

NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2266, a bill to establish a fellowship program for the congressional hiring of disabled veterans.

S. 2284

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2284, a bill to extend the termination date for the exemption of returning workers from the numerical limitations for temporary workers.

S. 2318

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2318, a bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille.

S. RES. 180

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 180, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Epidermolysis Bullosa Awareness Week to raise public awareness and understanding of the disease and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families.

S. RES. 313

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 313, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week should be established to increase awareness of methamphetamine and to educate the public on ways to help prevent the use of that damaging narcotic.

S. RES. 371

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 371, a resolution designating July 22, 2006, as "National Day of the American Cowboy".

S. RES. 378

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 378, a resolution designating February 25, 2006, as "National MPS Awareness Day".

S. RES. 383

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 383, a resolution calling on the President to take immediate steps to help improve the security situation in Darfur, Sudan, with an emphasis on civilian protection.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2333. A bill to require an investigation under the Defense Production Act of 1950 of the acquisition by Dubai Ports World of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I come to the Chamber today first to announce introduction of legislation, S. 2333, which would deal with the Dubai Ports issue. The legislation is bipartisan. It has five Democratic and five Republican sponsors, although the number is growing. The lead Republican sponsor is my friend from Minnesota, Mr. COLEMAN, who had hoped to be here today, but I believe his flight was delayed, and he is just arriving about now.

First, I would like to speak about the recent developments in Dubai Ports World's takeover of several major ports. I believe the bipartisan legislation which I and others will introduce today is the path forward with respect to this deal and securing our Nation's ports and making sure that homeland security is the No. 1 priority.

As we know, the administration and DP World executives reached an agreement yesterday to allow for a 45-day investigation of security concerns raised by this deal. That is good news. I salute the administration and President Bush for doing so.

The bottom line is that many of us have called for this 45-day investigation—many of us from both parties over the last week and a half—and the fact that the President is doing it is very good news. To dig in one's heels doesn't make much sense, particularly when it comes to homeland security. So the new agreement is a major step forward, and it is a key part of what many of us have been asking for in recent weeks. But there are still some outstanding questions. That is why we will be introducing our legislation this afternoon. The devil is in the details. It is plain and simple.

Here are some of the questions that have yet to be answered.

First, we must make sure that the CFIUS Committee conducts a full, thorough, and independent investigation. We can ask for no less, given that the security of our homeland is at stake. Reports that I and others have received have been that the previous investigation was cursory, was casual, was not as thorough as it might be. There are reports, for instance, that people simply looked in the record books to see if there was something wrong that DP World had done. That is not the kind of investigation you need

when for the first time they are going to operate the ports here in the United States. And because the committee has already taken a position, even if it is in a casual and cursory way, we have to make sure they are able to approach this with an open mind. We need real independence here.

Make no mistake about it; the CFIUS Committee in the past has too often made economic and diplomatic considerations at a greater level than homeland security consideration. That is buttressed by the fact that there are reports in the newspapers that the homeland security representative on the committee first objected and then withdrew his objection.

Again, we have to make sure there is a broader question; that is, whether the CFIUS Committee is the right committee to begin with to do this. Are they structured properly in a post-9/11 world?

When they were first set up more than 20 years ago, part of the purpose was almost to provide a security justification for economic deals that had to go through. But even in the confines of present law, we have to make sure that the investigation is thorough, complete, and independent.

Let me mention one point in this regard. I had been very perturbed when I learned that the Port Authority of New York/New Jersey, in charge of our ports, was not even consulted about this deal. Had they been consulted, they would have talked about all kinds of problems that they saw, and as a result they are now suing to block the deal. But how thorough could an investigation be if the governmental agency in charge of running the ports, in our largest port on the east coast, was not even consulted?

So the first question is, will the investigation be thorough, will it be complete, and will it be independent? Will those who have already brushed aside any complaints or worries be able now to have an open mind? I hope so. I am not prejudging, but it is a question that has to be asked as the investigation proceeds.

The second question is, what will happen with the report once it is completed? If the report is kept secret and only given to the President, then what good was the new 45-day investigation? After all, the President has already said he is for this, and I would like to hear the President say that if new concerns are brought up by the report, he would reconsider his support of this merger. We have not heard that yet. So at that point, we are sort of in a position where it is almost like Alice in Wonderland, where you first have the verdict and then the trial. For this 45-day investigation to have real merit, since it does go to the President by law and he gets the right to say "yes" or "no," it would help with the American people to say he has an open mind as well; he is not locked into a position.

My belief is this: I think the report should be made available to the Senate

and the House, to any Member of the Senate and House who wishes to see it, and should be made public, at least the nonclassified parts of the report. It can be done on a redacted basis.

Why? First of all, we do need independent judgment. Again, because the President has come out so firmly for this proposal, to allow the House and Senate to see the full report makes a great deal of sense and because the American people have so many concerns. Go to any street corner in any city or town or suburb in this country and you will hear questions asked about this. Every time I have been on an airplane—and I have been on airplanes in various parts of the country—people actually get out of their seats and come over to me and say: What is going on here? So making the report public, at least in a redacted way, so the classified parts are not obviously exposed, makes a great deal of sense. So that is our second question.

The third question is evaluation. It seems to me that in this particular area where there has been such concern, there ought to be, in a constitutionally and legislatively proper way, an ability for this body and the other body to disapprove the deal. And that is what our legislation calls for. It calls for a 30-day period after the report is issued before any merger is consummated so that Congress can disapprove the deal. As you know, Mr. President, there are strict laws on how Congress can approve and disapprove administrative actions, and we have consulted those documents and our disapproval is in keeping with the way you should structure such a disapproval.

So those are the three major questions that our legislation asks. The legislation, S. 2333, which 10 of us, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, are introducing this afternoon, deals not only with the 45-day review which the President has already agreed to but the giving of the final report to the House and Senate and to the public in a non-classified way and gives the Congress the 30-day right for disapproval.

Now, there is one other question not engaged by our legislation that has to be answered and that is this: Because this is a voluntary agreement between the administration and DP World, I have concerns about, because the merger is going to go forward, how securely walled off is the American part of this new enterprise from the rest. If you read the document that has been made public, it is sort of contradictory, in a certain sense. We want to make sure that those walls are thick, that nobody in the Dubai Ports World organization can influence decisions made here, at least while the investigation is going forward. These will be other questions that I think we should ask.

Now, what is the status, what will we do with this legislation? Well, the President's agreeing to a 45-day investigation obviates the need to ask for a vote in this Chamber immediately, al-

though I am confident that if the legislation were brought to the floor, it would receive an overwhelming vote, probably a veto-proof majority. However, we will keep this legislation at the ready as we follow the investigation. If the investigation should falter or it should not be made public, then the legislation might well be brought to the floor again. The bottom line is, those of us who have great concern about this deal are in a period of watchful waiting. We are hopeful that the bipartisan compromise we have put together will sort of spread. We are hopeful that the President's going along with the 45-day investigation is an indication that we can continue to work together. None of us relishes the occasion to bring this legislation to the floor. It would be much better if the President would agree to all of its terms. But at the moment, we will carefully watch and wait, doing our best to make sure that the investigation is complete, thorough, and independent, doing our best to make sure that Members of Congress and the public can see all the appropriate parts of the investigation and then, should the need arise, have an opportunity to disapprove of this merger.

One other point, larger point. Whatever happens with this merger, in terms of its effect on the United States and its ports, there is one bit of good that can come out of this sorry mess; namely, that this Congress, that this administration focus much more on port security. There is no question that we have not done enough in terms of port security. In the air, we have done a pretty good job. We have spent about \$8 billion, and while not all of it was spent perfectly, we are a lot safer from terrorism in the air than we were before. But in our ports, which are perhaps more vulnerable and wide open, we haven't done enough. Amendment after amendment after amendment that I and others have brought up over the last 4 years has been defeated, oftentimes on party-line votes. There is a need to do many things. There is a need to make sure that every container that comes into this country can be inspected, can be done mechanically for nuclear material. There is a need to make sure that those containers do not contain biological or chemical weapons. There is a need to make sure that the containers are far more tamperproof than they are today—not all of them are; far too many are not—so that there can't be something slipped into that container while it is on board ship or has already been loaded or checked out at the port of embarkation. There is a need to make sure that personnel both on our side of the ocean and on the other side of either ocean have been thoroughly checked out, in terms of their background, so that terrorist organizations cannot infiltrate because we all know in terrorism handbook 101, infiltration is probably the best way to smuggle some terrible weapons onto our shores.

We also have to make sure that we have greater personnel, greater machinery, greater computers and technology so that a higher percentage of containers, not just the 1 in 20, can be inspected; 1 in 20 is too great a gamble and too great a risk.

As we move forward, I hope that these will happen. And one other thing that ought to be done. We ought to take a look at the CFIUS committee, which in the past has too often taken the path of least resistance and doesn't give foreign takeovers the critical national security review they deserve.

According to a 2005 report, "The manner in which the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States implements Exon-Florio may limit its effectiveness. For example, Treasury in its role as Chair and some others narrowly define what constitutes a threat to national security."

This week, the Banking Committee will hold hearings on CFIUS reform, and I look forward to working with Chairman SHELBY and Senator SARBANES to carefully examine the CFIUS process, something I have had trouble with in the past.

In conclusion, the last 2 weeks have been extraordinary. Rarely do we see these days a bipartisan, bicameral unity to ensure our Nation is protected, and those of us who worked hard at this, I say to my colleagues, can be proud that we have already seen some major progress. The 45-day investigation will commence. We must keep our vigilance and make sure the rest of the process is done fairly and carefully and independently because the security of our country depends upon it.

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

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

S. 2333

*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 "Foreign Investment Security Improvement Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. INVESTIGATION UNDER DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.**

(a) INVESTIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President or the President's designee shall conduct an investigation, under section 721(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(b)), of the acquisition by Dubai Ports World, an entity owned or controlled by the Emirate of Dubai, of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, a company that is a national of the United Kingdom, with respect to which written notification was submitted to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States on December 15, 2005. Such investigation shall be completed not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) SUSPENSION OF EXISTING DECISION.—The President shall suspend any decision by the President or the President's designee pursuant to section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) with respect

to the acquisition described in paragraph (1) that was made before the completion of the investigation described in paragraph (1), including any such decision made before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR INVESTIGATION.—The investigation under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of foreign port assessments conducted under section 70108 of title 46, United States Code, of ports at which Dubai Ports World carries out operations;

(2) background checks of appropriate officers and security personnel of Dubai Ports World;

(3) an evaluation of the impact on port security in the United States by reason of control by Dubai Ports World of operations at the United States ports affected by the acquisition described in subsection (a); and

(4) an evaluation of the impact on the national security of the United States by reason of control by Dubai Ports World of operations at the United States ports affected by the acquisition described in subsection (a), to be carried out in consultation with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, and relevant State and local officials responsible for port security at such United States ports.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the investigation conducted pursuant to this section is completed, the President shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) contains the findings of the investigation, including—

(A) an analysis of the national security concerns reviewed under the investigation; and

(B) a description of any assurances provided to the Federal Government by the applicant and the effect of such assurances on the national security of the United States; and

(2) contains the determination of the President of whether or not the President will take action under section 721(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(d)) pursuant to the investigation.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date on which the report described in subsection (c) is submitted to Congress pursuant to such subsection, the President or the President's designee shall provide to the Members of Congress specified in paragraph (2) a detailed briefing on the contents of the report.

(2) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—The Members of Congress specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate.

(B) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(D) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(E) Each Member of Congress who represents a State or district in which a United States port affected by the acquisition described in subsection (a) is located.

### SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the determination of the President contained in the report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 2(c) of this Act is that the President will not take action under section 721(d) of the De-

fense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(d)) and not later than 30 days after the date on which Congress receives the report, a joint resolution described in subsection (b) is enacted into law, then the President shall take such action under section 721(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as is necessary to prohibit the acquisition described in section 2(a), including, if such acquisition has been completed, directing the Attorney General to seek divestment or other appropriate relief in the district courts of the United States.

(b) JOINT RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term “joint resolution” means a joint resolution of the Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the Congress disapproves the determination of the President contained in the report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 2(c) of the Foreign Investment Security Improvement Act of 2006 on \_\_\_\_\_”, with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(c) COMPUTATION OF REVIEW PERIOD.—In computing the 30-day period referred to in subsection (a), there shall be excluded any day described in section 154(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2194(b)).

By Ms. COLLINS:

S.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution disapproving the results of the review conducted by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) into the purchase of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation (P&O) by Dubai Ports World (DP World); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a joint resolution disapproving the conclusion of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS, to allow Dubai Ports World, DP World, to take over certain port operations in the United States. My colleague and good friend, Congresswoman JANE HARMAN, will be introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives.

This resolution would do the following: 1. Disapprove the CFIUS review of the transaction; 2. direct the CFIUS to conduct a 45-day investigation in order to ensure that the sale will not have an adverse effect on national security; and 3. direct CFIUS to brief Members of Congress on the findings of its investigation before the transaction is allowed to proceed if the Committee maintains that it should go forth.

The pending sale raises potential maritime security concerns. The sale would transfer control of Peninsular & Oriental, P&O, Ports North America to DP World, a foreign government-owned entity. P&O Ports has extensive terminal and stevedoring operations along the eastern seaboard and on the gulf coast. It encompasses not only terminal facility leases in six major U.S. ports, as has been reported widely in the media, but also stevedoring and terminal operations in a total of 21 U.S. ports, including my home State in Portland, ME.

We have long acknowledged the vulnerability of our ports—both as a potential target and as a conduit through which terrorists, their weapons or

other contraband may enter the U.S. coming from a State with three international cargo ports, I am keenly aware of the importance of our seaports to our national economy and to the communities in which they are located. In addition to our ports' economic significance, the link between maritime security and our national security is evident.

The attacks of 9/11 have forced us to reassess and rebuild our entire approach to security. Against an enemy determined to cause maximum harm to both the American people and the American economy, we are building a structure that, in great part, relies upon private-public partnerships. Nowhere is this more apparent than in our ports—where terminal operators, longshoremen, port authorities, importers, carriers, and others have worked with the United States Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection, and state and local law enforcement to put security plans in place.

The foreign government in question, that owns DP World, is the government of Dubai, part of the United Arab Emirates, UAE. While UAE is an ally in the war on terrorism, it also has been used as a base of terrorist operations and financing. In fact, the 9/11 Commission reported that UAE was “both a valued counterterrorism ally of the United States and a persistent counterterrorism problem.” The attacks of 9/11 were planned in part in the UAE, and much of the financing for those operations was funneled through the UAE banking system. The facts warrant a thorough 45-day investigation by CFIUS, not a cursory review.

This incident has revealed significant shortcomings in the CFIUS process. It is not adequately transparent and does not provide for sufficient oversight reporting to appropriate committees and the leadership of Congress. The Exon-Florio provision of the Defense Production Act gives the President the authority to suspend or prohibit any foreign acquisition, merger or takeover of a U.S. corporation that is determined to threaten the national security of the U.S. Through Executive order, the President established the CFIUS to review transactions pursuant to Exon-Florio and make a recommendation regarding the exercise of his authority. It may be appropriate for the reviews, which may involve proprietary data and classified information, to be held confidential. However, once a decision has been reached by the CFIUS, it is wholly appropriate, and even necessary, that Members of Congress be briefed on the findings of the review and the basis for the decision.

I am truly troubled by the review process that was followed with respect to this purchase. The more I learn, the more questions are raised. The law requires a 45-day investigation in cases where an acquirer is controlled by a foreign government, as in the case of DP World, and the acquisition could affect the national security of the U.S.

However, the CFIUS did not conduct an investigation, as the plain language of the statute would demand.

I am pleased that, in a recent development, the administration has agreed to undertake a 45-day investigation as a result of discussions with DP World and congressional leadership. Perhaps its recommendation, once briefed to Congress, will allay concerns that have been raised. Perhaps the national security implications, apparent on the face of the deal, will be adequately addressed through a more rigorous process. Given the remaining uncertainties, however, I felt it was important to proceed with the introduction of this resolution, in conjunction with my colleague in the House, Congresswoman HARMAN.

The silver lining of recent events is that they have served to highlight the critical importance of port security to our Nation. Last November, Senator MURRAY and I introduced the GreenLane Maritime Cargo Security Act of 2005. This comprehensive legislation authorizes \$835 million annually for programs and initiatives to better secure our Nation's ports.

It would help build a coordinated approach to maritime and port security across all levels of government and with our overseas trading partners, improving our Nation's security as it expedites trade with those governments and businesses that join in this goal.

The bill addresses the problem of uncoordinated supply-chain security efforts, directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a strategic plan to enhance security for all modes of transportation by which containers arrive in, depart from, or move through seaports of the United States. The strategic plan also must include protocols for the resumption of trade in the case of an incident.

This legislation recognizes that America's ports, large and small, are our partners in keeping our Nation safe and our economy strong.

I seek my colleagues support both for this resolution and for the GreenLane bill.

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce a correction for the information of the Senate and the public.

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources hearing to review the proposed Fiscal Year 2007 Forest Service budget will be held on Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 10 a.m. in Room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Frank Gladics (202-224-2878), Elizabeth Abrams (202-224-0537) or Sara Zecher (202-224-8276) of the Committee staff.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the infor-

mation of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been rescheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing originally scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 10 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building will now be held at 9:30 a.m. on March 1, 2006, in the same room.

The purpose of the oversight hearing is to receive testimony regarding the state of the economies and fiscal affairs in the Territories of Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Josh Johnson at 202-224-5861 or Steve Waskiewicz at 202-228-6195.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, March 7, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the goal of energy independence.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Frank J. Macchiarola 202-224-1219 or Shannon Ewan at 202-224-7555.

##### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, the wishes to inform Members that the Committee on Small Business & Entrepreneurship will hold a public hearing to consider, "The Nomination of Eric Thorson to be the Inspector General of the Small Business Administration" on Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 2 p.m., in room 428A Russell Senate Office Building.

The Chair urges every member to attend.

#### AUTHORITIES FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Monday, February 27, 2006, at

2:30 p.m. for a briefing on the Dubai Ports World purchase of Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Company.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR STAR PRINT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2300 be star printed with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business for up to an hour, with the first half under the control of the majority leader or his designee and the second half under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee. I further ask that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2271, the PATRIOT Act amendments bill, and that the time until 12:30 p.m. be equally divided, and that the time from 2:15 to 2:30 be equally divided as well.

I further ask consent that from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. the Senate stand in recess for the weekly policy luncheons, and that the live quorum under rule XXII be waived with respect to the 2:30 vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate resumed consideration of the PATRIOT Act amendments bill. At 2:30 tomorrow afternoon we will have a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill. This will be the first vote of the week. Once cloture is invoked, we will proceed on Wednesday at 10 a.m. to the vote on the passage of that bill.

As a reminder to all of our colleagues, on Wednesday at 11 a.m., Prime Minister of Italy Berlusconi will address a joint meeting of Congress. Senators should plan their schedules accordingly.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:07 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 9:45 a.m.