

the Northwest Atlantic are preventing the recovery of cod stocks, despite the lack of any credible scientific evidence to support this claim;

Whereas two Canadian government marine scientists reported in 1994 that the true cause of cod depletion in the North Atlantic was over-fishing, and the consensus among the international scientific community is that seals are not responsible for the collapse of cod stocks;

Whereas harp and hooded seals are a vital part of the complex ecosystem of the Northwest Atlantic, and because the seals consume predators of commercial cod stocks, removing the seals might actually inhibit recovery of cod stocks;

Whereas certain ministries of the Government of Canada have stated clearly that there is no evidence that killing seals will help groundfish stocks to recover; and

Whereas the persistence of this cruel and needless commercial hunt is inconsistent with the well-earned international reputation of Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the Government of Canada to end the commercial hunt on seals that opened in the waters off the east coast of Canada on November 15, 2006.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Canada's commercial seal hunt is the largest slaughter of marine mammals in the world. According to the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), over one million seals have been killed for their fur in the past three years. In 2006 alone, more than 350,000 seals were slaughtered, most of them between 12 days and 12 weeks old.

Canada officially opened another seal hunt on November 15, 2006, paving the way for hundreds of thousands of baby seals to be killed for their fur during the spring of 2007. Today, I am joined by Senator COLLINS and Senator BIDEN in submitting a resolution that urges the Government of Canada to end this senseless and inhumane slaughter.

A study by an independent team of veterinarians in 2001, found that the seal hunt failed to comply with basic animal welfare standards and that Canadian regulations with regard to humane killing were not being enforced. The study concluded that up to 42 percent of the seals studied were likely skinned while alive and conscious. The United States has long banned the import of seal products because of widespread outrage over the magnitude and cruelty of the hunt.

It makes little sense to continue this inhumane industry that employs only a few hundred people on a seasonal, part-time basis and only operates for a few weeks a year, in which the concentrated killings takes place. In Newfoundland, where over 90 percent of the hunters live, the economic contribution of the seal hunt is marginal. In fact, exports of seal products from Newfoundland account for less than one-tenth of one percent of the province's total exports.

Canada is fortunate to have vast and diverse wildlife populations, but these animals deserve protection, not senseless slaughter. Americans have a long history of defending marine mammals, best evidenced by the Marine Mammal

Protection Act of 1972. Polls show that close to 80 percent of Americans and the vast majority of Europeans oppose Canada's seal hunt. In fact, close to 70 percent of Canadians surveyed oppose the hunt completely, with even higher numbers opposing specific aspects of the hunt, such as killing baby seals.

The U.S. Government has opposed this senseless slaughter, as noted in the attached, January 19, 2005, letter from the U.S. Department of State, in response to a letter Senator COLLINS and I wrote to President Bush, urging him to raise this issue during his November 30, 2004, visit with Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin.

The clubbing of baby seals can not be defended or justified. Canada should end it, just as we ended the Alaska seal hunt more than 20 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the January 19, 2005, letter from the U.S. State Department and the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, January 19, 2005.
Hon. CARL LEVIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEVIN: This is in response to your letter to the President of November 24, 2004, regarding Canadian commercial seal hunting. The White House has requested that the Department of State respond. We regret the delay in responding. Unfortunately, this letter was not received in the Department of State until mid-December, well after the referenced meeting between President Bush and Prime Minister Paul Martin of Canada.

We are aware of Canada's seal hunting activities and of the opposition to it expressed by many Americans. Furthermore, we can assure you that the United States has a long-standing policy opposing the hunting of seals and other marine mammals absent sufficient safeguards and information to ensure that the hunting will not adversely impact the affected marine mammal population or the ecosystem of which it is a part. The United States policy is reflected in the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (MMPA) which generally prohibits, with narrow and specific exceptions, the taking of marine mammals in waters or lands subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and the importation of marine mammals and marine mammal products into the United States.

The United States has made known to the Government of Canada its objections and the objections of concerned American legislators and citizens to the Canadian commercial seal hunt on numerous occasions over recent years. The United States has also opposed Canada's efforts within the Arctic Council to promote trade in sealskins and other marine mammal products.

We hope this information is helpful to you. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of assistance in this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

NANCY POWELL,
(For Paul V. Kelly, Asst.
Secretary, Legislative Affairs).

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY BY A FORMER DETAILEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 119

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has received a request from an attorney in the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a declaration from a former detailee of the Committee, Steven M. Dettelbach, for use in the Department of Justice's administrative proceeding styled *In re George A. Runkle, Jr.*, OARM-WB No. 06-2;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the former detailee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Steven M. Dettelbach, is authorized to provide a declaration for use in the administrative proceeding *In re George A. Runkle, Jr.*, OARM-WB No. 06-2.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2007, AS NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 120

Whereas rehabilitation counselors conduct assessments, provide counseling, support to families, and plan and implement rehabilitation programs for those in need;

Whereas the purpose of the professional organizations in rehabilitation is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to persons with disabilities through quality education and rehabilitation research for counselors;

Whereas the various professional organizations, including the National Rehabilitation Association (NRA), Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association (RCEA), the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE), the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association (NRCA), the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA), the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC), the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR), and the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) have stood firm to advocate up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education;

Whereas on March 22, 1983, Martha Walker of Kent State University, who was President of the NCRE, testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the House of Representatives, and was instrumental in bringing to the attention of Congress the need for rehabilitation counselors to be qualified; and

Whereas the efforts of Martha Walker led to the enactment of laws that now require rehabilitation counselors to have proper credentials in order to provide a higher level of quality service to those in need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2007, as National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day; and

(2) commends all of the hard work and dedication that rehabilitation counselors provide to individuals in need and the numerous efforts that the multiple professional organizations have made to assisting those who require rehabilitation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 23—EX-
PRESSING THE SENSE OF CON-
GRESS THAT PROVISIONS THAT
PROVOKE VETO THREATS FROM
THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT BE
INCLUDED ON BILLS THAT AP-
PROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE IM-
PLEMENTATION OF REC-
COMMENDATIONS OF THE BASE
CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT
COMMISSION

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas Congress and President George W. Bush approved the final recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission under the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment;

Whereas these recommendations propose major changes in the positioning of United States military personnel;

Whereas the Department of Defense is moving rapidly to implement these recommendations;

Whereas the communities near military installations that are slated to receive major troop increases have already invested time and capital in making preparations for upcoming increases in population; and

Whereas funding these recommendations on an annual basis is absolutely necessary for their implementation and the economic confidence of the communities that are expecting increases in population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that Congress should not include provisions that provoke veto threats from the President in bills that appropriate funds for the implementation of recommendations of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND
PROPOSED

SA 525. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012.

SA 526. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra.

SA 527. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 528. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 529. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 530. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 531. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 532. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 533. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 534. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 535. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 536. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 537. Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 538. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra.

SA 539. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 540. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 541. Mr. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 542. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra.

SA 543. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 544. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 545. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra.

SA 546. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 547. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 548. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 549. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 550. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 551. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 552. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 553. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 554. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 555. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 556. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 557. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 558. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 559. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 560. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 561. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 562. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 563. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 564. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 565. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 566. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 567. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 568. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 569. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 570. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the