedom in the Russian Federation;

(2) urge the Government of the Russian Federation to ensure that law enforcement officials vigorously investigate and prosecute acts of violence, arson, and desecration perpetrated against registered and unregistered religious communities as a means to make certain that government authorities are not complicit in such incidents;

(3) continue to raise concerns with the Government of the Russian Federation over violations of religious freedom, including those against unregistered religious communities, especially indigenous denominations not well known in the United States;

(4) ensure that United States Embassy officials engage local officials throughout the Russian Federation, especially when violations of religious freedom, including those against unregistered religious communities, are observed, and take outreach activities to educate local officials about the rights of registered and unregistered religious communities;

(5) urge the Government of the Russian Federation to invite the three Personal Representatives of the OSCE Chair-in-Office and the United Nations Special Representative on Freedom of Religion or Belief to visit the Russian Federation and discuss with federal and local officials concerns about the religious freedom of both registered and unregistered religious communities; and

(6) urge the Council of Europe, its member countries, and the other members of the G-8 to raise issues relating to religious freedom with Russian officials in the context of the Russian Federation’s responsibilities both as President of the Council in 2006 and as a member of the G-8.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 9

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ActingPresident pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk reads as follows:

A bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 17, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, July 17. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with the time equally divided until 12:30. Further, I ask that at 12:30 the Senate proceed to the stem cell bills as under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIS WEEK IN THE SENATE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we made real progress this week in passing a very important bill, the Homeland Security appropriations bill, under the leadership of Chairman Judd Gregg, who did a superb job on a very important bill which adds billions of dollars to issues we spend a lot of time talking about and debating but that puts real money, real resources where they are needed: over $14 billion for issues surrounding tightening our borders, increasing the number of border security agents by 1,000, increasing the number of detention beds by over 1,000, and well over $14 billion for border security and immigration issues. It is a very important bill.

Over the course of this month I also intend to address other issues surrounding securing our homeland, issues such as the Department of Defense authorization and our military construction bills, all of which focus on getting money down to where it is needed, protecting our homeland, supporting our troops here and overseas.

Also, it was an interesting week in that we had very positive economic developments announced with not just the 5.4 million jobs that have been created over the last 30 months or so, not just the low unemployment—4.6 percent, which is lower than the average of the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, or 1990s, but the fact that the deficit is coming down much faster than anyone had anticipated. That is in large part—most part—because of the pro-growth President-Bush-led policies of less taxation which promotes that strong economic growth. Revenues are coming into the Federal Government with lower tax rates, and the revenues are coming in much faster than anticipated because of those policies. And those increased revenues coming in, by definition, lower that deficit. The deficit is projected this year to be 30 percent lower than what we thought it was going to be just in February, earlier this year.

The important thing to recognize, as we have this great, what we call "macro" or large global prosperity, in the sense of our global or American economy here, with 5.6 percent growth in GDP last quarter, the fastest it has been in decades and that at the same time we have the squeeze that is on our average person, average taxpayer out there today. That is due in part to the high gasoline prices that we are going to see go up again—in part because of the international turmoil in the Middle East, the fact we are 60 percent dependent on the Middle East. Our response on this floor should be and will be to address issues surrounding lowering that dependence on foreign sources of oil. I hope we can do that in the next several weeks.

We had a very positive bipartisan announcement about opening exploration in the Gulf of Mexico. It is bipartisan, so I am very happy about that.

Health care is another one of those issues that squeezes people so much because health care prices continue to go up two to three times faster than wages. When that is the case, you get squeezed as years—oh, I believe of the great macro numbers around the United States of America, the individual feels squeezed with gasoline prices and health care. So small business health plans are something we should focus on. I want to make sure that we need to come back to and address. Most people today work for what we call small businesses. These small business health reform plans allow small businesses and the individuals to have lower health care costs. Now that growth of health care costs over time and hit at one of the major reasons they feel the pinch.

I mentioned energy. A lot of that focuses on the area called 181, in the Gulf of Mexico. And I mentioned health care costs with the focus on the small business health plans. We have the support of 56 Senators on the floor, and I need 60 Senators to actually pass that bill. So I hope a few more of our Senators will recognize, from a small business perspective, from the perspective of the individual employee, how important it is to allow small businesses to group together, to have the purchasing power to get those lower costs. I think those lower charges just like the big companies can get—the clout, the muscle you can get by grouping small business together.

It is common sense. The American people scratch their heads and say: Why can't you pass it? We have majoritarian support.

We don't have 60 people yet supporting it. We need to work on that, and I think we have to do it sometime this year.

Let me just comment and then I am going to take a short break and I will come back to the floor to make a final comment on stem cells. On Monday we will begin the debate on the three bills—one, a fetal farming bill, a second bill that looks at alternative ways of developing pluripotent cells or embryonic-like cells—stem cell research—and a third, the House bill which increases Federal support for embryonic stem cells that are derived from embryos that are otherwise going to be discarded. Those are the exact words in that bill.

We will have very good debate. It will be on Monday and Tuesday of next week. We will have those votes starting at 3:45 on Tuesday. Each of those votes will have 60 votes for passage. People ask why. We all agree to that because we can spend weeks and weeks on the floor of the Senate and with all the filibuster and cloture and the like, that is what you end up with, is you have to have a 60-vote threshold. That is why we have agreed with that.

Mr. President, I will close and will come back and within 10 minutes or so speak on stem cells for about 4 or 5 minutes, and at that time we will formally close.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on Monday, the Senate will begin debate on three important pieces of legislation under an agreement that was reached between both sides of the aisle several days ago. Those three bills are as follows:

The Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, a bill sponsored by Senators SANTORUM and Specter; the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which is the bill from the House, H.R. 810—the House—Castle and DeGette, Senator—Specter and Hatch bill; and, third, the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006—the Santorum and Brownback bill.

It was 5 years ago almost exactly—on July 18, 2001, before the administration laid out its policy—that I laid out a comprehensive proposal to promote stem cell research within a strong ethical and moral framework. I proposed at that time on the floor 10 specific interdependent principles. I also laid out four proposals: one would be all of the policymakers and my colleagues I felt it was our responsibility to assess and to reassess, on a periodic basis, whatever we or the administration does because of the rapidly advancing science that so characterizes this decade or the 21st century. As this century progresses and as science advances—and it is skyrocketing in terms of the advances
that are being made—we are going to continually have to face our responsibility to face the moral and ethical challenges and limits. It is our responsibility, as individuals, as part of this body politic, to reassess whatever construct we came up with that frame and that govern biomedical research.

It is uncomfortable, it is challenging, and it causes each of us to go back and study the science which can be confusing for everyone, including scientists as well as nonscientists, and to look at the framework—both moral and ethical framework that individuals have and that we have—in representing the people of our States, our constituents.

I said 5 years ago, on July 18, 2001, and I believe now that we must also do all we can to pursue promising alternative strategies that hold the magnificient potential for developing these powerful pluripotent cell lines without damaging or destroying nascent human life.

That is why, in the package we will be looking at Monday, I have asked the Senate to consider legislation to enhance support for alternatives to embryonic stem cell research.

I have worked very closely with my distinguished colleague from Georgia, who is occupying the chair, on this very issue. I have asked Senators SANTORUM and SPECTER to work together, and they have done a tremendous job in crafting the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, S. 2754, in this regard. Their bill is very similar to the legislation that Senator ISAKSON and I and a number of other colleagues introduced last year. And I encourage every Senator to look very carefully at it because I believe every Senator should be able to support that bill.

There is no reason why that piece of legislation should not unite this body and be something that everybody can support.

Third is the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006. People ask the question—and I have been asked over the course of today and the reason I wanted to come back to the floor and close and begin to frame the debate—what is fetus farming? It is the implantation, growth or gestation of an embryo in a human or in an animal for the purpose of aborting that growing fetus for research. Fetus farming is not currently employed. But it is forward thinking because it is a trend that we could inadvertently move to in trying to advance science, and that line should not be crossed. Therefore, Senators BROWNBACK and SANTORUM have proposed legislation that would draw a clear line that should not be crossed—a clear line that is not there today.

Again, 5 years ago on July 18, when I outlined the proposal on the floor, it was covered in an article in the Wall Street Journal on that same day. I outlined my principles. Shortly after—I month later—the President laid out the administration’s policy on embryonic stem cell research.

A lot of people do not pay attention to it today.

The President’s legislation was the first Federal legislation to fund embryonic stem cell research. It did so within an ethical framework, a moral and ethical framework. It showed respect for basic human life.

President Bush and I do not differ about the need for strong guidelines supporting embryonic stem cell research. His policy was generally consistent with the principles I set forth a month before his announcement in 2001. However, what has now sort of changed, since that point in time, is science has progressed over the last 5 years, and I feel that the limit on cell lines available for federally funded research, those original limits—given what has happened in science today and what we have learned—are too restrictive.

Because people’s views shift, let me refer back to the principle I presented 5 years ago. The fifth principle which I presented on the floor 5 years ago, No. 5, and I quote:

Provide funding for embryonic stem cell research only from blastocysts that would otherwise be discarded. We need to allow Federal funding for research using only those embryonic stem cells derived from blastocysts that are left over after in vitro fertilization and would otherwise be discarded.

I quote that to point out that that was my stance 5 years ago, and indeed when people ask: Why, Senator FRIST, or Dr. FRIST, are you supporting the House bill, you can see the consistency there.

This is very important. H.R. 810, despite its many shortcomings which I mentioned last week, is clearly consistent with that principle. And the bill applies this restriction almost verbatim. The very words “would otherwise be discarded” were from my remarks 5 years ago and is also in the House bill.

All three of the bills the Senate will address raise profound ethical questions. They will require a lot of thought, a lot of study over the course of the next several days. They are challenging to us as a body and challenging to us as individuals. They merit serious debate. That is why I am pleased, on an issue of this magnitude, that Senators will have an opportunity to have their ideas considered in an orderly, respectful and dignified way and voted on separately and clearly.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 14, 2006

I have worked very closely with my distinguished colleague from Georgia, who is occupying the chair, on this very issue. I have asked Senators SANTORUM and SPECTER to work together, and they have done a tremendous job in crafting the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, S. 2754, in this regard. Their bill is very similar to the legislation that Senator ISAKSON and I and a number of other colleagues introduced last year. And I encourage every Senator to look very carefully at it because I believe every Senator should be able to support that bill.

There is no reason why that piece of legislation should not unite this body and be something that everybody can support.

Third is the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006. People ask the question—and I have been asked over the course of today and the reason I wanted to come back to the floor and close and begin to frame the debate—what is fetus farming? It is the implantation, growth or gestation of an embryo in a human or in an animal for the purpose of aborting that growing fetus for research. Fetus farming is not currently employed. But it is forward thinking because it is a trend that we could inadvertently move to in trying to advance science, and that line should not be crossed. Therefore, Senators BROWNBACK and SANTORUM have proposed legislation that would draw a clear line that should not be crossed—a clear line that is not there today.

Again, 5 years ago on July 18, when I outlined the proposal on the floor, it was covered in an article in the Wall Street Journal on that same day. I outlined my principles. Shortly after—I month later—the President laid out the administration’s policy on embryonic stem cell research.

A lot of people do not pay attention to it today.

The President’s legislation was the first Federal legislation to fund embryonic stem cell research. It did so within an ethical framework, a moral and ethical framework. It showed respect for basic human life.

President Bush and I do not differ about the need for strong guidelines supporting embryonic stem cell research. His policy was generally consistent with the principles I set forth a month before his announcement in 2001. However, what has now sort of changed, since that point in time, is science has progressed over the last 5 years, and I feel that the limit on cell lines available for federally funded research, those original limits—given what has happened in science today and what we have learned—are too restrictive.

Because people’s views shift, let me refer back to the principle I presented 5 years ago. The fifth principle which I presented on the floor 5 years ago, No. 5, and I quote:
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Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S7545–S7566

Measures Introduced: Six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3662–3667, and S. Res. 530–532. Page S7554

Measures Reported:
S. 3521, to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 109–283) Page S7554

Measures Passed:
G-8 Summit: Senate agreed to S. Res. 530, calling on President George W. Bush and other leaders attending the 2006 Group of Eight (G-8) Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia, to engage in a frank dialogue with the President of Russia concerning actions of the Government of the Russian Federation that appear inconsistent with the Group’s objectives of protecting global security, economic stability, and democracy. Pages S7563–64

Russian Federation Religious Freedoms: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 500, expressing the sense of Congress that the Russian Federation should fully protect the freedoms of all religious communities without distinction, whether registered or unregistered, as stipulated by the Russian Constitution and international standards, and the resolution was then agreed to. Page S7564

Water Resources Development Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, on Tuesday, July 18, 2006, Senate begin consideration of S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States; that the committee-reported amendments be withdrawn; that the managers’ amendment in the nature of a substitute at the Desk be agreed to as original text for purposes of further amendment; that only certain amendments be in order with specified time limits; that there be 2 hours of general debate on the bill; that following the disposition of amendments and the use, or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended if amended, be read a third time, and the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 2864, House companion measure, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 728, as amended if amended, be inserted thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read a third time, the Senate then proceed to a vote on passage, and S. 728 be returned to the Senate Calendar. Pages S7549–50

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:
Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2010.
Jon Wellinghoff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2008.
Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2011. Pages S7547, S7566

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination:
1 Army nomination in the rank of general. Page S7566

Messages From the House:
Measures Read First Time:
Enrolled Bills Presented:
Additional Cosponsors:
Pages S7554–55

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S7555–63

Additional Statements:
Pages S7553–54

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:45 a.m., and adjourned at 12:27 p.m., until 12 noon, on Monday, July 17, 2006. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on pages S7565–66.)

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.
House of Representatives

Chamber Action
The House of was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, July 17, 2006.

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD
Week of July 17 through July 22, 2006

Senate Chamber
On Monday, at 12:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of S. 3504, S. 2754, and H.R. 810, all Stem Cell Research legislation.

On Tuesday, at 10 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of S. 3504, S. 2754, and H.R. 810, all Stem Cell Research legislation, with 3 consecutive votes to occur thereon to begin at 3:45 p.m. Also, Senate will begin consideration of S. 728, Water Resources Development Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate will continue consideration of any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation bills and conference reports, when available.

Senate Committees
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: July 20, to hold hearings to examine USDA dairy programs, 10 a.m., SR—328A.

Committee on Appropriations: July 18, Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans’ Affairs and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5385, making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 11:15 a.m., SD—124.

July 18, Subcommittee on Defense, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5631, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 2 p.m., SD—192.

July 18, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5647, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 2 p.m., SD—138.

July 18, Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5576, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 4 p.m., SD—124.

July 20, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5631, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, proposed legislation making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5385, making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and H.R. 5576, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 2 p.m., SD—106.

Committee on Armed Services: July 18, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Charles E. McQueary, of North Carolina, to be Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense, Anita K. Blair, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Benedict S. Cohen, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, Frank R. Jimenez, of Florida, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy, David H. Laufman, of Texas, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense, Sue C. Payton, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration, and Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, 9:30 a.m., SD—106.

July 20, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing regarding overhead imagery systems, 9:30 a.m., S—407, Capitol.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: July 18, to hold hearings to examine perspectives on insurance regulation, 2 p.m., SD—538.

July 19, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD—106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: July 19, business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark V. Rosenker, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, R. Hunter Biden, of Delaware, and Donna R. McLean, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Reform Board (Amtrak), John H. Hill, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Andrew B. Steinberg, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, routine lists in the Coast Guard.
and NOAA, and other pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SR–253.

July 19, Subcommittee on Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness, to hold hearings to examine high performance computing, 11 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: July 17, to hold hearings to examine implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 provisions on hydrogen and fuel cell research and development, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

July 18, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine United States and India energy cooperation in the context of global energy demand, the emerging energy needs of India, and the role of nuclear power can play in meeting those needs, 10 a.m., SD–366.

July 19, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold an oversight hearing on the implementation of Public Law 108–148, The Healthy Forests Restoration Act, 10 a.m., SD–366.

July 20, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Ray Correll, of Indiana, to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, and Mark Myers, of Alaska, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, both of the Department of the Interior, and Drue Pearce, of Alaska, to be Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: July 19, to hold hearings to examine the science and risk assessment behind the Environmental Protection Agency’s proposed revisions to the particulate matter air quality standards, 9 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Foreign Relations: July 17, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Christina B. Rocca, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, 3 p.m., SD–419.

July 18, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Islam and the West, focusing on the search for common ground, 10 a.m., SD–419.

July 18, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing regarding the sale of F–16 aircraft to Pakistan, 2:30 p.m., S–407, Capitol.

July 19, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and related exchanges of letters, signed at Washington on March 31, 2003 (Treaty Doc.108–25), 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

July 20, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine U.S. policy options regarding North Korea, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: July 19, business meeting to consider proposed Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, S. 843, to amend the Public Health Service Act to combat autism through research, screening, intervention and education, and the nominations of Elizabeth Dougherty, of the District of Columbia, Peter W. Tredick, of California, and Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the National Mediation Board, 10:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: July 18, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold an oversight hearing to examine District of Columbia government operations, focusing on successes and challenges the District has experienced during the two terms of Mayor Williams, including the anticipated challenges that the new mayor will face, 10 a.m., SD–342.

July 18, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine S. 2590, to require full disclosure of all entities and organizations receiving Federal funds, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

July 19, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Department of Homeland Security purchase cards, 10 a.m., SD–342.


July 20, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine Iran’s nuclear impasse, focusing on the status of Iran’s nuclear weapons capabilities, European negotiations and the U.N. Security Council, and the feasibility of further negotiations, democracy promotion, sanctions, and/or military operations, 1:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: July 18, to hold oversight hearings to examine the Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

July 19, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine antitrust concerns relating to credit card interchange rates, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

July 19, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2 p.m., SD–226.

July 19, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine judicial nominations, 2:15 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: July 20, business meeting to mark up an original bill to reauthorize the Small Business Administration, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: July 20, to hold hearings to examine “VA Data Privacy Breach: Twenty-Six Million People Deserve Assurance of Future Security”, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: July 18, to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

July 19, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

July 20, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: July 20, to hold hearings to examine the generic drug maze relating to access to affordable, life-saving drugs, 10 a.m., SD–106.
House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, July 20, hearing on H.R. 3849, PIC and POPs Conventions and the LRTAP POPs Protocol Implementation Act, 10 a.m., 1500 Longworth.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, July 19, hearing on Guest Worker Programs: Impact on the American Workforce and U.S. Immigration Policy, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

July 20, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing on H.R. 16, Tribal Labor Relations Restoration Act of 2005, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


July 18, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Use of Imaging Services: Providing Appropriate Care for Medicare Beneficiaries,” 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

July 19, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing entitled “DOE's Revised Schedule for Yucca Mountain,” 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

July 19, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Questions Surrounding the 'Hockey Stick' Temperature Studies: Implications for Climate Change Assessments,” 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

July 20, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing on H.R. 5785, Warning, Alert, and Response Network Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, July 18, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing on ICANN and the Whois Database: Providing Access To Protect Consumers From Phishing,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.


July 19, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology, hearing entitled “Coin and Currency Issues Facing Congress: Can We Still Afford Money?” 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

July 20, full Committee, hearing on monetary policy and the state of the economy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, July 18, Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, hearing entitled “Public Housing in the 21st Century: HUD’s View on the Future of Public Housing in the United States,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


July 18, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, hearing entitled “Another Year, Another Billion Hours: Evaluating Paperwork Reduction Efforts in the Federal Government,” 2 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.


July 20, full Committee, hearing entitled “Climate Change: Understanding the Degree of the Problem,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


July 21, full Committee, hearing entitled “Policing Capital Sites: Improving Coordination, Training and Equipment,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, July 18, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, executive, briefing on the DHS State and Local Fusion Center Initiative, 4 p.m., 311 Cannon.

July 20, full Committee, executive, briefing on the National Asset Database by the Department of Homeland Security Office of Infrastructure Protection, 10 a.m., H2–176 Ford.


Committee on International Relations, July 20, hearing on Asian Free Trade Agreements: Are They Good for the USA? 10 a.m., and a hearing on the Sale of F–16 Aircraft and Weapons Systems to Pakistan, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on the Judiciary, July 18, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, hearing entitled “Should We Embrace the Senate’s Amnesty to Millions of Illegal Aliens and Repeat the Mistakes of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986?” 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


July 20, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 682, Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, 11:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.
July 20, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, oversight hearing entitled “Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act: Are We Fulfilling the Promise We Made to Cold War Veterans When We Created the Program? Part 3 in a Series,” 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, July 20, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, oversight hearing on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s Growing Operations Crisis Within the National Wildlife Refuge System, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, July 17, to consider H.J. Res. 88, Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

July 18, to consider H.R. 2389, Pledge Protection Act of 2005, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, July 18, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on The National Academy of Sciences’ Decadal Plan for Aeronautics: A Blueprint for NASA? 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

July 19, full Committee and the Committee on House Administration, joint hearing on Voting Machines: Will New Standards and Guidelines Prevent Future Problems? 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.


Committee on Small Business, July 20, Subcommittee on Rural Enterprises, Agriculture, and Technology and the Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports, joint hearing entitled “Chinese Barriers to Trade: Does China Play Fair?” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, July 19, to mark up the following: GSA Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; H.R. 4126, Chesapeake Bay Restoration Enhancement Act of 2005; H.R. 5483, Railroad Retirement Disability Earnings Act; H.R. 5782, Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2006; the Public Transportation Security Assistance Act of 2006; a measure to reauthorize the Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act; a measure to Reform the Wright Amendment; the MARPOL Annex VI Implementation Act of 2006; the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2006; and any other pending business, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

July 19, Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines, oversight hearing on Transit Safety: The Federal Transit Administration’s State Safety Oversight Program, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

July 20, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, oversight hearing on U.S. Coast Guard Licensing and Documentation of Merchant Mariners, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, July 18, hearing on Cyber Security proposal, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

July 19, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on the role of national, state, and county veterans’ service officers in claims development, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

July 20, full Committee, to mark up the following measures: Cyber Security and a Construction and Lease Authorization, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, July 18, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Price Transparency, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

July 19, full Committee, hearing to Review Outcomes of 1996 Welfare Reforms, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, July 18, executive, hearing on The CIA Director As HUMINT Manager, 9:30 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

July 19, hearing on FISA, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

July 20, executive, briefing on Global Updates/Hotspots, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

July 20, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, hearing on FBI Confidential Human Source Operations, 1:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
12 noon, Monday, July 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of S. 3504, S. 2754, and H.R. 810, all Stem Cell Research legislation.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:30 p.m., Monday, July 17

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.