

(2) Minority-serving institutions historically have an important role in reaching underserved populations.

(3) Minority-serving institutions in economically disadvantaged areas face particular hardships in acquiring funds to sustain and expand their resources.

(4) Low-income areas are technologically underserved.

(5) Congress and the technological community should do all that they can to find new and creative ways to bridge the current technology gap.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(2) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term “eligible educational institution” means an institution that is—

(A) a historically Black college or university;

(B) a Hispanic-serving institution as that term is defined in section 502(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5));

(C) a tribally controlled college or university as that term is defined in section 2(a)(4) of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)(4));

(D) an Alaska Native-serving institution as that term is defined in section 317(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(2)); or

(E) a Native Hawaiian-serving institution as that term is defined in section 317(b)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(4)).

(3) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term “historically Black college or university” means a part B institution as that term is defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

SEC. 4. MINORITY ONLINE DEGREE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the National Telecommunications and Information Administration a pilot program to develop online educational programs of study within eligible educational institutions under which the Administrator shall award 4 grants to eligible educational institutions to assist the eligible educational institutions in establishing an online curriculum for undergraduate and graduate programs of study.

(2) GRANT NUMBER, DURATION, AND AMOUNT.—

(A) NUMBER.—The Administrator shall award a total of 4 grants under this section.

(B) DURATION.—Each grant under this section shall be awarded for a period of 6 years.

(C) ANNUAL GRANT PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The Administrator shall make grant payments under this section in the amount of—

(i) \$1,000,000 for the first fiscal year of a grant awarded under this section;

(ii) \$600,000 for each of the second through fifth such fiscal years; and

(iii) \$100,000 for the sixth such fiscal year.

(b) PRIORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section the Administrator shall give priority to an eligible educational institution that, according to the most recent data available (including data available from the Bureau of the Census), serves a county—

(A) in which 50 percent of the residents of the county are members of a racial or ethnic minority;

(B) in which less than 18 percent of the residents of the county have obtained a baccalaureate degree or a higher education;

(C) that has an unemployment rate of 7 percent or greater;

(D) in which 19 percent or more of the residents of the county live in poverty;

(E) that has a negative population growth rate; or

(F) that has a median family income of \$32,000.

(2) HIGHEST PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section the Administrator shall give the highest priority to an eligible educational institution that meets the greatest number of requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1).

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) MANDATORY CURRICULUM REQUIREMENT.—An eligible educational institution receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to develop a curriculum that—

(A) leads to a baccalaureate or graduate degree;

(B) is focused on the needs and interests of working minority students in disadvantaged areas; and

(C) in the case of an online curriculum, strives to include a mix of—

(i) online lectures, including guest speakers;

(ii) reference material;

(iii) quiz and test preparation; and

(iv) class room participation.

(2) PERMISSIVE USES.—An eligible educational institution receiving a grant under this section may use the grant funds—

(A) to assist in establishing the technical capacity of the eligible educational institution to provide online or distance learning; and

(B) to develop curriculum, including pod broadcasts.

(3) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds made available under this section shall not be used—

(A) for any purpose other than a purpose associated with the direct costs incurred by the eligible educational institution in developing the curriculum or services described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(B) for building expenses, administrative travel budgets, or other expenses that are not directly related to the costs described in subparagraph (A).

(d) MATCHING NOT REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall not require an eligible educational institution to provide matching funds for a grant awarded under this section.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of each year, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report evaluating the progress, during the preceding fiscal year, of the pilot program assisted under this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of each of the programs of study developed with the grant funds provided under this section, including—

(A) the date of the grant award;

(B) statistics on the marital status, employment status, and income level of students participating in a program of study assisted under this section; and

(C) the degree objectives of students participating in a program of study assisted under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(A) \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(B) \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2012; and

(C) \$500,000 for fiscal year 2013.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(g) LIMITATION ON USE OF OTHER FUNDS.—The Administrator shall carry out this section only with amounts appropriated in advance specifically to carry out this section.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 684. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the management of the elk population located in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week I was in my State of North Dakota where we have a wonderful national park. It is named after Teddy Roosevelt. He is the conservation-minded President who established the National Park System. What a remarkable man he was. What a remarkable leader for this country.

We have a national park in the Badlands called the Theodore Roosevelt National Park. I picked up a newspaper to read that there are too many elk in the park, an overpopulation of elk, which is going to be a serious problem for the national park. The Park Service has had some discussion about what they might want to do to thin out or cull the elk herd in the national park. It has grown dramatically. They were talking in the newspaper article I read about considering hiring Federal sharpshooters to kill some elk and then use helicopters to remove their carcasses from the national park, for meat, I guess.

It occurred to me there are times when the Government is completely devoid of common sense. I understand the Park Service says there is a prohibition on hunting in the national parks. On the other hand, it seems to me if you are hiring Federal sharpshooters to kill elk, they are going to be hunting those elk. It would make a lot more sense, to me, for a limited opportunity for qualified hunters to be able to hunt the elk in cooperation with Federal and State authorities. You do not need Federal sharpshooters to be paid. You do not need helicopters to haul the carcasses out of the park. All you need are hunters with a pickup truck or two, and you will be fine.

Today I am introducing a piece of legislation that would allow the Park Service to allow local hunters in my State to work on a cooperative basis with the Federal and State authorities to thin that elk herd. Culling or thinning the elk herd, apparently, is a necessity. It is going to happen. The question is how. Do we spend a lot of money hiring sharpshooters and helicopters or do we do this in a common-sense way and allow hunters to go in, in a coordinated way and a careful way, to thin and cull that elk herd? It seems to me the latter is the better approach.

The Park Service, by the way, at the moment also says my State is short of prairie dogs. Of course, that is not the case. We have far more prairie dogs than we know what to do with. The prairie dogs were born—I should say luckily for them—with a button nose and fur on their tail. Otherwise, they would essentially look like a rat. But we have a lot of prairie dogs.

We are told by Federal authorities we need more prairie dogs, not because they think prairie dogs are cute, but apparently because they want to reintroduce something called the black-footed ferret in my State. The last person to spot a black-footed ferret in my State allegedly spotted a black-footed ferret some 20 years ago and was widely thought, according to local folklore, to have been drinking at the time.

So there apparently are no black-footed ferrets that live in my State. They apparently went to warmer climates in the South some long time ago. Now we are told by Federal authorities we need more prairie dogs as food for black-footed ferrets who are going to be reintroduced to North Dakota.

It is no small wonder, then, I look at some of these Federal agencies and wonder if there is any reservoir of common sense left. That is what persuaded me, last week, as I read the newspaper article about hiring Federal sharpshooters to shoot elk and hiring helicopters to take the deer meat out of our national park—a national park proudly named after one of the great hunters ever to occupy the White House, Teddy Roosevelt—I wondered whether there might be any common sense that might be applied that very simply says if we are going to thin or cull the elk herd in the Teddy Roosevelt National Park, let's do it the way Teddy Roosevelt would have anticipated it be done.

No, I do not suggest opening up all national parks to hunting. I suggest in this limited circumstance that thinning and culling the elk herd in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park can best be done without a massive cost to the taxpayers and with an opportunity for qualified hunters who live in my State.

I recognize that these issues pale in comparison to larger issues like the Iraq war and the health care crisis and fiscal policy that is off track, but it seems to me there are times when we ought to call attention even to comparatively small things that do not seem right.

What I read last week about sharpshooters and helicopters not only reminded me of the lack of common sense with respect to this little issue, but it annoyed me once again with respect to the subject of prairie dogs. I spoke about prairie dogs long ago on this Senate floor when the prairie dogs took over a small picnic area, and the response of the Park Service was to decide to spend a quarter of a million dollars to move the picnic area rather

than hire a couple of 16-year-old kids to tell the prairie dogs they have to be elsewhere.

But having said all that, I am introducing a piece of legislation dealing with the Theodore Roosevelt National Park—a park I am enormously proud of—and an elk herd that needs thinning and an opportunity for qualified North Dakota hunters who will use a substantial amount of common sense to solve a problem that can be solved quickly and easily.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 685. A bill to establish an expedited procedure for congressional consideration of health care reform legislation; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, in introducing legislation that requires Congress to act on what may be the most pressing domestic policy issue of our time, namely health care reform.

I believe we can find a way to make universal coverage work in this country. Universal coverage doesn't have to be defined by what's in place in other countries or by what's been attempted in the past. What universal coverage does mean is ending a system where more than 46 million Americans are uninsured, and where too many of those who are insured are struggling to pay their premiums, struggling to pay for prescription drugs, and struggling to find long term care.

Over the years I have heard many different proposals for how we should change the health care system in this country. Some propose using tax incentives as a way to expand access to health care. Others think the best approach is to expand public programs. Some feel a national single payer health care system is the only way to go.

I favor an American-style health care reform, where we encourage creative solutions to the health care problems facing our country, without using a one-size-fits-all approach. I believe that States have a better idea about what the health care needs of their residents are, and that they understand what types of reform will work best for their State. So I am in favor of a State-based universal health care system, where States, with the Federal Government's help, come up with a plan to make sure that all of their residents have health care coverage, and I am working with Senator GRAHAM to develop a bipartisan bill that will help States do just that. If we are finally going to fix our broken health care system, we need to be open to good, new ideas.

And this brings us to the legislation Senator GRAHAM and I are introducing today, because, the reason we haven't reformed our health care system isn't because of a lack of good ideas. The problem is that Congress and the White

House refuse to take this issue up. Despite the outcry from businesses, from health care providers, and from the tens of millions who are uninsured or underinsured or struggling to pay their premiums, the Federal Government refuses to address the problem in a comprehensive way.

That is why we are introducing this bill. Our legislation will force Congress to finally address this issue. It requires the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, as well as the Chairs of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee, to each introduce a health care reform bill in the first 30 days of the session of Congress following enactment of the bill. This bill provides an expedited process for considering reform legislation. Similar procedures are established for House consideration.

I want to emphasize that my bill does not prejudice what particular health care reform measure should be debated. There are many worthy proposals that would qualify for consideration, and this bill does not dictate which proposal, or combination of proposals, should be considered.

But what my bill does do is require Congress to act.

It has been over 10 years since the last serious debate over health care reform was killed by special interests. I am disappointed that Congress still has not acted to reform our health care system, and businesses and workers are crying out as never before for Congress to address the country's health care crisis.

It has been over 10 years since we've had any debate on comprehensive health care reform. We cannot afford any further delay. The cost of inaction is too great. I urge my colleagues to support the Reform Health Care Now Act of 2007.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this 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. 685

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 "Reform health Care Now Act".

SEC. 2. SENATE CONSIDERATION OF HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 10 calendar days after the commencement of the session of Congress that follows the date of enactment of this Act, the chair of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate shall each introduce a bill to provide a significant increase in access to health care coverage for the people of the United States.

(2) MINORITY PARTY.—These bills may be introduced by request and only 1 qualified bill may be introduced by each individual referred to in paragraph (1) within a Congress. If either committee chair fails to introduce

the bill within the 30-day period, the ranking minority party member of the respective committee may instead introduce a bill that will qualify for the expedited procedure provided in this section.

(3) QUALIFIED BILL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to qualify as a qualified bill—

(i) the title of the bill shall be “To reform the health care system of the United States and to provide insurance coverage for Americans.”;

(ii) the bill shall reach the goal of providing health care coverage to 95 percent of Americans within 10 years; and

(iii) the bill shall be deficit neutral.

(B) DETERMINATION.—Whether or not a bill meets the criteria in subparagraph (A) shall be determined by the Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, relying on estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, subject to the final approval of the Senate.

(b) REFERRAL.—

(1) COMMITTEE BILLS.—Upon introduction, the bill authored by the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance shall be referred to that Committee and the bill introduced by the Chair of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions shall be referred to that committee. If either committee has not reported the bill referred to it (or another qualified bill) by the end of a 60-calendar-day period beginning on the date of referral, the committee is, as of that date, automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill is placed directly on the chamber’s legislative calendar. In calculating the 60-day period, adjournments for more than 3 days are not counted.

(2) LEADER BILLS.—The bills introduced by the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate Minority Leader shall, on introduction, be placed directly on the Senate Calendar of Business.

(c) MOTION TO PROCEED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On or after the third day following the committee report or discharge or upon a bill being placed on the calendar under subsection (b)(2), it shall be in order for any Member, after consultation with the Majority Leader, to move to proceed to the consideration of any qualified bill. Notice shall first be given before proceeding. This motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill can be offered by a Member only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces the Member’s intention to offer it.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—The motion to proceed to a given qualified bill can be made even if a motion to the same effect has previously been rejected. No more than 3 such motions may be made, however, in any 1 congressional session.

(3) PRIVILEGED AND NONDEBATABLE.—The motion to proceed is privileged, and all points of order against the motion to proceed to consideration and its consideration are waived. The motion is not debatable, is not amendable, and is not subject to a motion to postpone.

(4) NO OTHER BUSINESS OR RECONSIDERATION.—The motion is not subject to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF QUALIFIED BILL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the motion to proceed is adopted, the chamber shall immediately proceed to the consideration of a qualified bill without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the bill remains the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of. A motion to limit debate is in order and is not debatable.

(2) ONLY BUSINESS.—The qualified bill is not subject to a motion to postpone or a mo-

tion to proceed to the consideration of other business before the bill is disposed of.

(3) RELEVANT AMENDMENTS.—Only relevant amendments may be offered to the bill.

SEC. 3. HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 calendar days after the commencement of the session of Congress that follows the date of enactment of this Act, the chair of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, the chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Majority Leader of the House, and the Minority Leader of the House shall each introduce a bill to provide a significant increase in access to health care coverage for the people of the United States.

(2) MINORITY PARTY.—These bills may be introduced by request and only 1 qualified bill may be introduced by each individual referred to in paragraph (1) within a Congress. If either committee chair fails to introduce the bill within the 30-day period, the ranking minority party member of the respective committee may, within the following 30 days, instead introduce a bill that will qualify for the expedited procedure provided in this section.

(3) QUALIFIED BILL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To qualify for the expedited procedure under this section as a qualified bill, the bill shall—

(i) reach the goal of providing healthcare coverage to 95 percent of Americans within 10 years; and

(ii) be deficit neutral.

(B) DETERMINATION.—Whether or not a bill meets the criteria in subparagraph (A) shall be determined by the Speaker’s ruling on a point of order based on a Congressional Budget Office estimate of the bill.

(b) REFERRAL.—

(1) COMMITTEE BILLS.—Upon introduction, the bill authored by the Chair of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall be referred to that committee and the bill introduced by the Chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means shall be referred to that committee. If either committee has not reported the bill referred to it (or another qualified bill) by the end of 60-days of consideration beginning on the date of referral, the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed directly on the Calendar of the Whole House on the State of the Union. In calculating the 60-day period, adjournments for more than 3 days are not counted.

(2) LEADER BILLS.—The bills introduced by the House Majority Leader and House Minority Leader will, on introduction, be placed directly on the Calendar of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

(c) MOTION TO PROCEED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On or after the third day following the committee report or discharge or upon a bill being placed on the calendar under subsection (b)(2), it shall be in order for any Member, after consultation with the Majority Leader, to move to proceed to the consideration of any qualified bill. Notice must first be given before proceeding. This motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill can be offered by a Member only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces the Member’s intention to offer it.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—The motion to proceed to a given qualified bill can be made even if a motion to the same effect has previously been rejected. No more than 3 such motions may be made, however, in any 1 congressional session.

(3) PRIVILEGED AND NONDEBATABLE.—The motion to proceed is privileged, and all points of order against the motion to proceed

to consideration and its consideration are waived. The motion is not debatable, is not amendable, and is not subject to a motion to postpone.

(4) NO OTHER BUSINESS OR RECONSIDERATION.—The motion is not subject to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFIED BILL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the motion to proceed is adopted, the chamber will immediately proceed to the consideration of a qualified bill without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the bill remains the unfinished business of the House until disposed of.

(2) COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.—The bill will be considered in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule, and the bill shall be considered as read and open for amendment at any time.

(3) LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion to further limit debate is in order and is not debatable.

(4) RELEVANT AMENDMENTS.—Only relevant amendments may be offered to the bill.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DODD, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 686. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historical Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, 225 years ago, on October 17, 1781, a few thousand American and French soldiers laid siege to Yorktown, forced the surrender of General Cornwallis and his British regulars, and won American independence.

Although we often remember the victory at Yorktown, too often we lose sight of the heroic efforts that made it possible. Too often we forget that this victory was the culmination of a miraculous campaign—when two nations, two armies, and two great men put aside their differences and worked together for a common purpose.

I, along with my colleagues, Senators WARNER, BIDEN, CLINTON, DODD, MENENDEZ, REED, SPECTER, and WHITEHOUSE, am privileged to call for the commemoration of the events leading to our victory at Yorktown and the end of the American Revolution with the designation of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route as a National Historic Trail.

The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route is 600 miles of history, winding from Providence, RI, to Yorktown, VA. In the opinion of my colleagues and me, it is worthy of designation as a National Historic Trail. Let us document the events in the cities and towns all along the road to Yorktown and the birth of this great Nation. Let us celebrate the unprecedented Franco-American alliance and the superhuman efforts of Generals George Washington and Jean Baptiste de Rochambeau to preserve that alliance in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds. Let us create a National Historic Trail along whose

course we can pause and remember these heroes, their travels, and sacrifices—from the journey's beginning when Rochambeau led the French army out of Newport and Providence, RI, into New York where he joined Washington's troops, and through a cross section of colonial America to its culmination at Yorktown.

Each of the nine States on the trail makes its own unique contribution to the tale of the journey. In my own State of Connecticut—the two generals met and through a translator planned their strategy. In Phillipsburg, NY, the French and American armies first joined together and faced off against the British in New York City. Here, Washington and Rochambeau planned their high risk strategy—abandoning established positions in the north and racing hundreds of miles south to surprise and trap an unsuspecting British army. In Chatham, New Jersey, the French made a show of storing supplies and building bread ovens in order to disguise their march towards Cornwallis in Virginia. They moved on through Princeton and Trenton, New Jersey—sites of previous colonial victories against great odds.

The trail goes through Philadelphia, PA—then capital of the colonies. Here Washington and Rochambeau stopped their men outside town, had them clean off the dirt of the trail and marched them through town with drums beating and flags unfurled before the Continental Congress and the people of Philadelphia. The grandeur of their new European ally helped restore the spirit of America during this very uncertain time.

A few days later in Chester, PA, Washington, the normally reserved commander-in-chief, literally danced on the dock when he learned the French fleet had arrived in the Chesapeake and trapped the British at Yorktown. For the first time, it seemed that victory for the colonies was possible. The armies marched on to Wilmington, DE and Elkton, MD, where American troops were finally paid for some of their efforts, using money borrowed by the bankrupt Continental Army from General Rochambeau.

Our Nation's capital region also played its part in this story. Troops camped in Baltimore near the site of today's Camden Yards. Some crossed the Potomac near Georgetown, while others camped in Alexandria, VA. Along the way, General Washington made a triumphal return to Mount Vernon, and hosted a celebration for his French allies. All along the route, towns were touched and thrilled by the passage of the army and events swirling around them.

The armies marched on through Williamsburg, VA until they reached positions outside Yorktown in late September. Washington and Rochambeau and their troops went on to win this battle and the war. Let us take the time to better remember the heroes of our past, those who sacrificed so much

for our freedom today, deserve no less. This bill ensures that this history, in all its rich detail, is not forgotten.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to join the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. JOE LIEBERMAN, in introducing legislation to designate the historic route undertaken by General George Washington and General Jean-Baptiste de Rochambeau to trap the British army at Yorktown, VA, as a national historic trail.

This proposed national historic trail traces the 600-mile route that French troops under the command of General Jean-Baptiste de Rochambeau took from Newport, RI, to Yorktown, VA, during the Revolutionary War. American troops under the command of General George Washington joined the French force outside of New York City and, later that year, on October 17, the combined armies defeated British General Charles Cornwallis at Yorktown with the help of the French fleet commanded by Admiral Francois de Grasse.

This historic trail would celebrate the Franco-American alliance and the heroic effort undertaken by these two great nations to ensure American independence. Led by their courageous and brilliant leaders, Generals Washington and Rochambeau, these two armies changed the course of history with their victory over the British at Yorktown. This national historic trail would recognize this historic route and educate the public at large about the contributions of these men and their armies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and I thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, February 28, 2007, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a markup of the Omnibus Budget for Senate Committees.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Howard Gantman at the Rules and Administration Committee on 224-6352.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the Chairman would like to inform the Members that the Committee on Small Business & Entrepreneurship will hold a hearing entitled "The President's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request for the Small Business Administration," on Wednesday, February 28, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. in Russell 428A.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session, to the consideration of the nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table; that any statements be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE COAST GUARD C-PN

PN106 COAST GUARD nomination of Thomas W. Denucci, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2007.

PN149 COAST GUARD nomination of Edward J. Mosely, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 11, 2007.

PN150 COAST GUARD nomination of Teresa K. Peace, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 11, 2007.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with 22 U.S.C. 1928a-1928d, as amended, appoints the following Senator as chairman of the Senate delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly during the 110th Congress: the Honorable JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., of Delaware.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appoints the following Senator as chairman of the Senate delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group during the 110th Congress: the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY of Vermont.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 976

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand that H.R. 976 is at the desk and is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 976) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes.