friend that we would vote on the cloture motion on Wednesday rather than Thursday?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say to my friend the majority leader, I think that is fine. Just a suggestion: If we go down that path of trying to get cloture on every single amendment, if cloture is invoked, then it would further delay completion of the bill potentially by somebody insisting on using postcloture time. We have no desire to make it difficult to get through this bill. We would, however, like to have votes on our amendments.

I think the better way to proceed, as the majority leader has suggested, is to see if we can come to agreement on amendments and side by sides and move the process along, which sounds to me is what the majority leader is suggesting, and that is fine with me.

Mr. REID. That is fine. What we will do, Mr. President, is hopefully not have to file cloture on this amendment. If we do, we will have a cloture vote on Wednesday. I feel confident we can work something out. We will certainly do our best on this side. Senator LEVIN is here. He is easy to work with, as is Senator WARNER.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the cloture vote taking place on Wednesday?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in January the Senate took an important step toward improving congressional accountability by passing the Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act as part of S. 1. One of the key provisions of this legislation attempts to shine light on the process by which Members request the inclusion of specific projects in legislation—in other words, earmarks.

That provision includes a requirement that each Senate committee make public all congressional earmarks included in bills reported by the committee. We normally think of earmarks as part of the appropriations process, but the requirement in S. 1 applies to all bills and makes it clear that the term ''congressional earmark'' includes language authorizing funds, not just appropriations language. The legislation includes a specific requirement to disclose earmarks contained in classified portions of reports ''to the extent practicable, consistent with the need to protect national security.''

With that in mind, I rise today to formally describe for the Senate the earmarks included in S. 1538, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, a bill reported by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on May 31, 2007. This information was not included specifically in the bill or report because we were wrestling with what, if anything, in the bill and classified annex met the definition of an earmark. The definition included in S. 1 is subject to some interpretation.

Taking an expansive view of the definition, Vice Chairman BOND and I identified three items that seem to fit. I ask to have a list of those earmarks printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS INCLUDED IN THE CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING S. 1538, THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

A provision adding $200,000 to the office of the Director of National Intelligence for an Intelligence Training Program run by the Kennedy School of Government. This program was started in fiscal year 2007 but the President did not request funding for it for fiscal year 2008. The provision was added at the request of Senator Rockefeller.

A provision adding $4,500,000 to the Naval Oceanographic Command. This provision was added at the request of Senator Lott.

A provision directing the expenditure of $5,000,000 for a classified effort with the National Reconnaissance Office's GEOINT/SIGINT Integrated Ground Development Engineering and Management Expenditure Center. This provision was added at the request of Senator Rockefeller.

S. 1538 contains no limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits, as defined in Section 103 of S. 1.

MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT OF 2007

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On July 1, 2007, while picnicking near Lake Natoma outside Folsom, CA, Satendar Singh, a 26-year-old from Fiji, was attacked by a man hurling racist and homophobic insults. Singh and his friends, each of either Indian or Fijian descent, were harassed repeatedly for several hours by a nearby group of Russian-speaking men and women. That evening, about six men from that group approached Singh, again insulting Singh and his friends. One of the men struck Singh, causing him to fall to the ground and hit his head. Bleeding profusely, Singh was taken to the hospital. He died 4 days later on July 5, 2007, after his relatives and doctors agreed to take him off of life support. According to his friends, Singh was not gay, but officials maintain that the attack was motivated by the belief on the part of the assailant that he was.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Matthew Shepard Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

H. RES. 121

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President. On June 26, 2007, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives met to consider and adopt H. Res. 121. This resolution was authored by Congressman MICHAEL HONDA of San Jose, CA.

H. Res. 121 expresses the sense of the U.S. House of Representatives that the Government of Japan should formally acknowledge, apologize, and accept historical responsibility in a clear and unequivocal manner for its Imperial Armed Force's coercion of young women into sexual slavery, known to the world as ''comfort women,'' during its colonial and wartime occupation of Asia and the Pacific Islands from the 1930s through the duration of World War II.

There is no doubt in my mind that during the war period the men in the Imperial Armed Forces of the Government of Japan did abuse, assault, and forcibly impose their wills upon women for sexual purposes. This was conduct and behavior that cannot in any way be condoned or justified.

These events, according to H. Res. 121, occurred during the war period of the 1930s and 1940s. Records indicate that on August 31, 1994, as the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II was approaching, then Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama issued a statement articulating Japan's remorse and apology to comfort women.

His statement says in part, ''on the issue of wartime 'comfort women,' which seriously stained the honor and dignity of many women, I would like to take this opportunity once again to express my profound and sincere remorse and apologies.''

This statement was made in his official capacity as Prime Minister of Japan.

Subsequently, every successive Prime Minister since 1996—Prime Ministers Hashimoto, Obuchi, Mori, and Koizumi—have all issued letters of apologies to individual former comfort women, who have accepted an apology letter along with atonement money offered to her by the Asian Woman's Fund. It should be noted that some former comfort women refused to accept the atonement money.

The Asian Women's Fund was established, sanctioned, and approved by the Government of Japan. The letters addressed to former comfort women were issued by the Prime Ministers of Japan in their official capacity, and recite, ''as Prime Minister of Japan, I thus extend anew my most sincere apologies