Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 923

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 923, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the New England National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 932

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize physical therapists to evaluate and treat Medicare beneficiaries without a requirement for a physician referral, and for other purposes.

S. 969

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 969, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to modify the definition of supervisor.

S. 1070

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1070, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to enhance the social security of the Nation by ensuring adequate public-private infrastructure and to resolve to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1175, a bill to end the use of child soldiers in hostilities around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to classify certain children's products containing lead to be banned hazardous substances.

S. 1354

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1354, a bill to amend the definition of a law enforcement officer under subchapter III of chapter 83 and chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, to ensure the inclusion of certain positions.

S. 1382

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1398

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1398, a bill to expand the research and prevention activities of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to inflammatory bowel disease.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to assure access to durable medical equipment under the Medicare program.

S. 1451

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1451, a bill to encourage the development of coordinated quality reforms to improve health care delivery and reduce the cost of care in the health care system.

S. 1476

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct special resources study of the Tule Lake Segregation Center in Modoc County, California, to determine suitability and feasibility of establishing a unit of the National Park System.

S. 1605

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1605, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for residential biomass fuel property expenditures.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for reimbursement to servicemebers of tuition for programs of education interrupted by military service, for deferment of student loans and reduced interest rates for servicemembers during periods of military service, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to establish a Special Counsel for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction within the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, to improve the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, to increase resources for regional computer forensic labs, and to make other improvements to increase the ability of law enforcement agencies to investigate and prosecute predators.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1792, a bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to improve such Act.

S. 1793

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1793, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for property owners who remove lead-based paint hazards.

S. 1843

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1843, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify that an unlawful practice occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 221

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 221, a resolution supporting National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Month and efforts to educate people about peripheral arterial disease.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. 1847. A bill to reauthorize the Consumer Produce Safety Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. 1847

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 ''Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2081) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2), and inserting the following:

''(1) $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

''(2) $77,500,000 for fiscal year 2009.

''(3) $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

''(4) $92,500,000 for fiscal year 2011.

''(5) $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.''.

(b) REPEAL OF QUORUM REQUIREMENT FOR TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS.—Section 4(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2053(d)) is amended by striking '', but three'' and all that follows through ''to decline to two''.

(c) REDUCED PERIOD OF NOTICE TO MANUFACTURERS AND PRIVATE LABELERS WITH RESPECT TO DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2055(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''not less than 30 days'' and inserting ''not fewer than 10 days''.

(d) EXPEDITION OF RELEASE OF INFORMATION IN CASE OF NONCOOPERATION BY MANUFACTURER OR PRIVATE LABELER.—Section 6(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2055(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection and paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (a), if the Commission makes an affirmative determination under subparagraph (B) with respect to information obtained under this Act pertaining to a consumer product of a manufacturer or private labeler, the Commission may immediately disclose such information to the public.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1848. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to address the impact of globalization, to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, to extend trade adjustment assistance to service workers, communities, firms, and farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today, I am proud to join with my good friend and colleague Senator SNOWE to introduce the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2007. This legislation would invest in America's workers and firms, farmer, and communities. It would help them to compete in the global marketplace.

The open trade system that has evolved over the past 50 years has created new markets for American ingenuity. It has delivered more affordable goods to American consumers. In Montana alone, trade supports nearly one in five jobs.

But for some Americans, trade-related economic change has not always been smooth. In 2005, the Owens and Hurst sawmill in Eureka, Mt, closed its doors. That mill fell victim to an onslaught of unfairly dumped and subsidized Canadian lumber. Jerry Ross, a supervisor at the mill, lost the job that she had held for over a decade.

Jerry's prospects for reeployment looked dim. Luckily for Jerry, she qualified for Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA. With a diligent, caring job service caseworker by her side, Jerry charted a new course in life.

Jerry has been training intensively the Building Trades program at the Flathead Valley Community College in Kalispell, Mt. She is also taking accounting coursework. When she finishes her training in December, she will be qualified as a construction superintendent. She hopes to start her own business.

Trade Adjustment Assistance helps tens of thousands of American workers like Jerry retrain for and fill jobs, right here at home. But the program is set to expire on September 30. It is up to this Congress to reauthorize and expand the program.

I have consulted closely with workers in Montana. I have sought advice from not just Montana's Department of Labor I have also consulted with officials from Iowa, Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania. I have sat down with unions, businesses, economists, and other experts.

Everyone agrees. TAA is a lifeline to American workers reentering an increasingly global labor market.

But for all the good that Trade Adjustment Assistance does, the current program is a complicated maze of hurdles and exceptions. For instance, workers can qualify for benefits if their jobs move offshore to Canada, Mexico, or another free trade agreement partner. But they will not qualify if their jobs move to China or India. Trade-displaced manufacturing workers can qualify for TAA if they lose their jobs. But accountants or any other service providers cannot. Workers can qualify for wage insurance, but only if they give up their right to retraining.

It does not have to be this way. The Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act authorizes a more fair, flexible, and relevant program.

Today's TAA overlooks the 80 percent of America's workforce employed in the services sector. Tens of thousands of workers who applied for TAA last year were shut out, simply because current law covers workers who produce ''an article.'' This technicality is a holdover from a different era. That was an era when only the manufacturing sector experienced strong foreign competition. We must extend the same protections to services sector workers.

Equally confounding is why workers whose firms move to Canada deserve any less protection than workers whose firms move to India. Globalization does not adhere to any trade agreement. My bill will end this discrimination, by covering any workers whose jobs move offshore, regardless of whether our nations have a trade agreement in force.

Losing health care coverage can be nearly as devastating as losing a job. In 2002, Congress passed legislation to provide TAA-certified workers and certain retirees with an advanceable, refundable healthcare tax credit to cover 65 percent of their insurance premiums. But few have used this credit to replace a portion of their former employer's contribution to their health care premiums. Since folks who are out of work cannot afford to pay more for health coverage, that means most are going without. Our bill would increase the Government share of participants' premiums to 85 percent. That could give workers a real shot at keeping their healthcare coverage. Our bill also would fix the glitches that have made it difficult for workers to access this tax credit.

Our bill would also ensure that States have enough funds to pay for the 2 years of training to which TAA-certified workers are entitled. Today, the law caps the amount of available funds. That leads some States either to run out of or to ration training funds. The Baucus-Snowe bill would double the cap on training funds. That would ensure that all workers, including newly eligible ones, get training. Our bill also includes a trigger to automatically raise the cap to respond to unanticipated training demands.

Our bill also would make important improvements to the pilot wage insurance program that Congress created in 2002. Wage insurance helps older workers supplement lost wages when they get a new job. While older workers suffer worse wage loss, they are certainly not alone. Our bill would allow younger workers to participate in the pilot program. It also would eliminate the requirement that workers forfeit training if they opt for wage insurance. Instead, our bill would allow workers to choose what income assistance is right for them. They could choose this assistance either with training, without training, or after successfully completing training. Wage insurance should supplement, not supplant, TAA benefits.

Our bill also would make important changes in the Commerce Department's TAA for firms program. This program helps workers *and* employers avoid painful layoffs in the first place. TAA for firms gives small businesses the technical assistance that they need to compete in the global economy. But the program runs a substantial backlog of approved but unfunded adjustment projects for participating firms. Our bill would extend coverage to services firms and triples funding to $50 million annually.

Likewise, our bill would improve the Department of Agriculture's TAA for Farmers program. It would ease the overly strict eligibility criteria that have kept many farmers and fishermen legitimately affected by trade from receiving assistance.

But we can do more than that. Many communities in which workers, firms, or farmers have been certified for TAA are struggling to redefine their place in

the global market. This bill would create a new TAA for Communities program to help communities uniquely challenged by trade to plan for the future and to access grant funding to implement that future.

Jerry Ross faced long odds when she lost her job. But because of Trade Adjustment Assistance, she has a bright career. ahead of her. Jerry believes in TAA. She traveled all the way to Washington, DC to urge its renewal and improvement at a Finance Committee hearing in June. I look forward to working with my Colleagues on the Finance Committee and in this chamber to ensure that this Congress does not disappoint Jerry and the tens of thousands of American workers just like her.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as we know, this administration has sought closer trade ties to a growing number of nations throughout the world. It asked the last Congress to consider four free trade agreements, and is currently negotiating at least that number of new agreements, in addition to the Doha round of the World Trade Organization. Yet, in its march to lower our tariffs on imported goods, we must be sure we are not selling our domestic businesses and their works short orworse still—out.

Last year saw a record U.S. trade deficit of $764 billion with the rest of the world. This includes bilateral imbalances with each of China, the European Union, and Japan. These are the latest figures demonstrating a steady slide of U.S. producers' market share in both the domestic and global markets.

One of the most troubling features of the decline of America's trade profile is the dramatic reduction in the number of manufacturing jobs in recent years. Since 2000, America has lost approximately 3 million, or 17 percent of its manufacturing jobs. Maine has lost over 21,000 jobs, representing over 26 percent of our manufacturing workforce. Other States have also found it difficult to retain these high-wage, high-benefit jobs as manufacturing operations move overseas and our demand for foreign-made goods surges.

Unlike job losses due to technological advances, which are the initiative of private enterprise, trade liberalization that sacrifices foundational domestic industries is the chosen policy of government. We therefore have an obligation to ensure that the costs are not borne by these most vulnerable workers alone.

That is why Senator BAUCUS and I—along with Senators WYDEN, COLEMAN, and STABENOW—are today introducing the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2007, which will reauthorize and expand the TAA program to cover new groups of Americans disfranchised by trade liberalization, as I had proposed in previous Congresses.

First among these are service workers and firms. While TAA currently aids U.S. citizens who lost their manufacturing jobs to trade, it fails to address the growing problem of those finding themselves unemployed as a result of foreign outsourcing, also known as offshoring. It is already bad enough that Americans who had careers in the service sector—which proponents of free trade argue should benefit from trade liberalization—are finding themselves out of work. But it is simply Kafkaesque that such service workers, now unemployed due to policies that were supposed to benefit them, would not be eligible for aid under TAA. That is why the legislation we are proposing today critically extends TAA to cover service workers and firms.

It is similarly illogical for workers to be excluded from the TAA program simply because they lost their job due to multilateral trade liberalization carried out under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, as opposed to a bilateral trade agreement, such as a free trade agreement. Yet, thousands of workers remain ineligible for TAA benefits under current law because they happened to lose their job to trade competition from a WTO member such as China or India rather than an FTA partner country. Accordingly, our legislation extends TAA to cover Americans who have been adversely affected by trade liberalization with WTO member, such as China, who are often the worst offenders of international trade rules.

Of critical importance to Maine and other coastal States is TAA's failure to cover fishermen who have suffered from the adverse effects of trade liberalization. U.S. fishermen have seen their livelihoods dissolve due to the reduction of duties on foreign fish and seafood imports. Yet, TAA benefits remain unavailable to these hard-working Americans under the current program. That is why I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation which will make such fisherman eligible for TAA.

An additional concern with the present TAA program is its failure to address the inability of displaced workers in communities that have few jobs to offer. In small towns, including many in Maine, where the livelihood of the local economy often depends on one industry, one plant, or one company that is suffering under trade liberalization, the closure of that business is sure to cause economic ruin and devastation of individual lives.

Accordingly, the legislation we are introducing today would create a program to address economic dislocation in entire communities negatively affected by international trade and provide readjustment assistance to such communities. As we approach the expiry of authorization for both the TAA program and trade promotion authority, I view inclusion of relief for trade-affected communities as a necessary component of any comprehensive trade package.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1852. A bill to designate the Friday after Thanksgiving of each year as ''Native American Heritage Day'' in honor of the achievements and contributions of Native Americans to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that would designate the Friday following Thanksgiving of each year as Native American Heritage Day.

I believe that it is well known to most Members of this body that the original inhabitants of the lands that now constitute the U.S.—the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of America—occupied and exercised sovereignty over more than 550 million acres of land prior to the first European contact.

In the early days of our history, well before our Nation was formed, the native people fought alongside our soldiers in the Revolutionary War. The Indian tribes enabled the survival of General George Washington and his troops during the harsh winter at Valley Forge by providing food to the troops.

A few years later, as our Founding Fathers were engaged in the challenge of forming a new Nation, they drew upon the democratic model of government that they learned from the Six Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy. There they found the well-institutionalized practice of the fundamental principles of freedom of speech and a system of governmental checks and balances provided through the separation of governmental powers.

In our early days as a Nation, we entered into treaties with Native Americans pursuant to the provisions of the U.S. Constitution that recognize them as sovereigns. But later, we abandoned the path of an honorable course of dealings, and turned to war. Thousands lost their lives through these battles and horrific massacres. The native population everywhere was decimated.

Forced marches to relocate the native people from their traditional homelands to areas west of the Mississippi in the dead of winter cost thousands of more lives. Few Americans know that there was not one Trail of Tears, but many.

The Treaties could have signaled a return to a course of honorable dealings with the native people had the U.S. not proceeded to break provisions in every single one of the treaties that were ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Amazingly, notwithstanding these appalling deeds, the native people of the U.S. have always been and continue to be staunchly patriotic and loyal to this country. They have volunteered to serve in the defense of our nation in every military action and war in which we have been engaged, and on a per capita basis, more Native Americans have put themselves in harm's way and given their lives to protect the U.S. than any other group of Americans. They have made the greatest sacrifice, but their contributions do not end there.

We have only to look to the history that is sadly not found in the public school textbooks of America's schools, but has been recorded by historians and anthropologists and through direct, eye-witness accounts, we know that the native people of the U.S. have made significant contributions to our society in every walk of life, in every profession, in medicine and agriculture and as stewards of the lands and resources we all hold dear.

There have been great men and women who have led their native nations out of war, poverty, and despair. Throughout the generations, they have shown us the true meaning of courage in the face of the greatest odds, and the quiet strength to persevere.

A recent nationwide poll of Americans conducted in March of this year reveals that 85 percent of those polled strongly support the setting aside of a day each year to honor the contributions that native people of this land have made to the fabric of American society. Such a day would provide an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about the rich cultural legacy that this Nation's native people have given to us.

I believe the time has come to honor the first Americans of the country in this manner, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 1853. A bill to promote competition, to preserve the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Community Broadband Act of 2007. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senator SMITH of Oregon, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, Senator MCCAIN of Arizona, Senator MCCASKILL of Missouri, and Senator SNOWE of Maine.

Far too many U.S. residents live in areas of the country where there is no broadband access. Too many others live in areas where there may as well be no access because broadband is so expensive. This legislation will promote economic development, enhance public safety, increase educational opportunities, and improve the lives of the people who live in those areas.

In 2004, President Bush called for universal and affordable broadband in the U.S. by the year 2007. We are now more than halfway through 2007, and the U.S. is far from reaching this goal. Not only has the U.S. failed to provide universal, affordable broadband, but we are lagging far behind other countries. A recent study by the International Telecommunication Union shows that the U.S. ranks 15th worldwide in the percentage of people with broadband connections. If you take into account the availability of affordable broadband, the U.S. ranks 21st in the world. The U.S. should be a leader in providing fast and affordable broadband to its citizens.

Many of the countries ahead of the U.S. have successfully combined public and private efforts to deploy municipal networks that connect their residents and businesses with high-speed Internet services. The U.S. should be encouraging these innovative networks. We should not be creating obstacles for municipalities that want to provide affordable broadband access. Unfortunately, 14 States have passed legislation to prohibit or significantly restrict the ability of local municipalities and communities to offer advanced communications services and capabilities to their citizens. More States are considering such legislation. The Community Broadband Act is in response to efforts by States to tell local communities that they cannot establish networks for their residents, even in communities that have no access to broadband, in communities where access is not affordable to all residents, and in communities that want to build high-capacity networks that are comparable to those being built in the leading cities in the world.

The Community Broadband Act is a simple bill. It says that no State can prohibit a municipality from offering high-speed Internet to its residents; and when a municipality is a provider, it cannot abuse its governmental authority as regulator to discriminate against private competitors. Furthermore, a municipality must comply with Federal telecommunications laws. It also contains provisions to ensure transparency by making sure the public is aware of its town's or city's effort and intention to provide broadband either itself or in partnership with a private entity, and provides those in the community with an opportunity to be heard on the costs and benefits of the project and potential alternatives.

This bill will allow communities to make broadband decisions that would: improve their economy and create jobs by serving as a medium for development, particularly in rural and underserved urban areas; aid public safety and first responders by ensuring access to network services while on the road and in the community; strengthen our country's international competitiveness by giving businesses the means to compete more effectively locally, nationally, and internationally; encourage long-distance education through video conferencing and other means of sharing knowledge and enhancing learning via the Internet; and create incentives for public-private partnerships.

A century ago, there were efforts to prevent local governments from offering electricity. Opponents argued that local governments didn't have the expertise to offer something as complex as electricity. They also argued that businesses would suffer if they faced competition from cities and towns. But local community leaders recognized that their economic survival depended on electrifying their communities. They knew that it would take both private investment and public investment to bring electricity to all Americans.

We face a similar situation today. Municipal networks can play an essential role in making broadband access universal and affordable. We must not put up barriers to this possibility.

Some local governments will decide to do this; others will not. Let me be clear, this is not going to be the right decision for every municipality. But there are plenty of examples of municipalities that need to provide broadband, and those municipalities should have the power to do so.

A few months ago, the Parish Council of Jefferson Parish, Louisiana voted unanimously to create a wireless network. Jefferson Parish, like New Orleans, was plagued with communications problems following Hurricane Katrina. New Orleans has already created a wireless network. Now, Jefferson Parish plans to establish its own network to make sure that, should another disaster strike, emergency officials and family members will be able to communicate with one another. During non-emergency times, the network will foster communication between public workers and stimulate economic development.

These stories come from all across the country, from small towns to underserved urban areas. The small town of Granbury, TX, population 6,400, initiated a wireless network after waiting years for private industry to take an interest. In Scottsburg, IN, a city and its 6000 residents and businesses north of Louisville, KY, could not get broadband service from their local phone company. When two important businesses threatened to leave unless they could obtain broadband connectivity, municipal officials stepped forward to provide wireless broadband throughout the town. The town retained the two businesses and gained much more. There are many Granburys and Scottsburgs across the country.

There are also underserved urban areas, where private providers may exist, but many in the community simply cannot afford the high prices. For example, the City of Philadelphia reports that 90 percent of the residents of its affluent neighborhoods have broadband, whereas only 25 percent of residents in its low-income areas have broadband. For that reason, Philadelphia is now creating a city-wide wireless network.

Community broadband networks have the potential to create jobs, spur economic development, and bring the full benefits of the Information Age to everyone. I hope my colleagues will join Senators SMITH, KERRY, MCCAIN, MCCASKILL, SNOWE and me in our effort to enact the Community Broadband Act of 2007.

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. 1853

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 ''Community Broadband Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISION OF ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY AND SERVICES.

No State or local government statute, regulation, or other State or local government legal requirement may prohibit, or have the effect of prohibiting, any public provider from providing advanced telecommunications capability, or services using advanced telecommunications capability, to any person or any public or private entity.

SEC. 3. SAFEGUARDS.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—To the extent any public provider regulates competing providers of advanced telecommunications capability or services, such public provider shall apply its ordinances and rules and policies, including those relating to the use of public rights-of-way, permitting, performance bonding, and reporting, without discrimination in favor of itself or any other provider of advanced telecommunications capability or service that such provider owns or with which such provider is affiliated.

(b) APPLICATION OF GENERAL LAWS.—Nothing in this Act exempts a public provider that offers advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public from any Federal communications law or regulation that applies to all providers of advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS ENCOURAGED.

Each public provider that intends to provide advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public is encouraged to consider the potential benefits of a public-private partnership prior to providing such capability or services.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC INPUT.

(a) NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD.—Before a public provider may provide advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public, either directly or through a public-private partnership, such public provider shall—

(1) publish notice of its intention to do so;

(2) generally describe the capability or services to be provided and the proposed coverage area for such capability or services;

(3) identify any special capabilities or services to be provided in low-income areas or other demographically or geographically defined areas; and

(4) provide local citizens and private-sector entities with an opportunity to be heard on the costs and benefits of the project and potential alternatives to the project.

(b) APPLICATION TO EXISTING PROJECTS AND PENDING PROPOSALS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any contract or other arrangement under which a public provider is providing advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any public provider proposal to provide advanced telecommunications capability or services to the public that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) is in the request-for-proposals process;

(B) is in the process of being built; or

(C) has been approved by referendum.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTIONS.

The requirements of sections 3 and 5 shall not apply—

(1) when a public provider provides advanced telecommunications capabilities or services other than to the public or to such classes of users as to be effectively available to the public; or

(2) during an emergency declared by the President, the Governor of the State in which the public provider is located, or any other elected local official authorized by law to declare a state of emergency in the jurisdiction in which the public provider is located.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY.—The term ''advanced telecommunications capability'' has the meaning given that term by section 706(c)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 157 note).

(2) PUBLIC PROVIDER.—The term ''public provider'' means a State or political subdivision thereof, any agency, authority, or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or any entity that is owned, controlled, or otherwise affiliated with a State, political subdivision thereof, agency, authority, or instrumentality, or Indian tribe.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1854. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve elderly suicide early intervention and prevention strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Stop Senior Suicide Act.

As many of you know, suicide prevention is an issue close to my heart for personal reasons. In 1972, I lost my own father to suicide. Over the years that followed, my family did not talk about it and instead carried the pain in a very private and lonely way.

Sadly, this continued until I was contacted by Jerry and Elsie Weyrauch from the Suicide Prevention Action Network USA, a national advocacy organization focused on suicide prevention. Knowing that I had lost my dad to suicide, they asked if I would speak at their second annual suicide awareness event. I was also asked to sponsor a suicide resolution to focus much needed attention on the issue of suicide in America. On May 6, 1997, I introduced such a resolution and saw it pass the Senate that same day with unanimous support. I was heartened that my work on suicide prevention had begun on this auspicious note, but it was also clear that much more work remained to be done.

Today, 10 years later, I rise to address one of those challenges before us: the unacceptably high suicide rates among the elderly. While the public is increasingly aware of suicide as a leading cause of death in America, what is less well-known is the vulnerability of older adults. Suicide is disproportionately a killer of seniors, with the risk climbing steadily with age. In fact, the suicide rate for men 85 years of age and older is the highest of all. Moreover, older adults who attempt suicide are much more likely than younger people to carry it out to completion.

As shocks to the national conscience, these statistics point us to the despair, hopelessness, and desperation that predispose so many seniors to suicide. They also lead to the question: Why are older Americans more vulnerable? Compared to other age groups, they often must deal with social isolation, financial hardship, and debilitating illnesses. We also know that far too many have mental health care needs that go unrecognized and unmet. Tragically, one-third of older adults who die from suicide had seen their primary care physician in the week before their deaths, and 70 percent during the prior month.

These findings do not just constitute a serious public health problem. They also conflict with America's belief in living our golden years in dignity. The ''bankruptcy of hope and resources'' affecting those at risk ultimately affect us all as a nation.

I am introducing the Stop Senior Suicide Act to take action on this issue. As a start, this legislation would create an Interagency Geriatric Mental Health Planning Council to improve the geriatric mental health and social services delivery system. Composed of representatives from the health Federal agencies and the community of older adults, the council will make recommendations and foster the integration of mental health, suicide prevention, health, and aging services. In doing so, the council will ensure that senior suicide and geriatric mental health receive the attention befitting a national priority.

As another step, my legislation would authorize a grant program for suicide prevention and early intervention programs focused on seniors. Many of the risk factors and challenges facing the elderly, after all, are unique. Through these grants, public and private nonprofit entities would be able to build innovative approaches and implement them in settings that serve seniors, such as Older Americans Act delivery sites. To help grantees achieve their goals, the bill also would authorize additional funding for the Suicide Prevention Technical Assistance Center to offer guidance and training.

Finally, the Stop Senior Suicide Act would eliminate a major barrier to receiving and affording mental health care. Clinical depression and suicidal feelings are not a normal part of aging, yet these treatable conditions are often misdiagnosed, untreated, or ignored in far too many seniors. Out-of-pocket expenses under Medicare, the health insurance program for 37 million Americans aged 65 years and older, is a key reason. Medicare currently imposes a 50 percent coinsurance payment for outpatient mental health services,

even though it charges just a 20 percent coinsurance for all other outpatient care. The resulting coverage inequity discourages beneficiaries, especially low-income and fixed-income retirees, from seeking mental health treatment. It keeps some from getting treatment altogether. The Stop Senior Suicide Act would thus adjust the 50 percent coinsurance to 20 percent.

Together, the provisions in the legislation I am introducing today are designed to take an important step forward in our efforts to prevent senior suicides. That is why the Stop Senior Suicide Act is endorsed by the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, the American Geriatrics Society, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Public Health Association, Mental Health America, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Association of Social Workers, the National Council on Aging, and the Older Women's League. I would like to thank the Suicide Prevention Action Network USA in particular for all its hard work on this issue.

Anyone, regardless of age, can be at risk of suicide, but older Americans are especially vulnerable. The resulting call to action will only grow in importance and urgency as more of America's 77 million baby boomers enter their 60s in the coming years. As such, I hope that my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting the Stop Senior Suicide Act.

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. 1854

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 ''Stop Senior Suicide Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The rate of suicide among older adults is higher than that for any other age group, and the suicide rate for individuals 85 years of age and older is the highest of all. In 2004, 6,860 older Americans (age 60 and older) died by suicide (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007).

(2) In 2004, the elderly (age 65 and older) made up only 12.4 percent of the population but accounted for 16 percent of all suicides.

(3) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, from 1980 to 1992, the suicide rate rose 9 percent for Americans 65 years of age and above, and rose 35 percent for men and women ages 80 to 84.

(4) Older adults have a considerably higher rate of completed suicide than other groups. While for all age groups combined there is one suicide for every 20 attempts, there is one suicide for every 4 attempts among those 65 years of age and older.

(5) Of the nearly 35,000,000 Americans age 65 and older, it is estimated that 2,000,000 have a depressive illness and another 5,000,000 suffer from depressive symptoms and syndromes that fall short of meeting full diagnostic criteria for a disorder (Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, 1999).

(6) Seniors covered by Medicare are required to pay a 50 percent co-pay for outpatient mental health services while they are only required to pay a 20 percent co-pay for physical health services.

(7) It is estimated that 20 percent of older adults who complete suicide visited a physician within the prior 24 hours, 41 percent within the past week, and 75 percent within the past month (Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent Suicide, 1999).

(8) A substantial proportion of older patients receive no treatment or inadequate treatment for their depression in primary care settings (National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Panel on Depression in Late Life, 1992; Lebowitz et al., 1997).

(9) Suicide in older adults is most associated with late-onset depression. Among patients 75 years of age and older, 60 to 75 percent of suicides have diagnosable depression (Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, 1999).

(10) Research suggests that many seniors receive mental health assistance from their primary care providers or other helping professionals versus specialty mental health professionals (Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, 1999).

(11) Objective 4.6 of the National Strategy for Suicide Prevention calls for increasing the proportion of State Aging Networks that have evidence-based suicide prevention programs designed to identify and refer for treatment of elderly people at risk for suicidal behavior.

(12) Objective 1.1 of the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health calls for advancing and implementing a national campaign to reduce the stigma of seeking care and a national strategy for suicide prevention. The report addresses targeting to distinct and often hard-to-reach populations, such as ethnic and racial minorities, older men, and adolescents (NFC Report, 2003).

(13) One of the top 10 resolutions at the 2005 White House Conference on Aging called for improving the recognition, assessment, and treatment of mental illness and depression among older Americans.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL INTERAGENCY GERIATRIC MENTAL HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish an Interagency Geriatric Mental Health Planning Council (referred to in this section as the ''Council'') to coordinate and collaborate on the planning for the delivery of mental health services, to include suicide prevention, to older adults.

(b) MEMBERS.—The members of the Council shall include representatives of—

(1) the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration;

(2) the Indian Health Service;

(3) the Health Resources and Services Administration;

(4) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

(5) the National Institute of Mental Health;

(6) the National Institute on Aging;

(7) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(8) the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(9) older adults, family members of older adults with mental illness, and geriatric mental health experts or advocates for elderly mental health concerns, to be appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in consultation with a national advocacy organization focused on suicide prevention, including senior suicide prevention.

(c) CO-CHAIRS.—The Assistant Secretary for Health and the Assistant Secretary for Aging of the Department of Health and Human Services shall serve as the co-chairs of the Council.

(d) ACTIVITIES.—The Council shall—

(1) carry out an interagency planning process to foster the integration of mental health, suicide prevention, health, and aging services, which is critical for effective service delivery for older adults;

(2) make recommendations to the heads of relevant Federal agencies to improve the delivery of mental health and suicide prevention services for older adults; and

(3) submit an annual report to the President and Congress concerning the activities of the Council.

SEC. 4. ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATORY CO-PAYMENT RATES FOR MEDICARE OUTPATIENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2008.

SEC. 5. ELDERLY SUICIDE EARLY INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION STRATEGIES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 520E–2 (42 U.S.C. 290bb–36b) the following:

''SEC. 520E–3. ELDERLY SUICIDE EARLY INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION STRATEGIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants or cooperative agreements to eligible entities to develop strategies for addressing suicide among the elderly.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible for a grant or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) and entity shall—

''(1) be a—

''(A) State or local government agency, a territory, or a federally recognized Indian tribe, tribal organization (as defined in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act), or an urban Indian organization (as defined in the Indian Health Care Improvement Act); or

''(B) a public or private nonprofit organization; and

''(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity shall use amounts received under a grant or cooperative agreement under this section to—

''(1) develop and implement elderly suicide early intervention and prevention strategies in 1 or more settings that serve seniors, including senior centers, nutrition sites, primary care settings, veterans' facilities, nursing facilities, assisted living facilities, and aging information and referral sites, such as those operated by area agencies on aging or Aging and Disability Resource Centers (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965);

''(2) collect and analyze data on elderly suicide early intervention and prevention services for purposes of monitoring, research and policy development; and

''(3) assess the outcomes and effectiveness of such services.

''(d) REQUIREMENTS.—An applicant for a grant or cooperative agreement under this section shall demonstrate how such applicant will—

''(1) collaborate with other State and local public and private nonprofit organizations;

''(2) offer immediate support, information, and referral to seniors or their families who are at risk for suicide, and appropriate postsuicide intervention services care, and information to families and friends of seniors who recently completed suicide and other interested individuals; and

''(3) conduct annual self-evaluations concerning the goals, outcomes, and effectiveness of the activities carried out under the grant or agreement, in consultation with interested families and national advocacy organizations focused on suicide prevention, including senior suicide prevention.

''(e) PREFERENCE.—In awarding a grant or cooperative agreement under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants with demonstrated expertise and capability in providing—

''(1) early intervention and assessment services, including voluntary screening programs, education, and outreach to elderly who are at risk for mental or emotional disorders that may lead to a suicide attempt and that are integrated with aging services support organizations;

''(2) early intervention and prevention practices and strategies adapted to the community it will serve, with equal preference given to applicants that are already serving the same community, and applicants that will serve a new community under a grant or agreement under this section, if the applicant has already demonstrated expertise and capability in providing early intervention and prevention practices and strategies adapted to the community or communities it currently serves;

''(3) access to services and care for seniors with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds; and

''(4) services in States or geographic regions with rates of elder suicide that exceed the national average as determined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

''(f) REQUIREMENT FOR DIRECT SERVICES.—Not less than 85 percent of amounts received under a grant or cooperative agreement under this section shall be used to provide direct services.

''(g) COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section (including awarding grants and cooperative agreements under subsection (a)), the Secretary shall collaborate with the Interagency Geriatric Mental Health Planning Council.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in developing and implementing Federal policy to carry out this section, the Secretary shall consult with—

''(i) State and local agencies, including agencies comprising the aging network;

''(ii) national advocacy organizations focused on suicide prevention, including senior suicide prevention;

''(iii) relevant national medical and other health specialty organizations;

''(iv) seniors who are at risk for suicide, who have survived suicide attempts, or who are currently receiving care from early intervention and prevention services;

''(v) families and friends of seniors who are at risk for suicide, who have survived attempts, who are currently receiving care from early intervention and prevention services, or who have completed suicide;

''(vi) qualified professionals who possess the specialized knowledge, skills, experience, and relevant attributes needed to serve seniors at risk for suicide and their families; and

''(vii) other entities as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not consult with the entities described in subparagraph (A) for the purpose of awarding grants and cooperative agreements under subsection (a).

''(h) EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.—

''(1) EVALUATIONS BY GRANTEES.—

''(A) EVALUATION DESIGN.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant or cooperative agreement under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary a plan on the design of an evaluation strategy to assess the effectiveness of results of the activities carried out under the grant or agreement.

''(B) EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than 2 years after receiving a grant or cooperative agreement under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an effectiveness evaluation on the implementation and results of the activities carried out by the eligible entity under the grant or agreement.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date that the initial grants or cooperative agreements are awarded to eligible entities under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the projects funded under this section and include an evaluation plan for future activities. The report shall—

''(A) be a coordinated response by all representatives on the Interagency Geriatric Mental Health Advisory Council; and

''(B) include input from consumers and family members of consumers on progress being made and actions that need to be taken.

''(i) DEFINITION.—In this section:

''(1) AGING NETWORK.—The term 'aging network' has the meaning given such term in section 102(5) of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

''(2) EARLY INTERVENTION.—The term 'early intervention' means a strategy or approach that is intended to prevent an outcome or to alter the course of an existing condition.

''(3) PREVENTION.—The term 'prevention' means a strategy or approach that reduces the likelihood of risk or onset, or delays the onset, of adverse health problems that have been known to lead to suicide.

''(4) SENIOR.—The term 'senior' means—

''(A) an individual who is 60 years of age or older and being served by aging network programs; or

''(B) an individual who is 65 years of age or older and covered under Medicare.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section there is authorized to be appropriated $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $6,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

''(2) PREFERENCE.—If less than $3,500,000 is appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this section, in awarding grants and cooperative agreements under this section during such fiscal year, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants in States that have rates of elderly suicide that significantly exceed the national average as determined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.''.

SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER.

(a) INTERAGENCY RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—Section 520C(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–34(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''youth suicide early intervention and prevention strategies'' and inserting ''suicide early intervention and prevention strategies for all ages, particularly for groups that are at a high risk for suicide'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''youth suicide early intervention and prevention strategies'' and inserting ''suicide early intervention and prevention strategies for all ages, particularly for groups that are at a high risk for suicide'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''youth''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''for all ages, particularly for groups that are at a high risk for suicide'';

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking ''youth suicide'' and inserting ''suicide for all ages, particularly among groups that are at a high risk for suicide'';

(5) in paragraph (5), by striking ''youth suicide early intervention techniques and technology'' and inserting ''suicide early intervention techniques and technology for all ages, particularly for groups that are at a high risk for suicide'';

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''youth''; and

(B) by inserting ''for all ages, particularly for groups that are at a high risk for suicide,'' after ''strategies''; and

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) by striking ''youth suicide'' each place that such appears and inserting ''suicide''; and

(B) by striking ''in youth'' and inserting ''among all ages, particularly among groups that are at a high risk for suicide''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 520C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–34) is amended in the heading by striking ''youth''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) **In general**.—In addition to any other funds made available, there are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a).

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Any funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to carry out other activities under section 520C(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–34(d)) (as amended by subsection (a)).

(3) RESULT OF INCREASE IN FUNDING.—If, as a result of the enactment of this Act, a recipient of a grant under subsection (a)(2) of section 520C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–34) receives an increase in funding to carry out activities under subsection (d) of such section related to suicide prevention and intervention among groups that are at a high risk for suicide, then, notwithstanding any other provision of such section, such recipient shall provide technical assistance to all grantees receiving funding under such section or section 520E–3 of such Act (as added by section 5).

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. 1855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide relief to individuals from the penalty for failure to pay estimated taxes on amounts attributable to the alternative minimum tax in cases where the taxpayer was not subject to the alternative minimum tax in the preceding year; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, right now millions of Americans don't know whether they should be paying an estimated tax because Congress hasn't passed AMT relief. In other words, there are many taxpayers who will be facing a big tax bill if we don't pass AMT relief. By law, many of these taxpayers should be paying estimated tax right now based on the fact that as the law is today, they are subject to the AMT. In order to these taxpayers, I am introducing the AMT Penalty Protection Act of 2007.

Under this legislation, in computing tax for purpose of the penalties in the

tax code dealing with estimated tax, a taxpayer would be permitted to disregard the alternative minimum tax if the individual was not liable for the alternative minimum tax for the preceding tax year.

So if you didn't have to pay AMT last year we aren't going to penalize you if you don't file estimated taxes for AMT this year.

Just because Congress can't do its job, doesn't mean the taxpayer should be punished.

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. 1855

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 ''AMT Penalty Protection Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. ESTIMATED TAX SAFE HARBOR FOR ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6654 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to failure by individual to pay estimated income tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsection:

''(m) SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX PAYERS.—In the case of any individual with respect to whom there was no liability for the tax imposed under section 55 for the preceding taxable year—

''(1) any required payment calculated under subsection (d)(1)(B)(i) shall be determined without regard to any tax imposed under section 55,

''(2) any annualized income installment calculated under subsection (d)(2)(B) shall determined without regard to alternative minimum taxable income, and

''(3) the determination of the amount of the tax for the taxable year for purposes of subsection (e)(1) shall not include the amount of any tax imposed under section 55.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 277

Whereas it is a tradition of the Senate to honor and pay tribute to those places and institutions within the United States with historic significance that has contributed to the culture and traditions of the citizens of the United States;

Whereas, in accordance with this tradition, the Senate is proud to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Archdiocese of New York and its history of faith and service;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York has planned a year-long series of events beginning in April 2007 to celebrate its bicentennial;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York is coordinating with Catholic Charities of New York to institute an Archdiocese of New York Day of Service to celebrate its history of serving the broader community;

Whereas, on April 8, 1808, the Diocese of New York was established with the Most Reverend R. Luke Concanen as its first Bishop, and the Diocese was elevated to an Archdiocese in 1850;

Whereas, on March 15, 1875, His Eminence John Cardinal McCloskey, the second Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York, became the first Cardinal Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York has welcomed Papal visits from Pope Paul VI, on October 5, 1965, and Pope John Paul II, on October 7, 1979 and October 5, 1995;

Whereas, on September 14, 1975, Elizabeth Ann Seton, a member of the Archdiocese of New York and founder of the modern Catholic education parochial school system, became the first person born in the United States to be named a saint;

Whereas Elizabeth Ann Seton is described on the front doors of St. Patrick's Cathedral as a ''Daughter of New York'' and several schools are named after her, including Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York is currently under the spiritual guidance of His Eminence Edward M. Cardinal Egan, who was installed on June 19, 2000 and elevated to Cardinal on February 21, 2001;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York originally included the entirety of the States of New York and New Jersey, an area that is now divided into 12 dioceses;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York has 2,500,000 Catholics in its fold;

Whereas the Archdiocese of New York consists of 402 parishes, 278 elementary and high schools, and 3,729 charitable ministries, including Catholic Charities, hospitals, nursing homes, and outreach programs; and

Whereas, throughout its rich historical past and up to the present day, the Archdiocese of New York has been sustained by the beneficent efforts of countless parishioners and ministries that have generously supported their community with abundant kindness and good deeds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 200th anniversary of the Archdiocese of New York.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2365. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1642, to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2366. Mr. DORGAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2367. Mr. DEMINT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2368. Mr. KENNEDY (for Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. NELSON of Florida)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2369. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2370. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1642, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2371. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. WEBB) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2372. Mr. AKAKA proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2373. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. BURR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2374. Mr. SESSIONS proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2375. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. BURR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2376. Mr. BROWN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2377. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2378. Mr. COLEMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1642, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2379. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2380. Mr. HARKIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2377 proposed by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. CLINTON) to the bill S. 1642, to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

SA 2381. Mr. KENNEDY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2369 submitted by Mr. COBURN to the bill S. 1642, supra.

SA 2382. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1642, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2365. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1642, to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 895, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

PART H—FEDERAL DIRECT LOANS

SEC. 498. NO ACCRUAL OF INTEREST FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS AND THEIR SPOUSES.

Section 455 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) NO ACCRUAL OF INTEREST FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS AND THEIR SPOUSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, and except as provided in paragraph (3), interest on a loan made under this part shall not accrue for an eligible borrower.

''(2) ELIGIBLE BORROWER.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible borrower' means an individual—

''(A) who is—

''(i) serving on active duty during a war or other military operation or national emergency; or

''(ii) performing qualifying National Guard duty during a war or other military operation or national emergency; or

''(B) who is the spouse of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) LIMITATION.—An individual who qualifies as an eligible borrower under this subsection may receive the benefit of this subsection for not more than 60 months.''.