one Senator. I am not a member of that committee. That will be up to Senators LEAHY and SPECTER to run as they see fit and to bring the nominations forward. I will do what I can, working with Senator LEAHY, to expedite the judicial process, but I do not want to interfere with their work other than to say what I have said. I hope people understand the relationship Senator MCCONNELL and I have as to how the Senate runs is extremely important. There are times, I can tell my colleagues, any reservation, when I wish I were the Speaker of the House. The Speaker of the House doesn't have to worry about the minority; they run over everybody. That is the way it is set up. But here, the Founding Fathers those many years ago when they came up with this unique experiment called the Congress, a bicameral legislature, these wise men set up this situation so that one House, if you are in control—if one party is in control, they can do anything they want, and in the other House—the Senate—if one party is in control, they can do some things they want but not everything, because the minority has tremendous power in the Senate, I know. I have been in the minority quite a bit. So I want to reflect I will continue to work with Senator MCCONNELL to move these judges as quickly as we can, and I hope this statement reflects my position on judges. I will do my very best, and if any problems arise regarding judges and people don't understand my position, if I haven't explained it clearly enough today, I will try to do so again if any questions arise.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINEES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, seeing the occupant of the Chair and realizing he is new to the Senate and learning the process here, I think the majority leader had it right. One thing that is important for everyone to remember is that in the Senate, if you are here for a while, sooner or later the shoe is on the other foot. The position you are in today is the position your adversary may be in very soon in the future. So the precedents we set in the Senate are extremely important.

The majority leader and I, as he indicated this morning, talked about this issue at the beginning of the session and we agreed that the process of confirming circuit court judges had become entirely too contentious, and it was largely a waste of time to try to cast blame as to who was most at fault in that situation developing. The majority leader and I, we agreed we wanted to have a clean, fresh start that would honor the traditions of the Senate.

A good way to look at it is to look at the last three Presidents. Each of them in the last 2 years of their tenure in office had a Senate controlled by the opposition party. So the question is, how did the opposition party in the Senate treat the President on circuit court nominees? And there were averages of 17 circuit court judges confirmed in similar situations.

The majority leader, in one of our discussions on the floor back in February, said:

This is not our last circuit court judge, but the first of a significant number who can at least meet the standards of Congresses similarly situated as ours.

That was an accurate public reflection by the majority leader back in February of the numerous conversations he and I have had, both publicly and privately, about the standard we outline for circuit judges in this Congress. I think that is a standard that can still be met. Three circuit judges have been confirmed this year—a little slower process than frankly I had thought, particularly since we are in the early part of the Congress where presumably it would be more easily done than later. The majority leader was entirely correct, and I commend him, for referring to the gesture the President made at the beginning of this Congress about not resubmitting four or five highly contentious nominees that it is clear the new Democratic majority, as well as the Democratic minority in the past, did not want to see confirmed. The President took those off the table, sent up new nominees, and most of them were confirmed without controversy. One of them will have a hearing beginning at 10 o'clock this morning, and how that turns out and how that individual is treated will tell us a lot about where we are going to be able to go from here to achieve the standard the majority leader referred to that he and I wish to meet for this Congress.

I thank my friend from Nevada for his observations. I agree with them. I think they accurately reflect our mutual desire here to have this Congress do no worse than the last three Congresses—this Senate—in the last 2 years with Presidents of the opposite party. It is a standard that can be met. It is a standard that should be met.

One day, in spite of the best efforts of people like myself, there will be a Democratic President. One of the things we know around here is that precedents established and lessons learned are hard to undo. So I say to our good friends on the other side, heed the advice of the majority leader. It is in your best interests for us to have a less contentious and more successful treatment of circuit judges during this Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Engineers. So we are here today to tell the Senate that this bill is a win-win for everyone in this country. We urge our colleagues who have amendments to consider them carefully, because we have worked so hard to balance this bill. It is a delicate balance. I know I have conversations with my side who have ideas that I support, but I have an agreement, as does Senator BAUCUS, as do Senator ISAKSON and Senator INHOFE, that we will oppose all amendments that are not unanimously agreed to by both sides in order to keep this balance in this bill. If we have amendments all four of us can agree to, they will be placed in a managers’ package.

We want colleagues to please come to this floor as soon as possible with their amendments so we can see how we can dispose of them. Even though we will probably not be voting tomorrow or Monday, we will be working here on this bill.

This bill makes a huge commitment to the people of Louisiana. It puts Louisiana’s coast on a category 5 protection with the Corps of Engineers.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to do something very important, which is to have printed in the RECORD the CBO cost estimate associated with the substitute text that will be considered by the Senate.

There being no objection, the material that follows may be printed in the RECORD.

U.S. CONGRESS.
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

HON. BARBARA BOXER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: As you requested, CBO has reviewed a proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 1248, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on March 29, 2007, and has prepared this cost estimate for you.

CBO staff contact is Tyler Kruzich.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Tyler Kruzich.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007
Summary: The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to conduct water resources studies and undertake specified projects and programs for flood control, inland navigation, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration. The bill would authorize the agency to conduct studies on water resource needs, to complete feasibility and design studies for specified projects, and to convey ownership of certain federal properties. Finally, the bill would extend, terminate, or amend provisions for existing water projects and would authorize new programs to develop water resources and protect the environment.

Assuming the appropriation of the necessary amounts, including adjustments for increases in anticipated inflation, CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would cost $26 billion over the 2008–2012 period and an additional $26 billion over the 10 years after 2012. In particular, section 1003(0) would effectively authorize the Corps to conduct certain projects in southern Louisiana to protect the region from a hurricane storm surge that results from a category 5 hurricane. CBO expects that most of those projects would approach $2 billion. New Orleans and its vicinity. The cost of flood protection infrastructure within coastal Louisiana at an estimated federal cost of $683 million. Restoration project, also on the Upper Mississippi River at an estimated federal cost of $1.8 billion. Another large program that would be authorized by this bill is the Indian River Lagoon project in the Florida Everglades at an estimated federal cost of $683 million. Construction of those projects would likely take more than 15 years.

Hurricane Damage. Several provisions in title I would authorize coastal restoration projects and water control infrastructure in Louisiana that are needed to correct hurricane damage. For example, the Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection Project would seek to reduce hurricane and flood damages across 1,700 square miles of coastal Louisiana at an estimated federal cost of $576 million. Other projects would improve flood protection infrastructure within the Louisiana coast line and its vicinity. The cost of those provisions would approach $2 billion.

CBO expects that most of those projects would be built over the next five to 10 years. Impacts resulting from the completion of those projects could reduce the costs of damages from future storms and the amount of federal funds needed for recovery from such events.

This bill would authorize the Secretary to construct projects in southern Louisiana that would provide protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “≤” means less than $500,000.

Annual changes in direct spending after 2012 would sum to less than $500,000 a year.
for a storm surge equivalent to a category 5 hurricane (or a 500-year storm, which is a storm that has a 1-in-500 chance of hitting the city in any given year) if the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Infrastructure each pass a resolution approving those projects.

Very few projects authorized in previous authorizations would incur costs to comply with environmental protection. Consequently, CBO estimates that cancelling the authority to build those projects would provide no significant savings over the next several years.

Federal Share of Project Costs. Most projects undertaken by the Corps are required to have a specific portion of costs covered by local interests, and the remaining costs are considered the federal share of the total project cost. Section 2001 would allow local interests to have provided and contributed for the construction of water resources projects to have the value of such contributions credited toward the local share of the total construction cost of such projects. Under the bill, the Corps would be authorized to credit in-kind contributions of local participants on projects. Based on information from the Corps, CBO expects that any credit toward in-kind contributions would not significantly affect the federal share of the projects.

Deauthorizations. The bill would withdraw the authority for the Corps to build more than 50 projects authorized in previous legislation from the Corps. However, CBO does not expect that the agency would begin any significant work under those provisions and that the net budgetary impact would be negligible.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact. The legislation contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. Grant funds authorized in the bill would benefit state governments that participate in a national program to improve levee safety. State, local, and tribal governments also would benefit from water resource projects and other programs authorized in the bill. Governments that choose to use these grants and programs would incur costs to comply with the conditions of the federal assistance, including cost-sharing requirements, but such costs would be incurred voluntarily. In addition, some state and local governments participating in ongoing water resource projects would benefit from provisions in the bill that would alter existing cost-sharing obligations. Many of those provisions would make it easier for non-federal participants to meet their obligations by giving them credit for expenses already incurred by expanding the types of expenditures counted towards the non-federal share.

Previous CBO estimate: On March 29, 2007, CBO transmitted to Congress for H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 15, 2007. Assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimated that implementing H.R. 1495 would cost about $6.7 billion over the 2008-2012 period and $8 million over the 10 years after 2012. In addition, CBO estimated that enacting H.R. 1495 would decrease net direct spending by $5 million in 2008, $9 million over the 2008-2012 period, and $8 million over the 2008-2017 period. The differences in the cost estimates stem from different levels of authorized funding and from differences in the timing of payments. In particular, the CBO estimates that the House bill does not contain the provision regarding Arcadia Lake, Oklahoma.


Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Director.

Mr. BOXER. Mr. President, what we are very proud of, both Senator INHOFE and I, is that the CBO comes in with a cost estimate that is $13.9 billion, which is about $2 billion less than the House-passed bill.

So for all of those reasons, we urge a ‘yes’ vote on this motion to proceed on this bill.

I yield the remaining time to my friend and colleague Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the leader and the chairman of the committee. Let me make one comment that is true, that is this is the first bill that has had such a short period of time to talk before this, and I hope anyone who has any concern over this bill at least will go ahead on the motion to proceed.

Let me make one comment that surprises a lot of people. It is true I used to chair this committee before the Democrats took the majority, and now Senator BOXER is the chairman. Senator BOXER is a very proud liberal Democrat and I am a very proud conservative Republican. I think it is important for people to know that, because there are areas where we agree. We understand we have a crisis in this country on infrastructure.

I have often said—and I am ranked No. 1 as the most conservative Member of the Senate—I feel we need to spend in areas of national defense and infrastructure, and this bill is the second most important infrastructure bill that is out there. We are far beyond the time we should have had this. It has been some 7 years since we have had an infrastructure bill.

Let me say to my conservative friends, it was misrepresented that this is going to be a $30.5 billion bill. It is less than half of that. It is less than the House has sent over. I can tell my colleagues this: If we don’t pass this—this is not a spending bill; this is a reauthorizing bill. This is not an appropriations bill. So if we don’t do this, then it will be done without any guidelines. We followed guidelines. Perhaps they are not quite as good as they were a year ago, but still, they are guidelines in terms of what we will consider and what we won’t. But if we don’t pass this, then we will be doing it without any type of discipline at all. So I think it is very important that we agree to move on to the bill.

I yield my last minute to the Senator from Georgia, who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ISAACS. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member and I commend the chairman on great work on this bill. Let me just make the point, again, this is not a spending bill; this is an investment bill. It is an investment in safe drinking water. It is an investment in flood control and water resources of the United States of America. It is an investment in infrastructure. It is accountable. We have worked together in an absolutely bipartisan way to accomplish that.
I encourage each of our Members to come and vote for the motion to proceed. If they have an amendment, bring it early, and let’s go forward with the most important bill we may do in this session of the Congress of the United States.

I want to add to that it is bipartisan, it is fiscally responsible, and it is the first time we have reauthorized it in 7 years. It is long overdue and important for us to do it now.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, even though the disclosure requirements of S. 1 have not been enacted, Senator INHOFE and I believe we should comply with the intent of that legislation, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a listing of all the project-related provisions of the substitute text and the proponents of those provisions.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4001+A-1</th>
<th>Project Authorizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HANES HARBOR, ALASKA</strong></td>
<td>Stevens, Murkowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARIQUE VICE CREEK, ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td>Eds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALT RIVER (VA BLUFF FORMERLY), MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td>Kyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY BRANCUT, PORT SMITH, ARKANSAS</strong></td>
<td>Lincoln, Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAMILTON CITY, CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPIRE, BELL, CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATILDA DAM, VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE CREEK, LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH, CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, DENVER, COLORADO</strong></td>
<td>Allard, Salazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>Nelson (D), Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIAN RIVER LAGOS, SOUTH FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>Nelson (D), Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAHAI HARBOR, MIAMI, FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>Nelson (D), Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PACIFIC STRAND, FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>Nelson (D), Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY, ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td>Durbin, Obeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEORIA RIVERSOUT, ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td>Durbin, Obeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOOD RIVER, DUGUAY SYSTEM, ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td>Grassley, Harbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DES MONEYS AND RACOON RIVERS, DES MONEYS, IOWA</strong></td>
<td>Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYOU BOREL, LOUISIANA</strong></td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORGANZA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LOUISIANA</strong></td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORT OF BEAUMONT, LOUISIANA</strong></td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPLAR ISLAND EXPANSION, MARYLAND</strong></td>
<td>Mikulski, Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMITH ISLAND, MARYLAND</strong></td>
<td>Mikulski, Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RODEAU RIVER, ROSEAU, MINNESOTA</strong></td>
<td>Coleman, Nadler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSISSIPPI COASTAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, HAMMOND, HARRISON, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI</strong></td>
<td>Cochran, Lott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARGENTINE, EAST BOTTOMS, FAIRFAX JERSEY CREEK, AND NORTH KANSAS LEVEE SYSTEMS, MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES AT KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI, AND KANSAS</strong></td>
<td>Bond, Brown, Roberts, McCaskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPOE PARK, INDUSTRIAL AREA, MISSOURI</strong></td>
<td>McCaskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNTERDON-RARITAN ESTUARY, LIBERTY STATE PARK, NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANASQUAN TO BAYMEAD INLETS, NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANTA BARBARA BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH RIVER, NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO</strong></td>
<td>Domenici, Bingaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONTAUK POINT, NEW YORK</strong></td>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONTGOMERY CREEK, OHIO</strong></td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOOMSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA</strong></td>
<td>Specter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKERS ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLESTON SHIP CHASE, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS</strong></td>
<td>Hultgren, Comyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, MATAGORDA BAY-ROUTE, TEXAS</strong></td>
<td>Hultgren, Comyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, HUGO BOLIVAR TO BRAGG RIVER, TEXAS</strong></td>
<td>Hultgren, Comyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, PHASE I, TEXAS</strong></td>
<td>Hultgren, Comyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRANEY ISLAND EASTWARD EXPANSION, VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td>Warner, Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEEP CREEK, CHEAPSHAM, VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td>Warner, Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLESTON RIVER, CENTRALIA, WASHINGTON</strong></td>
<td>Campbelletal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1002 - ENHANCED NAVIGATION CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PLAN FOR UPPER MISSISSIPPI-RIVER AND IOWA-WATERWAY SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td>Grassley, Bond, Durbin, Obeme, McCaskill, Kubik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1003 - LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECO SYSTEM RESTORATION, LOUISIANA</strong></td>
<td>Durbin, Landrieu, Vitter, Obeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1004 - SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION</strong></td>
<td>Lincoln, Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOB COUNTY AND THE CITY OF MANN LEVEE, GEORGIA</strong></td>
<td>Chocolates, Valdson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORT WASHINGTON AND VICINITY, IOWA</strong></td>
<td>Lange, Binn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS</strong></td>
<td>Kennedy, Kurney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1005 - Small Projects for Navigation</td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Harbor, Alaska</td>
<td>Stevens, M. K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne, Wyoming</td>
<td>Coleman, J. D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1006 - Small Projects for Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Kline, M.</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Black Lake, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1007 - Small Projects to Prevent or Mitigate Damage Caused by Navigation Projects</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Island, Georgia</td>
<td>C. B. Bathroom</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>North Carolina, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1008 - Small Projects for Aquatic Plant Control</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Durbin, R.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2012 - Regional Sediment Management</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Lautenberg, R.</td>
<td>New Jersey and Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2016 - Ecosystem Restoration Benefits</th>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graystone Creek, California</td>
<td>Buser, W.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Seven Oaks, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3013</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3017</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3018</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3019</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3022</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3023</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3024</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3026</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3028</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3032</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3033</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3034</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3035</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3036</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3037</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3038</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3039</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3041</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3042</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO RECONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROMOTION ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3044</td>
<td>PORT OF LEWISTON, IDAHO</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3045</td>
<td>CACINE RIVER LEVEE, ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3046</td>
<td>CHICAGO, ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3047</td>
<td>CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3048</td>
<td>ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3049</td>
<td>MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS RECONSTRUCTION PILOT PROGRAM</td>
<td>Rand</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050</td>
<td>SPUNKY BOTTOM, ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051</td>
<td>STREEM CEMETERY, JOHN REDMAN LAKE, KANSAS</td>
<td>Bruner</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3052</td>
<td>MILFORD LAKE, MILFORD, KANSAS</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3053</td>
<td>OHIO RIVER, KENTUCKY, ILLINOIS, IOWA, PENNSYLVANIA, AND WEST VIRGINA</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054</td>
<td>HICKMAN BLUFF STABILIZATION, KENTUCKY</td>
<td>Boddie</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3055</td>
<td>MCPALINE LOCK AND DAM, KENTUCKY AND MISSOURI</td>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3056</td>
<td>PUBLIC ACCESS, ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3057</td>
<td>REGIONAL VISITOR CENTER, ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3058</td>
<td>CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASSES, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3059</td>
<td>EAST BAYOU ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3060</td>
<td>MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET RELOCATION ASSISTANCE, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061</td>
<td>RED RIVER, J. BENNETT JOHNSON WATERWAY, LOUISIANA</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3062</td>
<td>CAMPELLUS, SACO, MAINE</td>
<td>Snowe</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3063</td>
<td>ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE</td>
<td>Snowe</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3064</td>
<td>ROCKPORT HARBOR, MAINE</td>
<td>Snowe</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065</td>
<td>SACO RIVER, MAINE</td>
<td>Snowe</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3066</td>
<td>UNION RIVER, MAINE</td>
<td>Snowe</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3067</td>
<td>BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3068</td>
<td>CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM, MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3069</td>
<td>CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND</td>
<td>Mikulski</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070</td>
<td>PUMPED WATER COVE, MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3071</td>
<td>FALL RIVER HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS AND RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3072</td>
<td>NORTHER RIVER, PEABODY, MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3073</td>
<td>EGERSON CREEK, MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Lenz</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3074</td>
<td>ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Lenz</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3075</td>
<td>CULJITH HARBOR, MINNESOTA</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3076</td>
<td>PROJECT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Cashen</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3077</td>
<td>LAND EXCHANGE, RICE COUNTY, MISSOURI</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3078</td>
<td>L-15 LEVEE, MISSOURI</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3079</td>
<td>UNION LAKE, MISSOURI</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080</td>
<td>LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT, MONTANA</td>
<td>Baucus</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081</td>
<td>YELLLOWSTONE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MONTANA AND NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>Baucus</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3082</td>
<td>WATERSHED MAPPING AND CLEAN CREEK, NEBRASKA</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3083</td>
<td>LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, MACKINAC RANCH, NEVADA</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3084</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT, NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085</td>
<td>NICOLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3086</td>
<td>LONG ISLAND SOUND OYSTER RESTORATION, NEW YORK AND CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New York and Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3087</td>
<td>MAMARONECK AND BELLPORT RIVERS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK</td>
<td>Schumer</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3088</td>
<td>BIRCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3089</td>
<td>NEW YORK HARBOR, NEW YORK, NEW YORK</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090</td>
<td>NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New York State Canal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3091</td>
<td>SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AND UPPER DELAWARE RIVERS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3092</td>
<td>SUSQUEHANNA RIVER RESTORATION, NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3093</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>Conrail</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3094</td>
<td>LOWER GRAY LAKE DAM, GRAND, OHIO</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3095</td>
<td>TOLUSSIAN RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3096</td>
<td>ARCADIA LAKE, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3097</td>
<td>LAKE EUPALIA, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3098</td>
<td>RELEASE OF RETAINED RIGHTS, INTERESTS, AND RESERVATIONS, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3099</td>
<td>OKLAHOMA LAKES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3100</td>
<td>OTTAWA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3101</td>
<td>RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLAHOMA AND TEXAS</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3102</td>
<td>MAURER LAKE, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Inhephqj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3103</td>
<td>LOCKWOOD POINT PROJECT, LOWELL, OREGON</td>
<td>Wyler Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3104</td>
<td>UPPER WALLAMETT RIVER WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION</td>
<td>Wyler Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3105</td>
<td>UPPER SUBQUIANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK</td>
<td>Senator Clinton, Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3106</td>
<td>HARRISANSETT BAY, MAINE</td>
<td>Reed Whipplehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3107</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL, AT RICHARD B. RUSSELL LAKE, SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3108</td>
<td>MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>Thune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3109</td>
<td>MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>Greene Bond McCaskill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3110</td>
<td>NONCONOMA WER, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3111</td>
<td>OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, CUMBERLAND RIVER, TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3112</td>
<td>SANDY CREEK JACSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3113</td>
<td>CEDAR BAYOU, TEXAS</td>
<td>Hutchison Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3114</td>
<td>DEER ISLAND, TEXAS</td>
<td>Hutchison Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3115</td>
<td>CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, TEXAS</td>
<td>Hutchison Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3116</td>
<td>FREEPORT HARBOUR, TEXAS</td>
<td>Hutchison Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3117</td>
<td>HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS</td>
<td>Hutchison Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3118</td>
<td>CONNECTICUT RIVER RESTORATION, VERMONT</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3119</td>
<td>DAM REMOVAL, VERMONT</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3120</td>
<td>LAKE CHAMPLAIN EUGANUS MILL, WATER CHNSTEM AND OTHER NONNATIVE PLANT CONTROL, VERMONT</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3121</td>
<td>UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN WETLAND RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3122</td>
<td>UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3123</td>
<td>LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VERMONT AND NEW YORK</td>
<td>Sanders, Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3124</td>
<td>CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RESTORATION, VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND</td>
<td>Warner Mikulski Cardin Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3125</td>
<td>JAMES RIVER, VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Warner Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3126</td>
<td>JASSO ISLAND, VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Warner Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3127</td>
<td>ERIE COUNTRY. FLEET ISLAND, WASHINGTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Murray Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3128</td>
<td>LOWER QUANTZ POOL, WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Murray Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3129</td>
<td>MACHAL LOCK AND DAM, MACHAL NATURAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO</td>
<td>Craig Murray Crapo Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3130</td>
<td>SHORE RIVER PROJECT, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO</td>
<td>Craig Murray Crapo Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3131</td>
<td>NINETY-FOUR CREEK WATERSHIP, ROLLINGHAM, WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Murray Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3132</td>
<td>LOWER MUD RIVER, MOUNT WASHINGTON, NEW YORK</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3133</td>
<td>MCGILLUCY COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3134</td>
<td>GREIS BAY BAPTIST PROJECT, GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN</td>
<td>Kohl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3135</td>
<td>MANITOWAC HARBOR, WISCONSIN</td>
<td>Kohl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3136</td>
<td>OCONTO HARBOUR, WISCONSIN</td>
<td>Kohl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3137</td>
<td>MISSISSIPPI RIVER HEADWATERS RESERVOIRS</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3138</td>
<td>LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MUSEUM AND RIVERFRONT INTERPRETIVE SITE</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3139</td>
<td>UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>Harkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3140</td>
<td>UPPER BASIN OF MISSOURI RIVER</td>
<td>Bonham Hagel *Farrell Thune Tester Volkmer Bechler Schumel Sladek Snow Clinton Brown Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3141</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>Bonham Hagel *Farrell Thune Tester Volkmer Bechler Schumel Sladek Snow Clinton Brown Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3142</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND RESTORATION</td>
<td>Bonham Hagel *Farrell Thune Tester Volkmer Bechler Schumel Sladek Snow Clinton Brown Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3143</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES THREATENED SPECIES STATE OF THE ART PROGRAM</td>
<td>Bonham Hagel *Farrell Thune Tester Volkmer Bechler Schumel Sladek Snow Clinton Brown Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3144</td>
<td>UPPER MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES NAVIGATION SYSTEM NEW TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM</td>
<td>Specter Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title IV - Studies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4001</td>
<td>SPEND BROWSER WATER, ALASKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4002</td>
<td>HOME FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, ALASKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4003</td>
<td>SJOCC, FLARE KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4004</td>
<td>STRIPLAND AVENUE RAILROAD BRIDGE ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4005</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES RIVER REHABILITATION STUDY, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Water Resources Development Act of 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4008</td>
<td>Comprehensive Flood Protection Project, St. Helena, California</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4009</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Sherman Island, California</td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010</td>
<td>South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study, California</td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011</td>
<td>San Pablo Bay Watershed Restoration, California</td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012</td>
<td>Fountain Creek, North of Pueblo, Colorado</td>
<td>Bise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4013</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4014</td>
<td>Delaware Inland Bays and Tributaries and Atlantic Coast, Delaware</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015</td>
<td>Herbert Hoover Dike Supplemental Major Rehabilitation Report, Florida</td>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4016</td>
<td>Boise River, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4017</td>
<td>Promontory Point Third-Party Review, Chicago Shoreline, Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4018</td>
<td>Valdosta Port, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4019</td>
<td>Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan</td>
<td>Levin, Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020</td>
<td>Wild Rice River, Minnesota</td>
<td>Coleman, Isakson, Coburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4021</td>
<td>Asian Carp Dispersal Barrier Demonstration Project, Upper Mississippi River</td>
<td>Coleman, Coburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022</td>
<td>Flood Damage Reduction, Ohio</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4023</td>
<td>Middle Bass Island State Park, Middle Bass Island, Ohio</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4024</td>
<td>Ohio River, Ohio</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025</td>
<td>Toledo Harbor, Dredged Material Placement, Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4026</td>
<td>Toledo Harbor, Maumee River, and Lake Channels Project, Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>Voinovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4027</td>
<td>Woonsocket Local Protection Project, Blackstone River Basin, Rhode Island</td>
<td>Rehd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4028</td>
<td>Jasper County Port Facility Study, South Carolina</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4029</td>
<td>Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas</td>
<td>Himes, Comyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030</td>
<td>Ecosystem and Hydropower Generation, Maine, Vermont</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4031</td>
<td>Eurasian Melaleuca</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4032</td>
<td>Lake Champlain Canal Study, Vermont, New York</td>
<td>Ottinger, Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033</td>
<td>Baker Bay and Walpack Harbor, Washington</td>
<td>Murray, Cardwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4034</td>
<td>Elliot Bay Seawall Rehabilitation Study, Washington</td>
<td>Gorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4035</td>
<td>Johnsonville Dam, Johnsonville, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4036</td>
<td>Dredge Removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title V - Miscellaneous Provisions**

### Lakes Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5001</td>
<td>Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5002</td>
<td>Lake Marmar, Vermont</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5003</td>
<td>Lake Fairview, Vermont</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5004</td>
<td>Lake Rogers, Camden, North Carolina</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5201</td>
<td>Jackson County, Mississippi</td>
<td>Cochran, Lott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5202</td>
<td>DeSoto County, Mississippi</td>
<td>Cochran, Lott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5203</td>
<td>Hoffman County, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5204</td>
<td>Albemarle, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5205</td>
<td>Macon, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5206</td>
<td>Stephens County/City of Tecosa, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5207</td>
<td>DeSoto County, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5208</td>
<td>Lassen County, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5209</td>
<td>Butte County, California</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210</td>
<td>City of East Point, Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5211</td>
<td>Franklin County, Kentucky</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5212</td>
<td>vértebre Parish, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5213</td>
<td>South Central Planning and Development Commission, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5214</td>
<td>Rapides Area Planning Commission, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5215</td>
<td>Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5216</td>
<td>Lafayette, Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Vitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92. Lake Charles, Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Villar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Ouachita Parish, Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Villar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Union-Lincoln Regional Water Supply Project, Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Villar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Central Lake Region Sanitary District, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Goodhue, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Grand Rapids, Minnesota</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Joly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Willmar, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. City of Connell, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Heflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Clean Water Coalition, Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Town of Measeville, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. City of Winston-Salem, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Neuse Regional Water and Sewer Authority, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Town of City Limits, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. City of Fayetteville, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Washington County, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. City of Greenville, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. City of Ada, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Norman, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Eastern Oklahoma State University, Wilberon, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. City of Weatherford, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. City of Bethany, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Woodward, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. City of Okemah and Langston, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. City of Durant, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. City of Midwest City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. City of Ardmore, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. City of Guymon, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Logun-Atoka Irrigation District, Atoka, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. City of Searcy, Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Guymon, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. City of Barling, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. City of Yonkers, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. City of Mustang, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. City of McAlester, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Wagoner County, Ohio</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. Bur Oak Regional Water District, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Fremont, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. Martinsburg, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Defiance County, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Meigs County, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. City of Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. Warren, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Lawrence County, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. City of Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Beaver Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Myrtle Beach, South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Charleston and West Ashley, South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Surfside, South Carolina</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (Devon and Ziebach Counties) and Perkins and Meade Counties, South Dakota</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, and pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 128, H.R. 1495, Water Resources Development Act.

Harry Reid, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Byron L. Dorgan, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Dick Durbin, Claire McCaskill, Bernard Sanders, Tom Carper, Max Baucus, Frank R. Lautenberg, Ben Cardin, Robert Menendez, Ken Salazar, Edward Kennedy, H.R. Clinton, Amy Klobuchar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1495, an act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSASKA). Are any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 7, as follows:

|Roll Call Vote No. 162 Leg.| YEAS—89
|--------------------------| -------
|Akaka                     | Durbin  |
|Alexander                 | Enzi    |
|Baucus                    | Feingold|
|Bayh                      | Feinstein|
|Bennett                   | Graham  |
|Biden                     | Grassley|
|Bingaman                  | Hagel   |
|Bond                      | Harkin  |
|Boxer                     | Hatch   |
|Brown                     | Hatchen |
|Brownback                 | Isakson |
|Burr                      | Inouye  |
|Bryd                      | Isakson |
|Cantwell                  | Kennedy |
|Cardin                    | Kerry   |
|Carper                    | Kobolch|
|Casey                     | Koch    |
|Chambliss                 | Kyl     |
|Clinton                   | Landrie |
|Cochran                   | Landreng|
|Coleman                   | Leahy   |
|Collins                   | Levin   |
|Conrad                    | Levin   |
|Corker                    | Lincoln |
|Curnyn                    | Lott    |
|Craig                     | Lugar   |
|Dodd                      | Martinez|
|Dole                      | McCain  |
|Domenici                  | McConnell|
|Dorgan                    | Menendez|

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 7. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak in morning business under the time that is allotted to me postcloture.

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

**IRAQ FUNDING**

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, last week, the Congress sent the President an emergency supplemental spending bill for Iraq. That bill provided every dollar our troops needed every dollar the President requested and then some.

It also provided what a majority of Americans expect and that is they expect a plan to start to bring home American troops, to bring this war to an end in a responsible way, to escalate it indefitintely as this President is doing.

In vetoing the bill, the President not only denied our troops the funding they needed, but he denied the American people what they have clearly stated they want: a responsible path out of Iraq. That is what the 2006 election was about. That is what every poll is about. That is what the Senator from West Virginia, whom I see on the floor, and I and others have been saying for some time now, I might add, that is also what I think an awful lot of our Republican colleagues want.

I raised a few eyebrows when I said a month ago that I don’t think there are more than a dozen members of the opposition who would defend this policy of unrelenting escalation with no end in sight in Iraq is one they support.

The question is: What do we do in the face of the President’s recalcitrance?

We all know, and again I refer to my friend from West Virginia, the most learned person in the Senate—I don’t go back as far as he does, but I go back to trying to end the war in Vietnam. I remember how painfully long that process was. Once the whole Nation and the Senate had turned against the process was. Once the whole Nation and the Senate had turned against the war, it was still painfully difficult to end.

So if it were up to me, I would send the same emergency spending bill back to the President and have the votes, with the money for our troops and the plan that is in that legislation to end the war, which the people expect. I would send it back to him again and again and again and again and let him veto it again and again and again and again. Any reasonable person listening to me might say, why would you do that, not a fool’s errand? I believe the more we keep this front and center, the more we relentlessly push on this President to abandon his flawed policy, the more pressure will be brought upon our colleagues who, in their hearts, know this is not the right policy but are voting with the President instead of with the troops.

I must admit straight up, this is about building pressure. We are going to need 67 votes to end this war—67 votes in the Senate. So that means, although I had a great conversation with Senator Johnson last night, I might say, he sounded wonderful—although that means until Senator JOHNSON comes back, we need 17 Republican Senators to change their minds. That is why we have to keep pushing. We have to let the President demonstrate time and again that he is totally out of touch with what our troops need, what the American people want, and where America’s interests lie. In a sense, this reminds me a little bit of Richard Nixon, it seems to me. He seems divorced from what is going on around him. I don’t quite understand it. I have been here 34 years. It reminds me of Nixon during Watergate. We had the general testify before our Judiciary Committee with a terrible appearance, and the President says he did wonderfully. The President says the war is going well. The President said the response to Katrina initially was great. There seems to be a disconnect here. So the only thing I know to do is to continually force him to demonstrate again and again, until he changes his mind, how out of touch he is, to build pressure in the Congress.

The truth is, votes matter. We need the votes to stop this war because I am convinced this President has made a decision with his Vice President to keep this from completely blowing up and it is off to the next Presidency. The problem is, in the meantime, a lot of people are going to lose their lives—a lot of Americans and a whole lot more Iraqis. But I recognize, as I said, the reality that it takes 60 votes to send the same bill back to the President, as it would take 60 votes to formally deauthorize the war, as my friend from West Virginia is attempting to do, as I and Carl Levin talked about, and we introduced legislation similar to that, to deauthorize the war and reauthorize a more limited mission. We need, though, 60 votes. It is just as people talk about cutting off funding, we still need 60 votes. It would take, obviously, 67 votes then to overcome a Presidential veto.

The reason I say this is we all are frustrated on this floor. Right now, we don’t have those votes. We don’t have the votes right now to send back the same supplemental.

What should we do next? In my view, first, anything we send back to the President must and will provide every dollar the troops need. As long as we are on the frontlines, I will vote for the money to protect them. That money must include funding for additional Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles, so-called MRAP’s.
The amendment I offered was overwhelmingly adopted. The vast majority of deaths and injuries are from roadside bombs. They are responsible for 70 percent of our casualties in Iraq. These new V-shaped hull vehicles that will take the place of heavily armored hummers, if fully deployed, will make a greater prospect of protecting troops inside those vehicles. They can literally cut our casualty rates by two-thirds.

As a matter of fact, depending on what we do send back to the President, it is my intention, if somehow we make no progress, to take this money out for those vehicles and move it separately because it literally, literally, literally can change the lives of our soldiers in the field. Our military wants them; our soldiers need them.

Defense Secretary Gates said MRAPs are "the highest priority acquisition program. Any and all options to accelerate the production and fielding of these vehicles should be identified, assessed, and applied." I am happy to hear him say that because originally they didn't ask for this money to fast-track the production and fielding of this program. Any and all options to accelerate the production and fielding of these vehicles should be identified, assessed, and applied.

I am happy to hear him say that because originally they didn't ask for this money to fast-forward the funding of these vehicles. The Secretary is right. I think it would be unwise not to get as many as possible in the field as fast as possible.

Second, if we don't have the votes now for a hard timetable, which is what is in the bill that was vetoed, a hard timetable came out of the language Senator LEVIN and I worked on putting in the bill, if, in fact, we don't have the votes now for that hard timetable to start getting our troops out of Iraq, any bill we send back to the President must limit dramatically the mission of the troops in Iraq.

We must get our troops out of the middle of this sectarian civil war that we cannot end militarily. Having 15,000, 20,000, 30,000 troops in a city of 6,200,000 people, knocking on doors in the middle of a civil war is just foolhardy. Instead, we should focus our military on a much more limited mission that is in the national interest, that we can achieve with fewer troops, and that is doable; that is, training the Iraqi Army, preventing al-Qaeda from occupying territory in parts of Anbar Province, and—and—force protection.

If we limit the mission in that way, the President will not be able to justify keeping them in Iraq especially at a time when our military is dangerously overstretched, threatening the readiness of our troops and the ability to retain those now serving, to recruit those who may wish to serve in the future, and—and—to provide a National Guard at home that is not manned close to home if they enlisted. Within 2 days of that switch, 460 youths had signed up.

So you have Sunnis joining the police and army in their own regions, staying in their regions to deal with Sunni extremists in the midst of their own region, and becoming part of the anti-al-Qaeda solution.

Just as important, we have to have a plan to bring stability to Iraq as we leave behind will impact on that region for the next 15 years. How we leave and what we leave behind is critical. We have to have a plan for what we leave behind so we do not trade a dictator for chaos in Iraq.

Across the country, our Governors have been warning for months that their National Guards are not prepared for the next local disaster because they are tied down overseas; or, even if they are home, because they took their equipment overseas when they were deployed in Iraq. To give it back, they are ill prepared in terms of manpower and/or equipment. So if we limit the mission of our troops in Iraq to a more rational mission, the President will have to start bringing troops home now, with or without a hard timetable.

He will have to start listening to our Governors. He will have to start listening to our troops and their families who have told so many of us about the strain of going back to Iraq on third and fourth tours, about being ordered to stay longer each time they go, about not having the year at home at deployments that they were promised. He will have to start listening because he was willing to listen to me when I warned that one of the Army's col leagues will stop voting with the President and start backing what the American people want: a responsible end to this war.

Until we have the votes to force the President to change course, we have to keep the pressure on for change every single day. That is what I have been doing, and that is what I will continue to do until this policy levee that the President has erected breaks.

The fact is, the fundamental strategy under which the President has operated is flawed. The idea that through force we are going to be able to establish a strong central democratic government in Baghdad is simply not possible. It is simply not possible. It is not going to happen in the lifetime of any Member of this Senate.

Starting to get our troops out of Iraq, and getting most of them out by early next year, is the first step toward bringing this war to a responsible end. Just as important, we have to have a plan for what we leave behind so we do not trade a dictator for chaos in Iraq and the region that undermines our interests for decades.

I don't want my son going to Iraq, but I also don't want my grandson going to that part of the world in the next 15 years. How we leave and what we leave behind will impact on that second question. We have to have a plan to bring stability to Iraq as we leave, and that requires a political solution. Everyone—everyone—from the President on, says there is no military solution to Iraq; there is a political solution only. But he hasn't offered a political solution.

I know my colleagues have heard me talk about my plan for a political settlement in Iraq for more than a year now. It calls for separating the warring factions, giving them breathing room in their own regions, as their constitution provides, with control over the fabric of their daily lives—such as police protection, education, marriage, jobs, religion—and a limited central government that would be responsible and relevant. Look at what is happening in Ramadi, where al-Qaida has a stronghold. The administration rightly points to some successes in getting Sunni tribal leaders to turn on al-Qaida in Iraq and getting thousands of young Sunni men to sign up for the Ramadi police force and protection forces. Listen carefully to how this happened, as described by the Los Angeles Times:

Fed up with the insurgents’ killings and the absence of a political compromise, the Sunni sheiks came to the coalition in September to tell the U.S.-led force that they were ready to cooperate and would urge their troops to supply recruits to army and police. Even the most optimistic U.S. colonel was not prepared for the flood of recruits once the sheiks got the word out that joining the Army, along with provincial forces had their approval. Recently, 1,500 Iraqi youths showed up to enlist in the police, more than the recruiters could take.
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get its act together. But there is no trust within that government, no trust of the government by the people it purports to serve, and no capacity on the part of the government to deliver the services or security that is needed. Thereby it is perfect that the government will build that trust and capacity any time soon.

In short, the most basic premise of the President’s approach, and that of some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, is that the Iraqi people will rally and find a strong central government that looks out for their interests equally and is fundamentally fair. That whole notion, I have been saying for over 4 years, is fundamentally flawed. It is not achievable. So instead of escalating this war with no end in sight, we have to start bringing our troops home with the goal of getting most of them out by early next year.

As the President rails against those of us who have been proposing that, I remind him that if he remember Secretary of State Eagleburger, were part of a commission that said we should get our troops out by March of 2008. The British, in Basra, did essentially what we are proposing. They redeployed their troops out of the cities, did not engage in the civil war, and began to draw them down. Are they abandoning?

Instead of escalating this war, we have to start to bring our troops home, and we can help the Arab governments, who believe there may be projects they want to see passed the Water Resources Development Act. We are going to again invite Members to come now. I know there are several Members who have said they want to come to the colleague. There is a limit number of those who wanted some of those to be considered. Frankly, I would have preferred not to. But nonetheless, that is now part of the criteria. There is a limited number of the criteria.

We have 22 projects in the bill that have to go along the line of making sure there is local support. We do not have any waivers for local support of these efforts, so the participation had to be there from the local governments to demonstrate clearly these are important projects to be considered.

Speaking as a conservative, let me emphasize there are certain things conservatives should be doing. The top two in my category are armed services—we have to defend America; that is our function; that is what we are supposed to be doing—and second is infrastructure. Way back in the Eisenhower administration, we started a system of national highways. It has been very successful. But we have a problem in the way we have been funding them with user fees, with a Federal gasoline excise tax. It has worked fairly well. However, we are to the point now where the last bill we passed 2 years ago, the Transportation reauthorization bill, was one where, even though it was a very large bill in terms of spending, in terms of the amount of money, it did nothing more than maintain what we currently have. That is not adequate.

You might say that has nothing to do with the Water Resources Development Act. It does. Right now, looking into the future, I see nothing but serious problems. We know 10 years from now the traffic on our highway system throughout America is going to double and probably triple in 20 years. If something is not done to increase the road capacity, it is going to be chaotic. The two things that have the most favorable effect on surface transportation are our rail and waterway system. That is what is all about, our waterway system.

We are going to be talking in a lot more detail about this, but I want to say, particularly to those out there who believe there may be projects they don’t like in this bill, that it is not a criteria. If we were not to pass the Water Resources Development Act, if we were to say we are not going to pass it—maybe people are fabricating some reason, they don’t like one or two projects that are in this bill, and that criteria. If we were not to pass the Water Resources Development Act, if we were to say we are not going to pass it—maybe people are fabricating some reason, they don’t like one or two projects that are in this bill, and that criteria. I will give an example. In the State of Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers and the Port of Catoosa, down through the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers and distributed throughout the water system. It is something absolutely necessary. If we did not have that, if we were not able to pass legislation to expand that capacity, then that traffic is going to fall on our highways.

I can assure you right now the same committee considering the water bill now is going to be considering the transportation reauthorization bill in a couple of years. It is going to make it that much more traumatic if we do not get this done.

I will give an example. In the State of Oklahoma, 98 percent of the road we are going to fall on our highways.

I reemphasize to those who are my conservative friends—we have rankings around here. One of the unique things about the Senate and House of Representatives is that if people want to know how their Members are voting, if you are concerned about overtaxation, you have a number of organizations—the National Taxpayers Union, the National Tax Limitation Committee, and others—that rank us as to how we vote on tax increases. If you are concerned about overregulation of small business—I spent 35 years in small business so I know a little bit about overregulation—if you are concerned about that, the National Federation of Independent Business ranks all Members, Democratic and Republican in the Senate, as to how they vote on regulatory issues that might inhibit the expansion of small businesses.

The same thing is true with how people vote on defense. The American Conservative Union ranks all Members of the House and Senate. I have to say to my conservative friends, I am, as of...
2 weeks ago, again, considered and ranked as the No. 1 most conservative Member of the Senate. I am proud of that. So I don’t want anyone to run around saying we are passing a bill that is somehow going out and doing projects that should not be done.

Sure, there are some projects in here that I don’t like as well as others. I might not have had the same criteria as someone on the other side of the aisle might. But I have to say this, with due to both of our committees, Senator BOXER, she and I have worked for a long time on this. She, as I said before, is a proud liberal Democrat. I am a proud conservative Republican.

We agree on these things. We know how to make sure that we consider all of our constituents. If we don’t, we don’t have a bill. We often need to consider the context in which we are working in order to make sure we do certain things. Certainly, the greatest Nation in the world has to have an infrastructure system that will accommodate transportation.

This is a very important part of that. When we deploy units for training out of Oklahoma, we send the heavy equipment via channels.

I have not told this story in a long time. Since I see Senator BOXER, I will tell it. Many years ago when I was in the State Senate, it occurred to me that our navigation way that makes us navigable in the State of Oklahoma was something nobody knew about. They knew about the Interoastal Waterway, we know about the Arkansas River, we know about the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes, but they didn’t know anything about the State of Oklahoma and the fact you can get the one day up the river and to barge traffic into my hometown of Tulsa, OK.

A guy came to me with an idea. This is years ago. He was from Kellyville, OK. His name was Kelly. That must tell you something. He was the head of the World War II submarine veterans.

He came to me and said: If you want to get the message across that we are navigable in Oklahoma, I can raise money. I believed in World War II surplus submarine from Orange, TX. With volunteers we can, together, if you will do the legislation in the State of Oklahoma and come help us on this, we can bring that submarine all the way up the Ineroastal Waterway, up the Mississippi, over the blossoms, to the Port of Catoosa—actually, the Port of Muskogee is where it ended up—and we can let the whole know we have this navigation way. We did.

And political adversaries were against it. They said, in the State Senate, we are going to sink Inhofe with the submarine. It didn’t work. The submarine is there now. It is proudly displayed in Muskogee, OK, letting all the world know we are able to barge material in and out of the State of Oklaho.

I have to say it is the Nation’s most inland port. I invite you to come out and take a trip. I say to my friend Senator BOXER.

The bottom line is this. We have to get the heavy stuff moved around. If it is not going to be on rail, if it is not going to be on the channel system, the waterway system we are talking about today, then it will have to be on the other surface transportation or highway system that is going to be so con-

That is what this is all about. I renew our request for Members who have amendments they want to bring to the floor, bring them now. We have lots of time. We have all day to be looking at these. We want to consider them. We want to go and hard to accom-

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER, Mr. President, I say thank you to Senator INHOFE. People see us tangling on a host of issues. I think it gives them a good feeling to know there are times when we see eye to eye. I would say, when those times occur, it should mean we can get our legislation through pretty quickly be-

cause we have worked hard to accom-

modate the views of both sides of the aisle.

I pleased the Senate voted overwhelmingly to start the process of consider-

ing Water Resources Develop-

ment Act of 2007. I hope, in short order, we will find out we can actually move to the bill. We are technically on a motion to proceed to the bill, which is slowing us up a bit, but we think there are other ways of doing that. We hope they will be resolved.

This important legislation authorizes projects and policies of the Civic Works Program of the Army Corps of Engi-

nee and, as I said, it has tremendous support both from my ranking mem-

ber, Senator INHOFE, the entire Envi-

ronment and Public Works Com-

mittee—which runs the gamut of phi-

losophies and geographies and all the rest.

Colleagues asked to see the sub-

stitute bill we worked so hard on, that has a very good score from the Con-

gressional Budget Office—less than the House-passed bill; fiscally responsible. A good chunk of it is aimed at Hurri-

canes. Katrina—which both Senator INHOFE and I feel very good about. We believe certainly Louisiana is in des-

perate need of help, and we have an-

swered their call in a very strong way. I would say about 25 percent of the bill is actually money to make sure Louisiana is made whole and is protected in the future.

We hope our colleagues from Lou-

isiana will feel good about this. If there are other things they want to offer, we ask them to come down and show us what they are. Senator INHOFE, Sen-

ator ISAKSON, Senator BAUCUS, and I have an agreement that unless the four of us agree on these amendments, we are going to oppose them. That is hard for us to do. We don’t like to give up our freedoms. But there are going to do it. Why? This bill is 7 years over-

due—7 long years. There is enough blame to go around as to why it hap-

pened. We don’t need to get into it. It is not important. Right now we have an opportunity to make up for lost time and get to where we are back on a track that makes sense. This is a great economy in this country. We need an infrastructure that matches the ambi-

tions of our future dreams for a thriv-

ing business community, a place where workers can get good jobs. So we need this bill.

What we are saying to colleagues is, first of all, some of you want to see the bill. Of course. The bill is available to you.

The bill is available in both cloak-

rooms. The bill will be printed in the RECORD tonight. You have all been part of it. I think you all will be pleased with it. There is a CBO score that has been placed in the RECORD for you to see. There is huge support out here in America for this bill. We have letters coming in from disparate groups in this country which include farmers, which include workers in particular, all kinds of businesses. This is a very powerful message to the Senate to move forward. The House has passed the bill. Let’s get to conference. Let’s get a bill to the President’s desk.

Again, I say thank you to Senator INHOFE. I will say this a lot. But it has been a pleasure to work with him and his staff. My staff feels the same way. We have made great progress. This bill is a project of commitment, of bipar-

tisan and partnership.

I mentioned Senators BAUCUS and ISAKSON. They have been very important in terms of working with us on this package. Many members of the committee went to Louisiana to see the problem there. Senators LANDRIEU and VITTER were determined to show us their needs, and they did. Again, a lot of the work in this bill is directed to-

ward Louisiana.

I do want to thank members of the staff. Sometimes when we wait until the bill is finished to do that. But I want to do it now. My staff director, Bettina Poirier, and my deputy staff director, Ken Kopocis; Jeff Rosato and Tyler Rushforth for all their work. On Senator INHOFE’s staff. I wanted to thank Andrew Wheeler, Ruth Van Mark, Angie Giancarlo, and Letmon Lee. Additionally, I thank Jo-Ellen Darcy and Paul Wilkins with Senator BAUCUS and Mike Quiello with Senator ISAKSON.

We have had many late-hour, emer-

gency, stressful phone calls getting to this stage. We hope those phone calls will not have been in vain and that we have come up with a product everyone will be proud of.

In so many ways this is the start of a new day because I believe we are now on track to restore the regular process of meeting the Nation’s water re-

sources needs as they arise. But we will not get done with this bill if colleagues do not come to the floor and let us see their amendments.

I echo what Senator INHOFE said. Let’s not play hide and seek with
amendments. Let’s get those amendments out. I have already been very open. I have told everybody there is an agreement with the big four on the committee; that we need to agree to them, to support them. It may well be there is an amendment on Senator INHOFE’s side but we would all hope that because of one of us said it is not acceptable. The same thing could well happen on our side. That does not diminish anyone’s right to offer these amendments. They have the right to do it. We support that right to do it because if they come soon, maybe we can work on these amendments together and get them included in the managers’ package. So that would be the best of all worlds.

I thank Senator FEINGOLD because he and I had a chat. He is going to offer an amendment I do not agree with on prioritization of Corps projects. But he is going to come over here at noon. He is going to take his time then, and then he is going to talk about this anymore until we have a vote. And he will do it in 2 minutes on Tuesday so that we can get the debate on these amendments over with now.

So I ask other Senators with amendments, in the sound of our voices: Please come over with your amendments. We have all day, all day here with an open microphone for you. You can take as much time as you want. You can put your amendment out there. You can talk about it, and then Senator INHOFE and I can look it over, share it with Senators ISAKSON and BAUCUS.

We want to accommodate everybody. We really do. If you meet the criteria we have set out—I think the criteria is well thought out. We want to make sure every project in this bill can be defended. That is important because we have precious few dollars to waste. So we want you to come over with your amendments. We are going to talk about this, help everyone. We have already done so much to help you. We want to do more. We both agree, Senator INHOFE and I, that WRDA is an important bill, and it is overdue 7 years—too long to wait for a bill that authorizes essential flood control, navigation, ecosystem restoration; 7 years of projects being ready to go and unable to begin because, for whatever reason.

Again, we did not—we could not get the political will, or we could not just push it over the finish line, as I like to say. So we had 7 years of communities in your State and mine and Oklahoma and other places, people waiting to shore up their infrastructure needs, many of them vital to protecting homes and families from catastrophic flooding.

Believe me, I can tell you, in my State flood control is one of the major priorities of Senator FEINSTEIN and I, as well as Governor Schwarzenegger. It is a quintessential in the State legislature as well.

So, yes, there are a lot of projects in the bill. It is the cost of waiting so long to act. So I think it is remarkable that given all the time that has gone on, we were able to put together a bill that is fiscally responsible. The bill before the Senate is less expensive than the bill passed by the House. The original bill had some ambiguous language that caused concern. But I believe Senator INHOFE and I and others, we have corrected this problem. It was not easy. It took discipline, but we worked cooperatively in a bipartisan way.

We have a bill that meets our communities’ and Nation’s acute and unmet water infrastructure needs. It does it in a fiscally responsible way. Let me tell you what the bill does. Title I would authorize 47 projects consistent with combined chief of engineers reports. Now, that is very important because these reports lay out what we have to do, what the cost will be.

Those chief of engineers reports deal with flood control, navigation, and ecosystem restoration projects. These chief reports are the result of years of engineering science, economic analysis, environmental assessment, hours of Corps of Engineers work and expertise going into the decisions, concluding with the final review of the chief.

Title I would also authorize new locks on the upper Mississippi River, Illinois waterway, and the concurrent ecosystem restoration plan for those waters. This project is important to waterway goods movement, particularly from the heartland of America. That is why the farmers support this bill. It brings a11 these dams, this co2ntrolling coalition of people supporting this bill.

If you cannot move goods, grain, from the heartland, we are in a lot of trouble. We will be in a lot of trouble if this bill does not get done. Senator INHOFE and I are committed to getting this done. We have our differences in this Chamber, and by the way, that is the way it should be. There are differences in this Chamber, but when it comes to this, it seems to me we have to set them aside. Those differences should be set aside.

Title I also includes authorization for the Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration Program, to revert wetland loss, provide hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits.

I will discuss this issue in depth at a later time. But we know the loss of wetlands is a major cause of flooding. Not even to get into the fact that our species need these wetlands, but that aside; the wetlands are flood control, natural flood control. We have lost so many wetlands that the Corps came to us and told us they believe it is a major cause. They never did realize what we had until the water went. So now we are restoring wetlands.

Finally, title I includes small projects for flood damage reduction, navigation, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and continuing authority programs of the Corps.

Title II will make changes in Corps of Engineers authorities in how it carries out its programs. Title II contains the administrative provisions that are commonly referred to as Corps reform. These important provisions include updating the Corps’ planning process, the water resources planning coordinating committee, independent peer review, and transfers to the Corps’ mitigation program.

Now, a lot of this language was new to the last bill. I thank my colleague, Senator INHOFE. When he was in charge of the committee, he took the lead on this legislation, and kept it policy intact. We made progress with Corps reform. These provisions will help ensure the Corps does its job more effectively and soundly, require in many cases an extra pair of eyes on its projects.

Senator INHOFE worked with Senator FEINGOLD and me and others. The language stands. We should be proud. Yes, there is Corps reform in this bill.

Now, I wanted to make it clear that Senator FEINGOLD and I do not agree more. One of his ideas is prioritization. Frankly, I think it is off the mark, and we are going to have a debate about it to see where the chips fall on that particular amendment. But I thank him for the cooperation. He is going to come down in a little while. He is going to take his time. He is going to debate this bill. Senator INHOFE and I, I am sure, will have a response, and then we will be able to have a very short continuation of the debate just a couple of minutes per side, hopefully, on Monday or Tuesday, and we will finish this bill.

Title II also contains the authorization for the National Levee Safety Program, a new program that helps identify failing levees and provides Corps resources and expertise to help improve and repair those levees.

Title III includes provisions that would affect existing, ongoing, or completed projects. These sections include modifications to project cost ceilings, modifying project purposes, changing project boundaries, extending authorizations for annual programs, and correcting original deficiencies.

Why is this important? Because so much time has passed that these projects need another look. Sometimes there is new technologies that can come in and meet the needs. Sometimes there is new cost estimates that need to be reflected. So Title III affects existing, ongoing, or completed projects.

I have just about 3 more minutes or 4 minutes, then I will have to yield to whoever would like to speak at that time.

Title IV includes authorizations for new project studies. It also makes modifications to ongoing studies. Title V includes modifications to the Estuary Restoration Act, an existing restoration program of the Corps. It includes programmatic authorities for new and approaches to water resources problems.

Title VI would deauthorize all or portions of 42 previously authorized Corps
projects. The deauthorization represents projects or portions of projects that are no longer supported by local interests. This does happen. Sometimes you have a plan, and after years and years people say: There is a better way to do it. We don’t need it. That is reflected here.

So that is a brief overview of the bill. But it only begins to express the bill’s importance to our communities, our families, our Nation, our farmers, our workers and our businesses. The bill is about authorizing projects our communities need to help protect thousands of homes and millions of lives from catastrophic floods. The bill is about authorizing projects our communities need to help restore the great wetlands, estuaries, and rivers of our Nation. These are places in which wildlife thrives and our families can enjoy for generations to come.

Indeed, as hunting, fishing, boating, camping, and our outdoor industries boom, this bill is an important part of keeping America’s recreation economy thriving.

The bill makes other very important contributions to our Nation’s economy. It authorizes projects our communities need to help increase our port and waterway capacity and makes shipping easier, safer, more efficient. It literally keeps America’s economy moving.

We are in a global economy. Ships come into port, and they go out of port. They move goods in, they move goods out. Workers are at the ports, businesses are at the ports.

I want to tell you when we get to our next highway bill, we have to do a lot more for our ports in terms of cleaner air and goods movement. I look forward to working with Senator INHOFE perhaps as early as next year, and the other colleagues who chair and rank on that subcommittee, to begin looking at that next bill that is so important to our goods movement.

But this is part of it. We need to pass this bill to keep America’s economy moving because much of our economy is dependent on our water resources. In just the next 2 minutes, I am going to give you a couple of examples of what I am talking about.

America’s ports and harbors are our gateway to the world. Our manufacturers’ goods, automobiles, computer chips, agriculture goods such as grains, wines, and fruit pass through our ports and harbors around the world. Goods worth billions pass through our ports every day and more than 2.5 billion tons of trade move through our ports and waterways. That volume is expected to double over the next 15 years. In the next 15 years, goods movement is going to double in our country. So we have to get down passing this bill, because thousands of jobs are on the line. Many businesses are expecting us to take action, and our farmers want action. Five million jobs are at America’s ports. WRDA is essential.

Outdoor recreation, I talked about that. The Corps of Engineers operates more than 2,500 recreation areas at 463 projects, and leases an additional 1,800 sites to States or locals. The Corps hosts 360 million visits a year at its lakes, beaches, and other areas. It is estimated that 1 in 10 Americans visits Corps projects once a year, 25 million people. We need to pass this bill. That generates 600,000 jobs to support visitors.

Public health and safety, economic growth, environmental protection are the goals.

This is the first bill—I think Senator INHOFE and I are very proud of this—that takes into effect ethics reform, even though the bill has not been signed into law. We have asked colleagues to submit letters answering the question: Do you have a conflict of interest in any of your projects? Those letters are open for the public to see. They are at the committee offices. We have printed in large print the results of those letters and each of the projects Members have asked for.

We are proud of that.

One of the lessons of Hurricane Katrina is that we have to take our infrastructure at our own peril. We are going to be moving new WRDA bills right after this one. We are going to be looking at our levees. We are not resting after this bill passes.

I look forward to moving along on this bill. I know at this point we have a bit of a slowdown on the bill by my Republican colleagues. I understand their issues have nothing to do with the legislation. I respect that. It is a tool that has been used, side by side, let’s put aside our differences on whatever they are. Whether it is judges, politicians. It flows downstream and downhill and intersects regions as political jurisdictions. It does not recognize discipline. That is what I keep saying politicians. It flows downstream and intersects regions as political jurisdictions. It does not recognize discipline. That is what I keep saying to my conservative friends.

One of the Members who has been very helpful was the chairman of the subcommittee—and I was ranking member—out of which this bill emerged, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. ISAKSON. So we can lock in the next two speakers, if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that Senator INHOFE be recognized for 8 minutes, followed by Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. I also ask unanimous consent for Senator FEINGOLD to be recognized at noon today for up to 1 hour. Then at 1 o’clock, we will have an opportunity to respond. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia. Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I reiterate my commitment to the chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, Senator BAUCUS, that we will remain united to support this bill to the end. We will be united on amendments whether we are for them or against them. This is in the best interest of the United States. I think Ruth Van Mark, Angie Ciancarlo, Letmon Lee, Jeff Rosato, Ken Kopocius, Tyler Rushforth and Jo-Ellen Darcy for their work on this bill. I particularly thank my staff member Mr. Quello.

The bill before us is an investment in infrastructure. It is not a spending bill. It ensures safe drinking water, clean drinking water, storm water management, and navigable waterways will be preserved. They will be part of America and they will be improved. To use my State as an example, I cite three things included in this bill that are important to the infrastructure of the Southeast.

First, I wish to take a minute to talk about the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. This committee has considered that legislation to authorize four projects on a biennial basis. Unfortunately, we have gone 7 years without a reauthorization. Now is without the time to make that reauthorization. I am proud of the work the committee has done.

Specifically, for the State of Georgia, there are a number of important provisions included in this legislation: a fund for the construction of conveyance systems to connect both existing and planned wastewater infrastructure and facilities for the Metro North Georgia Water Planning District. What is important about that and the disciplines.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks made by the chairman of the committee, Senator Boxer. I do agree that what we are trying to do here is to pass this bill on one. It is important that everyone understands, this bill is actually less than the House bill. This bill is less than the bill when I was chairman of the committee a year ago. But the most important part is, it offers discipline. That is what I keep saying to my conservative friends.

One of the Members who has been very helpful was the chairman of the
the flow of water into the Chattahoochee and improved its quality and used new high technology for flood and water control management. It is essential we invest in that type of infrastructure in the future for good quality water, good quality runoff, and good quality repayment.

I also wish to take a moment to talk about an historic event that took place in my State at 2 p.m. on 12 March 2007. Governor Sonny Perdue of Georgia and Governor Mark Sanford of South Carolina met on the banks of Jasper in South Carolina and announced a bistate proposal to build a joint port operation in Jasper County. It is historic because for the better part of two decades, Georgia and South Carolina have fought over the use of that land. It has been used as an environmental dump, if you will. The two States operate the Port of Charleston, the Port of Savannah, and the Port of Brunswick. All are reaching capacity. The two States met together, build a port, and operate that port jointly to ensure the future of commerce to the Southeast and, in fact, the rest of the Nation, so much so that the two States are putting up the money to pay for the construction! The Water Resources Act only authorizes the study to be made. It does not cost the taxpayers of America a dime. The taxpayers of Georgia and South Carolina are paying for it.

During the debate, there is going to be a need for the Congress to clarify language in section 4028 of the bill which will more accurately reflect that agreement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of this historic transcript as well as a copy of the transcript of Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works John Paul Woodley talking about this agreement and acknowledging it in the EPW Committee.

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

**TERM SHEET**

Whereas, Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue set forth this Term Sheet for the payment of one-half the cost of joint maritime terminals in Garden City and Savannah, and to establish a framework from which their respective state legislatures can draft and adopt a formal compact to accomplish those objectives; Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue set forth this Term Sheet.

**THE JASPER COUNTY MARITIME TERMINAL**

1. Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue will use their best efforts as the Governors of their respective states to promote the development of a maritime terminal, by the two States, to serve the Jasper County Site, to create a separate, viable maritime port facility, with specific milestones to be met, to be owned on a 50-50 basis by the two States, and the cost of the terminal facilities owned and/or operated by the two States will be shared by the two States, 50-50, such cost (and the Federal share of such cost) would not be in any way biased toward the location of the new terminal in Jasper County.

2. Independent of the pursuit of the Bi-State Compact to develop a maritime terminal on the Jasper Terminal Site (see paragraph 3 below), Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue recognize that, as a threshold matter, in order for a maritime terminal to be developed on the Jasper Terminal Site by any entity, the easements (the Easements) which exist on the Jasper Terminal Site must be removed, released, or modified.

In this regard, Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue further recognize that the Georgia DOT as the current owner of the Jasper Terminal Site is the appropriate party to initiate and pursue the release, removal or modification of the Easements, and they will use their best efforts as the Governors of their respective states to cooperate in the timely release, removal or modification of the Easements by requesting:

(a) that the Corps (see paragraph 3 below) make a formal application to the Corps for the release or removal of the Easements and that the State of South Carolina submit a letter of support to the Corps;

(b) that the Congress authorize the necessary changes, release, removal or modification (the Federal Feasibility Study) and that each state take whatever action may be required, including legislation during the 2007 legislative session, to ensure that each state has the requisite funds dedicated as soon as possible after execution of the Bi-State Compact and acquisition of the Jasper Terminal Site to be shared by the two States 50-50, such sale to close immediately after the United States Congress ratifies the Bi-State Compact, and

(c) that each state’s legislature appropriate during the 2008 legislative session, if necessary, funds dedicated for the payment of one-half of the state or local share of costs associated with acquiring replacement spoil disposal sites.

Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue acknowledge that, in the event the Bi-State Compact process fails and the Jasper Terminal Site remains reposed with the Georgia DOT and thus continues to remain the subject of the condemnation litigation pending between the State of Georgia and the Georgia DOT, and that the Georgia DOT would be equitable for the State of Georgia to recoup the cost of the State of South Carolina for funds expended by it in connection with the Bi-State Compact, the Georgia DOT would accept replacement disposal sites to compensate for the areas no longer encompassed by the Easements, and therefore Governor Perdue will use his best efforts as Governor of Georgia to have the Georgia legislature make the appropriate equitable reimbursement arrangement.

3. Independent of their immediate effort to pursue the release, removal or modification of the Easements from the Jasper Terminal Site (see paragraph 2 above), Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue will also use their best efforts as the Governors of their respective states to promote the passage of the Bi-State Compact in their respective state legislatures, on or before March 31, 2008, to:

(a) create the Bi-State Port Authority to be located on a 50-50 basis by the two States and governed by a board comprised of directors appointed in equal numbers by the two States, provided, however, that there are adequate provisions for the resolution of deadlocks and specific assurances that the Bi-State Port Authority would be completely committed to the timely development of a maritime terminal on the Jasper Terminal Site, with specific milestones to be achieved, so that the Bi-State Port Authority is not left to its own devices to pursue the protection of existing or future maritime terminal facilities owned and/or operated by the South Carolina State Ports Authority (the SPA) at the Port of Charleston and the Georgia Ports Authority (the GPA) at the Port of Savannah;

(b) authorize the Georgia DOT’s sale of the Jasper Terminal Site to the Bi-State Port Authority for its fair market value, with matters of record that prohibit the development of a maritime terminal being removed prior to such sale, with costs of such removal to be shared by the states 50-50, such sale to close immediately after the United States Congress ratifies the Bi-State Compact;

(c) appropriate funds (with each state bearing one-half of the funding) for the Bi-State Port Authority land acquisition and site-related costs related to its accomplishment of its responsibilities;

(d) direct the SCSPA to dismiss its condemnation action against the Georgia DOT and release the Georgia DOT from such claims simultaneously with the Bi-State Port Authority’s taking of actions necessary to build the new maritime terminal on the Savannah River in Jasper County and to promote access to both this new terminal and the existing and potential new or expanded terminals in Garden City and Savannah, and

(e) direct the Bi-State Authority to issue Requests for Proposal for private companies to submit proposals to participate in the development of the first phase of the Jasper Terminal Site using private capital.
THE SAVANNAH HARBOR PROJECT
document contains information about the Savannah Harbor Project, including

4. After the release, modification or removal of the easements from the Terminal Site, the Georgia DOT’s sale of its right, title and interest in and to the Jasper Terminal Site to the State Port Authority, and the required approval and ratification of the Bi-State Compact by the state legislatures and the Congress, then Governor Perdue and Governor Sanford agree to co-operate and to use their best efforts to cause the respective Georgia and South Carolina agencies and departments to bear any local sponsor or other nonfederal costs associated with the Federal Feasibility Study and the deepening of the Savannah River navigation channel as conditionally authorized in the federal 1999 Water Resources Development Act and set forth as necessary to have a final adjudication in the pending condemnation action deferred by the June 2005 Georgia court judgment until after the expiration of 180-Day Task Force Due Diligence Period, with the understanding, however, that the two litigants during such time period will engage in activities preparatory to such final adjudication; and b) enter into a six-month tolling agreement confirming that the right of either party to petition the United States Supreme Court to accept jurisdiction of the condemnation action shall not be negatively affected by this request for a delay of final adjudication. In this latter regard, it is recognized that, notwithstanding this Term Sheet, the SCSPA expressly reserves any and all arguments and positions that it would be improper for the litigation it has with the Georgia DOT to be removed to the original jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the Georgia DOT expressly reserves any and all arguments and positions that such removal would be proper.

5. Market studies conducted both by the SCSPA and the GPA indicate that a window of opportunity for the deepening of the Savannah River navigation channel exists for the following reasons:

(a) The potential that fresh groundwater supplies in the Upper Floridian Aquifer are being contaminated by salt water intrusion from the Savannah and other rivers;

(b) the impact of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulation for the Lower Savannah River recently issued by the EPA;

(c) the use of the Savannah River below the Thurmond Dam as a receptacle for treated wastewater from municipalities and industries;

(d) the need for a long-term strategy between the two states to manage the use of the Savannah River.

Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue declare that nothing in this Term Sheet shall undermine the importance of the issues being considered by the Savannah River Committees and reaffirm that these committees have and continue to be charged with the responsibility of investigating those issues, with due consideration as to how such may impact the other objectives discussed in this framework. The term of this agreement shall expire which the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina to be jointly operated.

This Term Sheet is a statement of the mutual understanding of the parties. Neither this Term Sheet nor any provision hereof constitutes a contract, legal binding obligation, contract or agreement between either of the parties. Even though this Term Sheet is not binding in any way, they will operate each with the other and with other agencies and public interest parties to cooperate and to use their best efforts to cause the respective Georgia and South Carolina agencies and departments to bear any local sponsor or other nonfederal costs associated with the Federal Feasibility Study and the deepening of the Savannah River navigation channel as conditionally authorized in the federal 1999 Water Resources Development Act and set forth as necessary to have a final adjudication in the pending condemnation action deferred by the June 2005 Georgia court judgment until after the expiration of 180-Day Task Force Due Diligence Period, with the understanding, however, that the two litigants during such time period will engage in activities preparatory to such final adjudication; and b) enter into a six-month tolling agreement confirming that the right of either party to petition the United States Supreme Court to accept jurisdiction of the condemnation action shall not be negatively affected by this request for a delay of final adjudication. In this latter regard, it is recognized that, notwithstanding this Term Sheet, the SCSPA expressly reserves any and all arguments and positions that it would be improper for the litigation it has with the Georgia DOT to be removed to the original jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the Georgia DOT expressly reserves any and all arguments and positions that such removal would be proper.

6. Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue declare that nothing in this Term Sheet shall undermine the importance of the issues being considered by the Savannah River Committees and reaffirm that these committees have and continue to be charged with the responsibility of investigating those issues, with due consideration as to how such may impact the other objectives discussed in this framework. The term of this agreement shall expire which the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina to be jointly operated.

MISCELLANEOUS

6. Governor Sanford and Governor Perdue declare that nothing in this Term Sheet shall undermine the importance of the issues being considered by the Savannah River Committees and reaffirm that these committees have and continue to be charged with the responsibility of investigating those issues, with due consideration as to how such may impact the other objectives discussed in this framework. The term of this agreement shall expire which the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina to be jointly operated.

The legislature of the two states have not formally approved the Bi-State Compact, this Term Sheet and the Bi-State Compact, if any, shall terminate automatically.

Statement of the Honorable Johnny Isakson, a United States Senator From the State of Georgia

Senator Isakson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to welcome Senator Mack Mattingly from Georgia, who is in the audience today, and Doug Marchand, who will testify later, who since 1994 has overseen the expansion of the Port of Savannah and the Port of Brunswick. I express my appreciation to the Corps of Engineers for the investment and the work they have done at both those facilities.

I particularly welcome General Strock, and tell you how much I appreciate all you have done and how much you will be missed. You have done an outstanding job.

Senator Baucus. Without objection.

Senator Isakson. Speaking of cooperation, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to tell you that the Governors of Alabama and Georgia, you would think we were having a new civil war with all my testimony here, but the Governors of Alabama and Georgia have also worked together in the last eight months to bring about a tri-State water compact in the Chattahoochee Basin. We have been in court for 12 years, and it has hurt the States of Florida, Georgia and Alabama. The Corps was to begin early this year, has not yet, and am going to encourage them to hurry up and facilitate the completion of the water control plan, which is the essential framework to formalize the tri-State water compact and make that in fact happen.

I also am looking forward to the testimony of the members of the Corps with regard to the fiscal year 2008 budget request, as to its sufficiency. I mean, I have met with the Corps, and it is probably insufficient to meet the challenges that we need. I hope they will make suggestions as to what we can do in the Senate and the House to address this.

I again want to end where I began, with my sincere appreciation to the Corps of Engineers for the investment of capital and time in the State of Georgia and our resources. Our ports of Brunswick and Savannah are two of the great facilities on the East Coast of the United States. The proposal to build a third port in the State of South Carolina is because those two ports have finite capabilities: Brunswick, Savannah and the Port of Charleston. The States have real competition from the three states of Florida, Georgia and Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to tell you that in the 21st century, and
believe that facility to be an essential part of it.

I thank the Ports Authority representatives for attending today, I thank the Corps for this project in Georgia. I look forward to hearing from the Corps with regard to the water control plan on the Chattahoochee River.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ISAKSON. In conclusion, this water resources bill represents a long overdue step forward in the investment to protect our water resources, enhance our environmental restoration, and spur development. It is an investment in the future of our drinking water, an investment in the future of our navigable waterways, and an investment in the future of our commerce. For Congress to fail today or the Senate to fail today to act on this bill responsibly and move forward will be doing a disservice to commerce, to our citizens, and we will, in fact, be abandoning our responsibility to meet the needs of the people of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to see this bill out here again as it was last year, passing the Senate, I think unanimously. I had thoughts that maybe we would never see this bill again in this new Congress, such a needed bill as it is. We have not passed a water resource development bill since 2000. Usually Congress, before that period of time, had been reauthorizing every 2 years or authorizing for the first time on a regular basis.

This bill is important to the entire country, but we each represent our respective States. So I see the necessity of this bill from how it enhances the economy of the upper Midwest, Iowa being in the upper Midwest, benefiting very directly, not only because of where we are geographically located, but we are such a breadbasket for the world as well. For Iowa, the Enhanced Navigation Capacity Improvement and Ecosystem Restoration plan for the upper Mississippi and the Illinois water systems being included in this Water Resources Development Act is vital to the economy and to the ecology of the upper Midwest and particularly to the Mississippi River, with its triple purpose of environment, recreation, and commerce.

Of course, Iowa has the Mississippi River as our eastern boundary. Iowa and the Nation rely on the river to move many of our goods, both domestically and internationally, moving goods into our State that are needed for production as well as moving finished product and raw product out of Iowa, not only agricultural products, which maybe you think about most often, but other products beyond agriculture.

For the United States as a whole, our inland waterway system plays a major role in our Nation’s economy. More than a billion tons of commerce is moved domestically through our inland waterways with a value of $300 billion. Of the $300 billion, the upper Mississippi and the Illinois River system contribute significantly. The value of that part of our inland waterway system is $12 billion per year. Approximately 60 percent of that $12 billion a year is involved with bulk agricultural exports moving from the farms to the river, down the river, both upper Mississippi and Illinois River, out into international commerce. Navigation on these rivers supports over 400,000 jobs, including 90,000 high-paying manufacturing jobs.

The United States enjoys a comparative advantage in corn production worldwide. My State of Iowa is the leading corn-producing State of the Nation. But the United States as a whole has a comparative advantage to the rest of the world. The per-ton cost for transporting corn in the United States is lower than in many other countries. That gives us a tremendous advantage beyond our productive capability. Our Nation must not allow its transportation infrastructure to continue to deteriorate. I believe one of the most important improvements, at least as it relates to the Mississippi and Illinois, is there has been deterioration of the system on the one hand and, on the other hand, it has not been expanded in the most efficient way, the enhanced tonnage that goes up and down the river today compared to decades ago when this system was first set up. Because of that, we have to be concerned not only with this deterioration and maintenance but with the expansion of it because our international competitors are making major investments in their transportation systems.

I had the good fortune, a year ago about now, to travel to Brazil with a trade delegation, to look at the transportation of agricultural products from the inland of Brazil to the ocean into world commerce. As far as some of their infrastructure is concerned, it is very inferior to ours because when traveling in rural Brazil, last year, we ran over more potholes—and I suppose in that area, like in rural Iowa, you would call them mud holes—than you can count.

But Brazil has made significant investments in its river infrastructure as compared to their surface transportation. They are realizing they have to get the stuff to the river if they are going to get it into world commerce, so they are spending a lot in resources now on surface transportation to move it from the farm to the ocean. When that happens, I am telling you, we are really going to be at an economic disadvantage with Brazil because of what they are doing on the Amazon, because Brazil already has made significant investments in its river transportation.

In the Chamber, I have a map of Brazil, and it happens that where the two arrows are depicted on the map is where we stopped—at those locations on the Amazon River. At the eastern location, you can see there is a city called Santarem. It is 400 miles in from the Atlantic Ocean, which is about the same distance from New Orleans to Memphis. They have a brand new facility—the harbor, for freight and cargo ships—not using barges, the way we do, and then taking them out to the ocean and loading from the barges onto ocean-going ships. They have ocean-going ships going all the way up the Amazone River to Santarem. They get the efficiency of loading right onto the ocean-going ships, to give them an advantage. It is a very modern loading facility.

Now, there are also new facilities for barges farther up the river—another 200 miles up the river—where they can load onto barges and move their production into the world commerce. Barges traveling that far into the mainland are going to help Brazil become very competitive with our own farmers.

Then again, let me repeat, once they figure out how to get their railroad—they do not have much of a railroad system for commerce to move bulk—some of these investments in our roads, in our Interstate 80 and the Illinois River, put us in a position so that when they get their highways in place, they are going to be a real challenge to us.

Let me say, I ought to give them more credit than I have. From the standpoint of what they can produce, they can produce with some of the inputs, like soybeans, outproducing the United States, as of a couple years ago, when, for the first time, we were no longer the world’s leading producer of soybeans. So they have that capacity to produce. Where we are more competitive at this point is getting our stuff to market. But you can see they are concentrating on that. That is why we need to concentrate on this legislation to get our dam-and-lock situation on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers in a position so we can do that.

Now, South America has more virgin land that has not been under production, and they are converting 17 million acres of virgin land into agricultural production. The long-term results of these efforts on producers in the United States, if we do not keep our transportation system on the Mississippi River and Illinois River up to date and expanded, would be to reduce farm income by $562 million a year, income to the foreign trade by $245 million, and have to lose of sensitive global environmental habitat.

Therefore, we must invest in major improvements to all of our transportation infrastructure. Currently, every mode of transportation is near or at maximum capacity. If we do not make these investments in our roads, in our rail, in our water, U.S. agriculture, U.S. industry, and the working men and women are going to pay the price. According to the Congressional Research Service, in 2005, U.S. exports of goods and services totaled $1.2 trillion, compared to $1.1 trillion in 2004 and
just a little over $1 trillion in 2003. Also, our Nation relies on many imported goods that come to the United States. Many of these goods travel by our inland waterways. It is also forecast that both our exports and imports will continue to grow in the coming years. We must be able, then, to efficiently and economically move these goods.

Nearly two-thirds of all grain and soybean exports are moved through the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. According to one study, unless the Army Corps of Engineers modernizes the lock-and-dam system on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, the cost of transporting corn would rise 12 percent.

As a result, corn and soybean exports would decline by 58 million and 10 million bushels per year respectively. The decline in corn and soybean exports would reduce farm income by $260 million from Iowa and decreased interstate corn demand would equal $316 million. So these figures highlight how important barge transportation is to farmers and to the overall U.S. economy.

In addition, there are many environmental benefits to river transportation. According to the EPA, towboats emit 35 to 60 percent fewer pollutants than locomotives or trucks. Barges operate at a cost of 2 cents per ton-mile and 40 percent the cost of trains. The EPA also notes that the lock chambers are only 600 feet long and cannot accommodate 1,100-foot barge tows. These structures require modern tow configurations to “double lock” in order to make the pass-through. This adds up to increasing delay times, increased costs to shippers, increased harm to our environment by higher emissions and higher sediment suspension in the river channels, loss of jobs, and lower wages.

By the year 2020, if we do not make the much-needed improvements in these locks, $562 million will be lost in farm income per year. This amount does not even take into account the huge cost of increased delays and congestion on our rail system and our road system from this increased usage of $1 invested in this navigation project yields $6 in national benefit. That is a pretty good return on the investment of taxpayers’ money.

We realize the authorization for the lock-and-dam improvements is just a first step in a lengthy process of improving the lock-and-dam system on the upper Mississippi, but it is an important and necessary project for our Nation. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this balanced legislation for the good of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senators Reid and McConnell for his endorsement of this important bill.

It was interesting. I say to the Senator, that just as you came to the floor, I was handed the letter from the Corn Growers saying how much they support our legislation. And we add to that the letters from the American Public Works Association, the Associated General Contractors of America, the National Waterways Conference, the American Farm Bureau Federation. We have the Carpenters Union.

We have many more of these letters in this letter organization, but it is also an undersigned group of Senators is advocating for this very important modernization.

The lock system on the upper Mississippi River was built in the late 1930s. Many of the lock chambers are only 600 feet long and cannot accommodate 1,100-foot barge tows. These structures require modern tow configuration to “double lock” in order to make the pass-through. This adds up to increasing delay times, increased costs to shippers, increased harm to our environment by higher emissions and higher sediment suspension in the river channels, loss of jobs, and lower wages.

By the year 2020, if we do not make the much-needed improvements in these locks, $562 million will be lost in farm income per year. This amount does not even take into account the huge cost of increased delays and congestion on our rail system and our road system from this increased usage of $1 invested in this navigation project yields $6 in national benefit. That is a pretty good return on the investment of taxpayers’ money.

We realize the authorization for the lock-and-dam improvements is just a first step in a lengthy process of improving the lock-and-dam system on the upper Mississippi, but it is an important and necessary project for our Nation. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this balanced legislation for the good of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a second?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let me verify, not only from the National Corn Growers Association, as you read from their letter, but I can tell you, from the town meetings I had during the Easter break and also during the February break, from the grassroots of my State, farmers, including members of the Corn Growers Association, came to my meetings and on an individual basis backed up what their national organization stands for. So I think it is very much a national consensus of an organization, but it is also an undersigned group of Senators advocating for the importance of this legislation.

I thank the Senator for inserting those letters in the RECORD.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those letters be printed in the RECORD.

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


Hon. HARRY REID, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Reid and McConnell: The National Corn Growers Association (NCGA) appreciates your time, effort and steadfast commitment to bring the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) to the Senate floor for consideration. In particular, we applaud the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and associated staff for their determination to see this long-overdue legislation completed.

We have been long-time advocates for improvements to our inland waterway system. We have sought partners with industry, labor organizations, and environmental advocates building a broad coalition of support for WRDA. Our country’s inland navigation system plays a critical role in our nation’s economy, moving more than a billion tons of domestic commerce valued at more than $300 billion. More than 1 billion bushels of grain (about 60 percent of all grain exports) move to export markets via the inland waterways each year, accounting for $8.5 billion in exports.

Furthermore, inland waterways relieve congestion on our already-overcrowded highways and railroads in our cities. One jumbo barge has the same capacity as 58 trucks or 15 rail cars. For a typical 15-barge tow on our nation’s rivers, that is equal to 870 trucks in just one barge movement. One gallon of fuel in a towboat can carry one ton of freight 2.5 times farther than rail and nine times farther than truck.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries serve as one of our nation’s major transportation corridors. Yet, the infrastructure on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers was built in the 1930’s when the total corn crop for the country was two billion bushels. In 2006, corn production eclipsed 10 billion bushels for the fourth consecutive year.

For continued success, U.S. farmers need efficient transportation. It is an investment in the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers has not kept pace with demands. The antiquated system is slowly being starved of needed modernization. In operation failures that hinder barge movement and dramatically impact corn prices. Problems along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers will continue to persist unless the Army Corps of Engineers modernizes the lock-and-dam system on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers and decreased interstate corn demand from Iowa and decreased interstate corn demand would equal $316 million. So these figures highlight how important barge transportation is to farmers and to the overall U.S. economy.

In addition, there are many environmental benefits to river transportation. According to the EPA, towboats emit 35 to 60 percent fewer pollutants than locomotives or trucks. Barges operate at a cost of 2 cents per ton-mile and 40 percent the cost of trains. The EPA also notes that the lock chambers are only 600 feet long and cannot accommodate 1,100-foot barge tows. These structures require modern tow configurations to “double lock” in order to make the pass-through. This adds up to increasing delay times, increased costs to shippers, increased harm to our environment by higher emissions and higher sediment suspension in the river channels, loss of jobs, and lower wages.

By the year 2020, if we do not make the much-needed improvements in these locks, $562 million will be lost in farm income per year. This amount does not even take into account the huge cost of increased delays and congestion on our rail system and our road system from this increased usage of $1 invested in this navigation project yields $6 in national benefit. That is a pretty good return on the investment of taxpayers’ money.

We realize the authorization for the lock-and-dam improvements is just a first step in a lengthy process of improving the lock-and-dam system on the upper Mississippi, but it is an important and necessary project for our Nation. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this balanced legislation for the good of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let me verify, not only from the National Corn Growers Association, as you read from their letter, but I can tell you, from the town meetings I had during the Easter break and also during the
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Specifically, WRDA would authorize a fifteen-year project that includes the construction of seven new locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers as well as immediate implementation of small-scale measures. This legislation would authorize a fifteen-year project that includes the construction of seven new locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers as well as immediate implementation of small-scale measures and the creation of a major ecosystem restoration program. As with our highways and infrastructure improvement projects throughout the country, Corps projects provide safe and reliable service to our nation’s well-being. The Congress needs to act now to address issues such as environmental restoration, navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, water supply, irrigation, beach nourishment and recreation.

Corn growers appreciate your support and stand ready to work with you in passing this important piece of legislation to the nation.

Sincerely,

KEN McCauley, President.


Hon. BARBARA BOXER, Chairwoman, Environment and Public Works Committee. Washington, DC.

Dear Madam Chairwoman: The American Public Works Association applauds your leadership in moving the Senate Water Resources Development Act of 2007 through committee and readying it for floor action! This legislation is vital to the ongoing evolution of coastal public works projects needed for transportation, flood control, shore protection and environmental restoration. Passage of WRDA is long overdue and the time for action is now.

Our water resources systems are integral to our nation’s well-being. With adequate dredging, our ports and waterways are the backbone of our transportation system—ensuring domestic and international trade opportunities and low-cost, environmentally sensitive goods movements. Our flood damage reduction program saves lives and prevents almost $8 in damages for each dollar spent. Corps hydropower facilities provide electricity to 24% of citizens. Shore protection projects provide safety from hurricanes and other storm events for transportation, petroleum and agriculture infrastructure around our coastal waterways and deltas. They also provide recreational benefits, returning $4 in benefits for each dollar invested. Projects for water supply, irrigation, recreation and flood control are the foundation upon which citizens can be productive and our nation’s growing congestion problem can be alleviated.

APWA’s members are uniquely positioned to consult with municipal and county government agencies, engineers and local community leaders on these issues. APWA’s 29,000 members design, build, operate and maintain transportation, water supply, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings and other structures and facilities essential to our nation’s economy and way of life. Public works professionals serve a diverse range of local communities, municipalities, counties, townships, villages and districts, whether large or small, urban or rural. As stewards of public works, APWA members are dedicated to managing and operating public works departments that provide safe and reliable service to their communities.

We urge your efforts to ensure that our water resources infrastructure, from our coastlines to our inland rivers and Great Lakes, will continue to be viable.

I urge you to vote in favor of S. 1248, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA). The enactment of a strong WRDA is of critical importance to the nation’s environmental and economic well being. For every $1 billion expended on water resources development activities, approximately 40,000 direct and indirect jobs are created. In addition, an estimated $706 billion in damages have been prevented since flood damage reduction projects—most within the past 25 years—representing a six-to-one return on investment.

Over the past five years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has voluntarily implemented new policies designed to improve analysis, accountability, regulatory compliance and environmental protection for the nation’s Civil Works program.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 will finally set the Nation back on the track of reaping substantial returns on investment. Congress must commit to infrastructure investment now to leave behind a legacy of economic security and opportunity for future generations. WRDA is a key vote for AGC members and we urge you to vote YES for final passage of S. 1248.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY A. SHOAF, Senior Executive Director. Government and Public Affairs.


Hon. BARBARA BOXER, Chairwoman, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Madam Chairwoman: It is vitally important that America’s water resources infrastructure be reliable and productive. Therefore we applaud your efforts to end the stalemate over water resources project authorization by bringing H.R. 1455, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA) to the Senate floor. We firmly believe that it is time to end the Impasse over passage of WRDA.

A Water Resources Development Act is vitally important to many important projects awaiting authorization, including the modernization of the locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Projects with a Chief of Engineers’ report have undergone years of study and analysis to determine if they are in the best interest of the Federal government. In addition, stakeholders have demonstrated their willingness to cost-share the price-tags.

Water resources projects are the very foundation upon which our citizens can be productive. In the letter sent by the National Waterways Alliance on May 3, it is equally important that policy provisions enhance the process by which the Corps of Engineers evaluates project solutions.

Sincerely,

John Stalling, President.


Hon. BARBARA BOXER, Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Boxer: The American Farm Bureau Federation urges you to support S. 1248, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), when it is considered on the Senate floor. The bill authorizes important, long overdue flood control, dam safety, storm damage reduction and environmental restoration projects across the country. It includes critical provisions to update and modernize the locks and dams on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers.

Modernizing the locks and dams on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers is essential for U.S. commerce and the agricultural sector. One medium-size tow on the rivers carry the same weight as 670 trucks. However, the structures now in use were built many decades ago and were not designed to accommodate today’s larger barges that are already in operation in order to compete in a global market. While these outdated locks and dams make our transportation system less efficient, our competitors in countries such as Brazil and China are aggressively modernizing their own infrastructure.

Farm Bureau urges you to support S. 1248 and oppose any amendment that would hinder progress on infrastructure improvements.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN, President.
Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to allocate time, and that would be for Senator MARTINEZ to immediately follow my remarks and to have the floor for up to 10 minutes; then Senator SALAZAR for 10 minutes; then Senator NELSON for 10 minutes; and at the end of their time, the time be reserved for Senator FEINGOLD for 1 hour, followed by myself at the end of that hour.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I express my thanks to Chairman BOXER and Ranking Member INHOFE for bringing this important bill to the floor, which sets a high priority for my State, and for giving it such strong support. I also note how important it is that Republicans and Democrats are working together for something that is very important for our country and significantly important for the State of Florida. This bill is something Senator NELSON and I have worked on side by side to make sure we get the job done. It is long overdue. It is time.

My State of Florida is home to beautiful beaches, coastal estuaries, and 14 deepwater ports. No piece of legislation moving through Congress will have as much lasting improvement on Florida's fragile ecosystem as this bill. After a long delay, it is my hope my colleagues will support this bill and begin the Federal partnership for restoring the Everglades.

For many in our Nation's past, the Federal Government's water resources policies seemed to be in conflict with nature. In the not so distant past, the Army Corps of Engineers and even the elected congressional and State leadership of Florida were determined to drain the Everglades.

One of our most colorful former governors, Napoleon Bonaparte Broward, famously proclaimed: "Water will run downhill!" At that time, draining and improving what was then thought to be "useless swamp" was the epitome of true conservation because opening the wetlands and marshes of Florida to farming and development was considered a better use of land because it could feed people, it could employ people, it would fuel their development, it was good for Florida.

There is also a popular story of a man who moved to south Florida to make his fortune farming the rich soils around Lake Okeechobee. He was quoted as saying, "I have bought land by the acre, I have bought land by the foot, but I have never before bought land by the bucket.

There was still a large amount of what we called "Old Florida" back then with numerous hardwood hammocks and cypress domes that were prone to flooding.

The idea that places should be protected for their intrinsic value, as a water resource, and for public enjoyment was an alien concept. Fortunately for our Nation and more importantly for Floridians, the idea of conservation and restoration has seen entirely different and more sophisticated meaning today than in the past.

In the year 2000, Congress authorized the landmark Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, otherwise known as CERP, to repair and restore the natural sheet flow of water across the park and into Florida Bay. CERP projects will capture and store a great deal of the nearly 1.7 billion gallons of fresh water a day which is currently released into the Atlantic Ocean and into estuaries in south Florida, providing abundant, clean, fresh water while also ensuring the urban and agricultural water supplies.

Even though we get more rain than anywhere else in the country, Florida is currently experiencing a severe drought. Evidence of that drought is everywhere as we speak, out-of-control wildfires because of drought, but also because what normally would be wetlands and marshes have been drained over years of development—careless development. So it is vital that we capture this fresh water so it can be used to meet our growing conservation and water use needs.

Restoring the Everglades, this incredible undertaking, is the largest environmental restoration project in the world. I am proud to say the State of Florida has done its part. When I meet with our former Governor, when he was Governor, or our current Governor, or members of our legislature, I am reminded by them: Where is the Federal partnership? We have done our part. However, no other hand, has contributed around $3 million of their commitment. WRDA will help to address this inequity by authorizing major CERP projects such as the Indian River Lagoon and the Pica-yune Strand project. This area was originally planned as the largest subdivision in the United States. It was called Golden Gate Estates. In the early 1960s, the Gulf American Corporation dredged 48 miles of canals, built 290 miles of roads, and sold thousands of lots before going bankrupt. At that time there were no Federal or State laws setting drainage standards or regulating the development of wetlands. WRDA will help the State of Florida in restoring this degraded area back to the cypress wetland it was before by removing the harmful drainage canals that have made this area prone to wildfires and invasive species such as Old World climbing fern, malleo, and Brazilian pepper. In addition, the project will restore and enhance habitat for fish and wildlife resources, including threatened or endangered species such as the Florida panther, the Florida black bear, red-cockaded woodpecker, and wood stork, as well as rare habitat such as cypress hammocks and plant species, including orchids and bromeliads.

The habitat and water discharge benefits will provide a boon for the Big Cypress and Kissimmee River Basin projects in WRDA to the 10,000 Islands National Wildlife Refuge and the Florida Panther Wildlife Refuge.

This bill also contains an important study approved by the EPW Committee to direct the Army Corps of Engineers to examine the structural integrity of the Hoover Dike. This is a critically important step in trying to ensure the structural integrity of this dike. The dike around Lake Okeechobee was constructed in response to the 1926 hurricanes which drove much water around Lake Okeechobee to overflow, killing over 2,500 people in the Belle Glade area. A study was performed in 2006 by the
Florida Water Management District, and this study found the dike’s protective capability had been severely eroded in several areas. This study will direct the Corps to examine the findings and make recommendations for the State of Florida.

The WRDA bill also means greater jobs and improved transportation for coastal communities and ports in Florida. It authorizes additional passing lanes, increased safety at Florida’s largest port, the Port of Tampa, which is where half of the State’s seaborne tonnage moves through. In addition, WRDA provides navigation improvements for the Miami Harbor, which is widely regarded as one of the world’s major cruise and shipping destinations. It will also help with beach renourishment, which will also help restore some of the critically eroded beach areas from the devastating storms of 2004 and 2005.

In conclusion, I thank Chairman Boxer, Senator INHOFE, Senator BOND, and Senator ISAKSON for including the vital restoration and economic development projects in WRDA. This legislation is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support it. I hope for the swift conclusion of this legislation so the people of Florida can begin to see the benefits that are going to come to the State of Florida.

Vice President, the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress makes the following findings:

1. The United States Institute of Peace was designated as the facilitating organization for the Iraq Study Group with the support of the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, the United States Institute of Peace was designated as the facilitating organization for the Iraq Study Group.

2. The Iraq Study Group was composed of a bipartisan group of senior individuals who had distinguished careers in public service. The Group was co-chired by former Secretary of State James A. Baker, III and former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Lee H. Hamilton, and the other members were former Secretary of State Lawrence S. Eagleburger; Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., the Senior Managing Director of Lazard, Freres and Company; former Attorney General of Georgia; former Supreme Court Associate Justice Sandra Day O’Connor; former White House Chief of Staff Leon E. Panetta; former Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen; Senator Charles S. Robb; and United States Senator Alan K. Simpson.

3. On June 15, 2006, President George W. Bush signed the Iraq Study Group Act of 2007, which provided $1,000,000 to the United States Institute of Peace for activities in support of the Iraq Study Group.

4. The Iraq Study Group consulted nearly 200 leading officials and experts, including the senior members of the Government of Iraq, the United States Government, and key coalition partners and received advice from more than 500 scholars and experts from a variety of fields who conducted working groups in the areas of economy and reconstruction, military and security, political development, and strategic environment in Iraq and the Middle East.

5. While the Iraq Study Group recommended shifting the primary mission of United States military forces in Iraq from combat to training, and while the Iraq Study Group described actions and conditions that could allow for a redeployment of troops not necessary for the transition out of Iraq by the first quarter of 2008, the Iraq Study Group did not set a fixed timetable for withdrawal and said it could support a short-term redeployment of United States combat forces, complemented by comprehensive political, economic, and diplomatic efforts, to stabilize Baghdad or to speed up the mission of training and equipping Iraqis if the United States commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective.

6. The report of the Iraq Study Group includes a letter from the co-chairs of the Iraq Study Group, James A. Baker, III and Lee H. Hamilton, which states, “Our political leadership must use this report as a basis to bring a responsible conclusion to what is now a lengthy and costly war. Our country deserves a debate that prizes substance over rhetoric, and a policy that is adequately funded and sustainable. The President and Congress must work together. Our leaders must be candid and forthright with the American people in order to win their support.”

7. The Republicans and Democrats who comprised the Iraq Study Group reached compromise and consensus and unani mously concluded that the recommendations offer a new way forward for the United States in Iraq and the region, and are comprehensive and need to be implemented in a coordinated fashion.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF IRAQ STUDY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President and Congress should agree that the way forward in Iraq is to implement the comprehensive set of recommendations of the Iraq Study Group rather than those specifically described in this Act, and the President should formulate a comprehensive plan to do so.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS IN IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, the United States Government should—

1. establish a “New Diplomatic Offensive” to deal with the problems of Iraq and of the region;

2. support the unity and territorial integrity of Iraq;

3. encourage other countries in the region to stop the destabilizing interventions and actions of Iraq’s neighbors;

4. secure the borders of Iraq, including through the use of joint patrols with neighboring countries;

5. prevent the expansion of the instability and conflict beyond the borders of Iraq;

6. promote economic assistance, commerce, trade, political support, and, if possible, military assistance for the Government of Iraq from non-neighboring Muslim nations;

7. energize the governments of other countries to maintain and provide for the remains of American soldiers in Iraq;

8. encourage the governments of other countries to validate the legitimate sovereign claims of the people of Iraq by diplomatic relations, where appropriate, and reestablishing embassies in Baghdad;

9. assist the Government of Iraq in establishing active working embassies in key capitals in the region;

10. help the Government of Iraq reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the future of Kirkuk;

11. assist the Government of Iraq in achieving certain security, political, and economic milestones, including better performance on issues such as national reconciliation, equitable distribution of oil revenues, and the dismantling of militias;

12. encourage the holding of a meeting or conference in Baghdad, supported by the United States and the UN, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and the Arab League, both to assist the Government of Iraq in promoting national reconciliation, and to reestablish their diplomatic presence in Iraq;

13. seek the creation of the Iraq International Support Group to assist Iraq in achieving the milestones described in Section 11, and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region informed of progress in these areas;

14. make clear the willingness of the United States Government to continue training, assistance, and support for Iraq’s security forces, and to continue political, military, and economic support for the Government of Iraq until Iraq becomes more capable of governing, defending, and sustaining itself;

15. make clear that, should the Government of Iraq not make substantial progress toward the achievement of the milestones described in Section 11 and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region well informed of progress in these areas;

16. remain in contact with the Iraqi leadership, conveying the clear message that there must be action by the Government of Iraq to make substantial progress toward the achievement of the milestones described in Section 11, and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region well informed of progress in these areas;

17. make clear the willingness of the United States Government to continue training, assistance, and support for Iraq’s security forces, and to continue political, military, and economic support for the Government of Iraq until Iraq becomes more capable of governing, defending, and sustaining itself;

18. make clear that, should the Government of Iraq not make substantial progress toward the achievement of the milestones described in Section 11, and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region well informed of progress in these areas;

19. make clear that, should the Government of Iraq not make substantial progress toward the achievement of the milestones described in Section 11, and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region well informed of progress in these areas;

20. make clear that, should the Government of Iraq not make substantial progress toward the achievement of the milestones described in Section 11, and in convening in as much detail as possible the substance of these exchanges in order to keep the American people, the Iraqi people, and the people of the region well informed of progress in these areas;
(19) make clear that the United States Government does not seek to establish permanent military bases in Iraq;

(20) restate that the United States Government seeks to control the oil resources of Iraq;

(21) make active efforts to engage all parties in Iraq, with the exception of al Qaeda; and

(22) encourage dialogue between sectarian communities and press religious leaders inside and outside of Iraq to speak out on behalf of peace and reconciliation;

(23) encourage the presence of neutral international experts as advisors to the Government of Iraq on the processes of disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of militias and other armed groups not under the control of the Government of Iraq; and

(24) ensure that reconstruction efforts in Iraq consist of great involvement by and with international partners that actively participate in the design and construction of projects.

SEC. 5. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON SECURITY AND MILITARY FORCES.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement with the Government of Iraq a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) gives the highest priority to the training, equiping, advising, and support for security forces in Iraq to protect counterterrorism operations in Iraq; and

(2) supports the providing of more and better equipment for the Iraqi Army by encouraging the Government of Iraq to accelerate its efforts under the Foreign Military Sales program and, as United States combat brigades redeploy from the Iraq, provides for the transfer of certain United States military equipment to Iraqi forces.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON STRENGTHENING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) directs the Secretary of Defense to build healthy relations between the civilian and military sectors, by creating an environment where senior military leaders feel free to offer independent advice to the civilian leadership of the United States Government;

(2) encourages the Department of Defense to give sole authority to the Ministry of the Interior to pay police salaries and disburse financial support to local police;

(3) proceeds with efforts to identify, register, and control the Facilities Protection Service;

(4) provides for funds from the Government of Iraq to expand and upgrade communications equipment and motor vehicles for the Iraqi Police Service;

(5) directs the Attorney General to lead the work of organizational transformation in the Ministry of the Interior and creates a strategic plan and standard administrative procedures, contracts, and operational measures for Iraq; and

(6) directs the Department of Justice to proceed with the mission of training the police forces remaining under the Ministry of the Interior;

(7) provides for the transfer of the Department of Defense to continue its mission to train Iraqi National Police and the Iraqi Border Police, which shall be placed within the Iraqi Ministry of Defense;

(8) establishes greater responsibility for the Iraqi Police Service; and

(9) proceeds with efforts to identify, register, and control the Facilities Protection Service.

SEC. 7. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON POLICE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN IRAQ.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement with the Government of Iraq a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) transfers the Iraqi National Police to the Ministry of Defense, where the police commando units will become part of the new Iraqi Army;

(2) transfers the Iraqi Border Police to the Ministry of Defense, which would have total responsibility for border control and external security;

(3) establishes greater responsibility for the Iraqi Police Service to conduct criminal investigations and operations, including with other elements in the judicial system in Iraq in order to better control crime and protect Iraqi civilians;

(4) establishes the process of organizational transformation, including efforts to expand the capability and reach of the current major crime unit, to exert more authority over the activities of local law enforcement agencies to the Ministry of the Interior to pay police salaries and disburse financial support to local police;

(5) proceeds with efforts to identify, register, and control the Facilities Protection Service;

(6) directs the Department of Defense to continue its mission to train Iraqi National Police and the Iraqi Border Police, which shall be placed within the Iraqi Ministry of Defense;

(7) directs the Department of Justice to proceed with the mission of training the police forces remaining under the Ministry of the Interior;

(8) provides for funds from the Government of Iraq to expand and upgrade communications equipment and motor vehicles for the Iraqi Police Service;

(9) directs the Attorney General to lead the work of organizational transformation in the Ministry of the Interior and creates a strategic plan and standard administrative procedures, contracts, and operational measures for Iraq; and

(10) directs the Attorney General to establish courts, train judges, prosecutors, and investigators, and create strongly supported and funded institutions and practices in Iraq to fight corruption.

SEC. 8. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON OIL SECTOR IN IRAQ.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement with the Government of Iraq a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) provides technical assistance in drafting legislation to implement the February 27, 2007, White House Memorandum for the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury on principles for the equitable sharing of oil resources and revenues;

(2) encourages the Government of Iraq to accelerate the use of the comprehensive oil well work-overs in the southern fields needed to increase oil production, while ensuring that the United States no longer funds such infrastructure projects;

(3) supports the Iraqi military and private security forces in their efforts to protect oil infrastructure and contractors;

(4) implements contracts at both ends of the oil supply line to immediately improve accountability in the oil sector;

(5) in conjunction with the International Monetary Fund, encourages the Government of Iraq to reduce subsidies in the energy sector;

(6) encourages investment in Iraq’s oil sector by the international community and by international energy companies;

(7) assists Iraqi leaders to reorganize the national oil industry as a commercial enterprise for increased efficiency, transparency, and accountability;

(8) encourages the Government of Iraq to post all oil contracts, volumes, and prices on the Internet; and

(9) supports the efforts of the World Bank to ensure that best practices are used in contracting; and

(10) provides technical assistance to the Ministry of Oil for all aspects of assistance, improving the payments process, managing cash flows, improving contracting and auditing, and updating professional training programs for management and technical personnel.

SEC. 9. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON IMPROVING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN IRAQ.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) establishes a new Senior Advisor for Economic Reconstruction in Iraq reporting to the President, with the authority to bring interagency unity of effort to the policy, budget, and implementation of economic reconstruction programs in Iraq and the authority to serve as the principal point of contact with United States partners in the overall reconstruction effort; and

(2) gives the chief of mission in Iraq the authority to spend significant funds through a program structured along the lines of the Comprehensive Stabilization and Reconstruction Program, with the authority to rescind funding from programs and projects,

(A) in which the Government of Iraq is not demonstrating effective governance or

(B) that do not demonstrate substantial progress toward achievement of the milestones described in section 11;

(3) establishes processes for the comprehensive and credible audit of contracts, expenditures, and programs that involve United States assistance with assistance from international donors and Iraqi participants for the purpose of carrying out joint assistance projects.

SEC. 10. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON BUDGET PREPARATION, PRESENTATION, AND REVIEW.

It shall be the policy of the United States to formulate and implement a plan, consistent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that—

(1) provides the President to include the costs for the war in Iraq in the annual budget request;

(2) directs the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of National Intelligence to provide United States military and civilian personnel in Iraq the highest possible priority in obtaining professional language proficiency and cultural training;

(3) directs the United States Government to provide for long-term training for Federal agencies that participate in complex stability operations like those in Iraq and Afghanistan;

(4) creates training for United States Government personnel to carry out civil affairs tasks associated with complex stability operations; and

(5) directs the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense to devote greater analytic resources to understanding the threats and sources of violence in Iraq and institute immediate changes in the collection of data and violence and the sources of violence to provide a more accurate picture of events on the ground in Iraq.

SEC. 11. CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUED UNITED STATES MILITARY PRESENCE IN IRAQ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the policy of the United States to condition continued...
United States political, military and economic support for Iraq upon the demonstration by the Government of Iraq of sufficient political will and the making of substantial progress toward achieving the milestones described in subsection (b), and to base the decision to transfer command and control over Iraqis' national security forces units from the United States to the Iraqi Government upon the following:

(b) MILESTONES.—The milestones referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

1. Promptly establishing a fair process for the prosecution of Saddam Hussein regime Baathists who were not leading figures of the regime or political affiliation, including ex-Baathists who were not leading figures of the Saddam Hussein regime.
2. Enacting legislation or establishing other binding mechanisms to ensure the rights of qualified professionals, irrespective of ethnic or political affiliation, including ex-Baathists who are not leading figures of the Saddam Hussein regime.
3. Establishing and implementing new mechanisms to ensure the sharing of all Iraqi oil revenues among all segments of Iraqi society in an equitable manner.
4. Enacting free and fair provincial elections in Iraq at the earliest date practicable.
5. Enacting legislation or establishing other mechanisms to ensure the rights of women and the protection of all minority communities in Iraq are protected.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that—

1. with the implementation of the policies specified in sections 5 through 11 and the enacting the increased diplomatic efforts specified in section 4, and as additional Iraqi brigades are being deployed, and subject to unexpected developments in the security situation in Iraq, all United States combat battalions not necessary for force protection could be redeployed from Iraq by the first quarter of 2008, except those that are essential for—

   (A) protecting United States and coalition personnel and infrastructure;
   (B) training, equipping, and advising Iraqi forces;
   (C) conducting targeted counterterrorism operations;
   (D) search and rescue; and
   (E) rapid reaction and special operations;

2. the redeployment should be implemented as part of a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq.

SEC. 13. REPORT ON POLICY IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the actions that have been taken to implement the policies specified in sections 4 through 11.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, back in December when the Iraq Study Group put out their report, the recommendations, the recommendations were heralded by many people around the country as a new way forward—a new way forward for us to deal with this very difficult and impractical problem in which we find ourselves in Iraq. The recommendations that we have been asked to implement and some of which have not—I believe still create the centerpiece for how we can find a bipartisan way forward for how we deal with the Iraq issue.

I have walked around with the report of the Iraq Study Group for the last 4 months. I am very much appreciative of the fact that the people who put together the report of the best statesmen and women we have in the United States of America: James A. Baker, Lee Hamilton, Lawrence Eagleburger, Vernon Jordan, Ed Meese, Sandra Day O'Conner, Leon Panetta, William Perry, Charles Robb, and Alan Simpson. They are some of the best and brightest people we have in America and who are working on one of the most difficult issues that confronts our country today. So it is in the vein of their work that I come to the floor today with my colleague from Tennessee to suggest that their recommendations create the opportunity for us to provide the basis for some agreement among Democrats and Republicans on how we might move forward. We are faced with a very difficult national security issue we face in Iraq. As we debate this issue here in Washington, with veto pens and dueling press conferences, I come back to the reality of our brave American men and women and the Iraqis who face every day in the streets of Baghdad and al Anbar Province and in countless other places in that Nation which today we find in turmoil. It is for them, for our men and women in uniform, that we must find common ground. It is for them we must bridge our differences here on the Senate floor to create a path to success in Iraq. It is for them we must develop a policy that is worthy of their sacrifices and the sacrifices of their families.

I come to the floor today with my colleague from Tennessee to offer my view on how we can reach our common goal and how we can work to heal the deep divisions this war has caused here at home.

Not since the Vietnam war has the American public been so divided. I am concerned that the bitterness and the harshness of this debate is a debate that clouds good judgment on one of the most fundamental issues we deal with in the Congress: the issue of war and peace. It is important for us to remember that no matter how contentious this debate may become, every Senator shares the same goal, and that goal is to protect the Middle East and a safe return home of our troops. While we may disagree on the best path to that end, we must continue to work together for a constructive change in our policy.

It is important to remember what binds us together as a nation is something we must honor so we will not be torn so far apart that we cannot bring our Nation back together. The Iraq Study Group report, I believe, embodies the best wisdom we have seen as to how we can work forward with the issue of Iraq. I believe the work of the Iraq Study Group is a model for how we can come together in good faith. The group, as I have said before, is comprised of some of the finest and best public servants we have in America. They worked together for months and they did it in a nonpartisan, nonpolitical way. They are from both parties. That group and their work concluded over 250 meetings, including senior leaders of the Government of Iraq, the United States Government, and key coalition partners. They received advice from more than 50 distinguished scholars and experts in a variety of fields.

I am honored, therefore, to join Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER in appealing to our colleagues in the Senate to take a fresh look at the group's report and to consider how we can use it as our guide to create a successful policy for the war in Iraq.

The group proposed a new diplomatic offensive—a new diplomatic offensive—to deal with the problems of Iraq and the region. It is pleased that recently the administration has moved forward in embracing some of the recommendations set forth in that "new diplomatic offensive."

The report provided a roadmap for training and equipping our troops from a combat role to the training, equipping, and support of the Iraqi military.

The Iraq Study Group recommended how we can strengthen and restore our own military, which has been put under such strain by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In addition, the report details new policies for the Iraqi police and criminal justice system, the Iraqi oil sector, and for improving economic and security assistance programs in Iraq.

Finally, the Iraq Study Group recommended specific milestones for the Government of Iraq to meet. They include establishing a fair process for the conviction and release of prisoners, ensuring the establishment of a comprehensive plan to do so. It would require the establishment of policies and plans that implement...
the core recommendations of the group. And it states that the United States should condition political, military, and economic support on the Iraqi Government making substantial progress in meeting those milestones established in the Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group report.

The Iraq Study Group did not set a deadline for the redeployment of our troops, and neither would our bill. But the group did, and our bill would, state the policies and actions that can and should lead to the successful and rapid conclusion to the war.

I believe we all share that goal. I believe the distinguished members of the Iraq Study Group have given us the means to achieve it. I don’t believe the report of the Iraq Study Group should simply become another study on the shelf that gathers dust.

I will conclude with two remarks.

First, here in Washington, DC, it seems there is a lot of poison in the air, and most is fed on a partisan basis. It is my view, as a Senator from Colorado, that the issues of war and peace, when we have our men and women in uniform in harm’s way, should not be decided on the basis of Republicans versus Democrats. No matter what has happened in Iraq up to this time, and no matter what kind of finger-pointing will take place in terms of the wisdom or lack of wisdom on how the war has been prosecuted, the fact is, we are there now. Also, we have 140,000 men and women in harm’s way.

For us in the Senate, I believe it is our responsibility to come together, as Democrats and Republicans, to fashion a new way forward to success. I believe this new way forward to success has been laid out by the Iraq Study Group, which didn’t just look at this for an hour or a day or two but spent a year, working on milestones for improving our support and training of our troops, including as a goal a drawdown of the number of troops in Baghdad.

I am hopeful both Democrats and Republicans will join Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER and myself as we move forward with the introduction of this legislation, which we hope to do after the Memorial Day recess.

Finally, I think the working relationship Senator ALEXANDER and I have on so many issues, including land and water conservation and other areas, is the kind of bipartisan spirit we can bring to so many other issues that face us today. Of all the issues, the one that cries out the most for unity today is the 800-pound gorilla issue of the war in Iraq.

I am very pleased and honored that Senator ALEXANDER has joined us in this effort today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I salute the Senator from Colorado for his leadership, initiative, and patriotism, and the way he is approaching the foremost issue facing our country: Where do we go from here in Iraq?

There is too much partisan game playing on the issue of Iraq. We owe it to our country and our troops to find a bipartisan consensus to support where the rest of the world is heading, and to find a political solution in Washington, DC, as much as we need one in Baghdad. We need to get out of the combat business in Iraq and into the support, training, and equipment business as soon as we honorably can.

That is why Senator SALAZAR and I have drafted legislation to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group.

As the Senator said, we will introduce our legislation after Congress and the President have worked out the Iraq supplemental appropriations bill. We invite our colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—to join us. We believe the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group offer the best opportunity for a bipartisan consensus on a new course in Iraq.

In fact, these recommendations seem to already be guiding the President’s efforts and the efforts of those on the other side of the aisle to get us to a political conclusion to this war.

For example, the administration has begun to act on these recommendations by increasing the number of troops embedded with Iraqi forces, using milestones to help chart progress, and by meeting with Iraq’s neighbors, including Iran and Syria. The President’s national security adviser has pointed to the Baker-Hamilton report as authority for the surge in Baghdad.

Just last week, the President himself told the Associated General Contractors of America at their convention that he liked what Baker and Hamilton had to say. “It is something we should seriously consider. Their idea was that, at some point in time, it makes sense to have a U.S. presence configured this way,” the President said. “It is an interesting idea.”

At the same time, Democratic proposals in Congress have also been guided by the Baker-Hamilton report, for example, working on milestones for improvement in Iraq, limiting the role of the United States to one of training, equipping, and counterterrorism operations, and stating as a goal a drawdown of combat forces by March of next year.

In short, the seeds of bipartisan consensus about how the United States should go forward in Iraq are best found in the Iraq Study Group report.

Former Secretary of State Jim Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton prefaced their report by saying this:

Success depends on the unity of the American people in a time of political polarization. Americans can and must enjoy the right of robust debate in a democracy. Yet, U.S. foreign policy is doomed to failure—as is any course of action in Iraq—if not supported by a broad, sustained consensus. The aim of our legislation is to move our country toward such a consensus.

Yesterday and today, I talked with Secretary Baker and Congressman Hamilton. Each said the Salazar-Alexander legislation accurately reflects the recommendations of their report.

I have learned that sometimes a Senator has to say something two or three or more times on the Senate floor before anybody pays any attention.

For example, on March 14, I said that it was time for the President to take the Iraq Study Group report down off the shelf and use it for something other than a bookend.

They are all in this book. They didn’t shy away from the unpleasant facts.

They told us 79 percent of Iraqis have a mostly negative view of U.S. involvement in their country. Then they said 2,900 American lives were lost, and another 21,000 wounded; $400 billion was spent, with estimates as high as $2 trillion for the final cost. They said this is not a perfect option, but it is the best option.

The President could have invited the distinguished members of the Iraq Study Group to sit in the gallery during his speech, and, as Presidents often do, introduced them, 10 of America’s most distinguished citizens from the Reagan, Carter, and George H.W. Bush administrations, and the U.S. Supreme Court. One of these is now the Secretary of Defense. They are ideologically and politically diverse. They spent nine months, met nine times, went to Baghdad, interviewed 171 individuals, and made 79 recommendations, which are all in this book. They didn’t shy away from the unpleasant facts.

They told us 97 percent of Iraqis have a mostly negative view of U.S. involvement in their country. Then they said 2,900 American lives were lost, and another 21,000 wounded; $400 billion was spent, with estimates as high as $2 trillion for the final cost. They said this is not a perfect option, but it is the best option.

The President could have said in January: This isn’t my recommendation, it is theirs, and I accept it for the good of our country, and I ask the American people to accept it.

That is not Presidential weakness, that is Presidential leadership. The President’s job is not only to see urgent issues and lay out a strategy. It is the rest of his job—at least for a sustained military strategy— to persuade half of the people he is right. It is not too late.

The President has the option before him today, and we are trying to make it easier for him. What we are respectfully saying in our legislation is, if the President should choose to develop a
way forward based upon the Iraq Study Group’s recommendations, we will support that plan and we will encourage our colleagues and our country to do so on a bipartisan basis, so that Iraq, the Middle East, our troops, and the world will know that in our country we are united in our purpose.

Such a plan will not satisfy everyone. It will not pull out our troops tomorrow. It will not get us out of the combat business immediately. It won’t add 33,000 or 35,000 troops for “victory” in Iraq. It will get us out of the combat business in Iraq and into the support, training, and equipping business, in a prompt and honorable way. It will reduce the number of forces in Iraq. Because there will still be a significant but limited military presence in Iraq, it will signal to the rest of the Middle East to stay out of Iraq. It will give support to General Petraeus and his troops, who are in the midst of a surge. It will expand diplomatic capacity and build support for Iraq’s national reconciliation and sovereignty. It will recognize, as Prime Minister Blair said, it is time for the next chapter of Iraq’s history to be written largely by the Iraqis themselves.

As a Republican Senator, my message with respect to the President is that I hope he and the White House seriously consider this. We are not proposing this bill today. It will be introduced in 2 or 3 weeks. Then, we hope other Senators will support it. I hope the President will embrace it. There is plenty within this report that gives him the opportunity to continue our mission in Iraq. The difference is that this is not the President’s report, and that is its advantage. It has a better chance of success, in terms of developing bipartisan support here and in our country.

Finally, there are some issues that are still up for one party to solve. Iraq is, as the Senator from Colorado has said, the foremost among these.

Here we are, the oldest democracy, lecturing Baghdad, an infant democracy, for not coming up with a political solution, when we ourselves cannot come up with one.

Until we do come up with one, we should spend less time lecturing Baghdad and more time working together to fashion a way forward on the foremost issue facing our country. Coming together in support of the plan based upon the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group offers that best opportunity. We invite our colleagues to join us.

EXHIBIT 1

PRESIDENT BUSH SHOULD TAKE THE IRAQ STUDY GROUP REPORT DOWN OFF THE SHELF

My purpose today is to say that it is time for President Bush to take the Iraq Study Group report down off the shelf and use it for something other than a bookend.

There is a reason why we don’t have 355 commanding generals each saying charge down this street or over that hill. The founders of our country made the President Commander-in-Chief and gave to Congress the power to declare war and to pay for it.

That is why I will vote against any of the resolutions that seek to micromanage this war. Once a war is authorized, as this one was by a bi-partisan vote of 77–23 in 2002, it is the President’s job to participate in unexpected facts—that 79 percent of Iraqis have a mostly negative view of the influence that the United States has in their country, that 2,900 died in Iraq at the time, and another 21,000 wounded, that we have spent roughly $400 billion on the Iraq war and that estimates run as high as $2 trillion for the final cost. The President pledged that its recommendations were not perfect options but seemed to be the best options.

As much as America needs a new strategy in Iraq, we also need a consensus in support of that strategy. To put it bluntly, a majority of the American people do not now have confidence in the President’s course in Iraq. The Iraq Study Group offered the President an opportunity to say, “Okay, here is a different approach suggested by a bipartisan group of distinguished Americans. It is not perfect, but it is the best for the good of our country and the armed forces fighting for us. I ask you to accept it.”

Such a statement would not exhibit presidential weakness. This would be presidential leadership—recognizing that the President’s job is not only to choose the right strategy but to successfully persuade at least half the people he is right.

The President still has this option before him.

We would be wise to exercise it today—this week. Come back to Congress. Report on the last few weeks’ progress in Iraq. Invite the Iraq Study Group members to sit in the gallery. Compliment them on their recommendations. Ask the Congress and the country also to accept their recommendations.

This course will not satisfy those who want 100,000 more troops for victory in Iraq. Neither will it satisfy those who want all troops out on a specific timetable. But it will get U.S. troops quickly out of the combat business in Iraq, and into the support business. It will reduce the number of American forces in Iraq over the next year. It will leave American special forces in Iraq to go after al Qaeda and troops to help guard the borders.

Because there will still be a limited U.S. military presence, it will send a signal to the rest of the Middle East to stay out of Iraq. It will give support to General Petraeus and his troops who are in the midst of a surge to make Baghdad safer.

It will expand diplomatic efforts to build support for Iraqi national and sovereignty, including with Iraq’s neighbors.

And it will begin to recognize that America has done most of what it can do to help Iraq. As Prime Minister Blair said, it is time for the next chapters in Iraq’s history to be written by the Iraqis themselves.

Finally, this course will recognize that while the United States can and should be a shining example of democracy and does have the mightiest military force in the world, that a conservative view of human nature and our own national interests accept limits on what we can do to make it possible for others to adopt our democracy and our way of life.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as we all know, time has been reserved for Senator Feingold for up to an hour. He
saying he is going to take less time, but he has that time, at which time I will respond to him. What I wish to do is lock in some time for Senator Pryor immediately following my remarks so he may speak on the issue of Iraq.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for less than 1 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. I have no objection to that request.

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

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his eloquence in his statement and his plea for Americans to come together as we move forward on the biggest issue that faces our country today, Iraq.

I appreciate the hard work he has put in, together with my staff and working with the Iraq Study Group, to come up with language that is included in the legislation.

I also thank the chairperson of the Environment and Public Committee, Senator BOXER, for arranging for us to spend the time this morning discussing our bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Water Resources Development Act being considered today includes important language to reform the Corps of Engineers which I have long championed. I especially thank my colleague Senator BOXER in particular, but also Senator INHOFE, Senator Baucus, and Senator ISAаксon for reporting a Water Resources Development Act that includes many important Corps of Engineers reforms that were so hard fought in last year’s Congress, both in negotiations and on the floor.

While we still have far to go in improving Corps planning, such as, for example, passing the Feingold-McCain prioritization amendment, reform provisions in the underlying bill are absolutely essential for improving the Nation’s water resources planning, and they should be the baseline for reforms that come out of Congress.

These reform provisions include independent peer review of costly or controversial Corps projects, dramatic improvement to the Corps’ mitigation process, modernizing the Corps’ woeefully out-of-date planning guidelines, establishing a new national policy that directs the Corps to avoid impacts to floodplains, requiring an interagency assessment of the Nation’s vulnerability to flood and related storm damage, and recommendations to improve the Nation’s various flood prevention programs.

These reforms are essential for improving the Corps’ ability to properly plan and construct projects. Over the past decade, dozens of studies have highlighted stunning flaws in Corps project planning. Problems with the Corps project planning are so great that the GAO recently told Congress that Corps projects “did not provide a reasonable basis for decisionmaking because they were fraught with errors, mistakes, and miscalculations, and made invalid assumptions and outdated data.”

We can no longer afford to build projects based on flawed engineering, flawed science, or flawed economics. These reforms are essential for preventing costly and deadly mistakes, such as the levee failures that occurred in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

The Corps, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the National Academy of Sciences have all said faulty design and construction by the Corps resulted in the levee failures. So these reforms are essential for protecting the Nation’s natural resources.

The Nation’s rivers, streams, floodplains and wetlands provide vital services for all Americans. They help attenuate floods, they improve water quality, they provide vital fish and wildlife habitat, and they provide exceptional recreational opportunities.

These reforms are essential for improving the Corps planning, such as, for example, better safety, health, and economic well-being of all of us.

I am very pleased Senators BOXER and RIEFD agreed to join me in a colloquy with respect to the provisions in section 903(c) and (e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. We have reached an understanding that these are fundamental elements of meaningful reform. Chairman BOXER has stated it is the committee’s intent to retain these elements, and that she will strenuously support them in conference.

I understand the Senate is now debating the motion to proceed to H.R. 1455, the Water Resources Development Act. Senate Majority Leader MCCAIN and I cannot formally offer my prioritization amendment to that bill, I wish to take the time to speak in favor of it.

I will be offering this amendment to the Water Resources Development Act on behalf of myself and Senators MCCAIN, COBURN, CARPER, GREGG, and SUNUNU. Senator MCCAIN and I have worked together for years to modernize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and I am pleased to be working with him again on this issue.

I also appreciate the strong support of Senators COBURN, CARPER, GREGG, and SUNUNU. This important amendment recognizes we must address our current flawed planning process and also respond to the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina by working to make sure that limited taxpayers’ dollars go to the most worthy water resource projects.

That doesn’t seem like a lot to ask. As we all know, Congress is staring down deficits that only a few years ago were unimaginable. We also have a backlog of $58 billion in Corps projects that are authorized but not built, and that number will be closer to $70 billion when this bill passes.

Clearly, we have to get some kind of a way of identifying projects that are most needed. Right now, Congress does not have any information about the relative priority of the most massive backlog of authorized projects, and we don’t have any way of evaluating the relative priority of new projects. What we do have is individual Members arguing for projects in their States or districts, but no information on which projects are most important to the country’s economic development or transportation systems or to our ability to protect our citizens and property from natural disasters. Clearly, the status quo is not serving the public well.

This amendment would simply help Congress develop the tools to more wisely invest limited resources while also increasing public transparency in decisionmaking. This amendment would ensure that by creating a bipartisan water resources commission to do two things: one, make recommendations on a process for prioritizing Corps projects and, two, analyze projects authorized in the last 20 years that are not being constructed and put similar types of projects into tiers that reflect their importance.

This would be done with a clear direction to seek balance, meeting the needs of all States. This amendment would place Corps projects into three categories that correspond to the three main mission areas of the Corps: flood damage reduction, navigation, and ecosystem restoration. The commission will establish broad national priorities to apply to those projects. The amendment sets out minimum requirements that projects in each category have to meet so that, for example, flood reduction projects must be evaluated in part on their reduction of risk of loss of life. But the commission is free to consider other factors as long as it is clear which factors it is, in fact, considering.

Projects in each of the three project types will be placed in tiers based on how great a priority they represent.

This information will then simply be provided to Congress and the public in a nonbinding report—a nonbinding report. That is it. The Congress and the public will get information to help them make decisions involving millions and even billions of dollars. Surely, that isn't too much to ask. Don’t we want the benefit of objective, impartial advice when we decide how to allocate scarce taxpayers’ dollars?

As my colleagues may recall, Senator MCCAIN and I offered a prioritization amendment last Congress. This year’s amendment has been revised to address some of the concerns raised on the floor last year, in particular those raised by my friend and now-Chairman BOXER.

In response to criticism that the amendment gave too much authority to the administration, this year’s new
amendment creates a temporary com-
mission comprised of eight non-Federal
individuals appointed by Senate and
House leaders of both parties and the
President.

Also, instead of requiring regular up-
dating of a prioritization report, the bi-
ennial report that was mandated by this
year’s new amendment would only issue
one nonbinding report that would in-
clude recommendations for reevalu-
ating priorities in the future and when
new projects are authorized.

I also pleased to have the support of a
number of outside groups, including
Taxpayers for Common Sense Action,
the National Taxpayers Union, the
Citizens Against Government Waste,
American Rivers, National Wildlife
Federation, Earth Justice, Clean Water
Action, Defenders of Wildlife, Environ-
mental Defense, Friends of the Earth,
the League of Conservation Voters, Re-
publicans for Environmental Protec-
tion, the Sierra Club, and the Union of
Concerned Scientists.

A number of editorial writers weighed
in last year on behalf of prioritization.
Here is what the New
York Times had to say:

The Army Corps of Engineers must learn,
or be compelled, to place a higher priority on
safety projects than on Congressional pork...it
would shine more light on an often opaque
process, a reform we support.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune said:

The best chance for changing the way the
Corps operates is through reforms sought by
They’re offering two amendments to the
water resources bill. One would establish
independent review of corps projects from
planning and design to construction. The
other would require corps projects to be
ranked in importance based on three na-
tional priorities: flood and storm damage re-
duction, navigation and environmental res-
toration.

The Philadelphia Inquirer opined that
“with 50 States demanding serv-
ices, the Corps needs better direction
than the whims of competing politi-
cians.”

And the Washington Post said:

Hurricane Katrina was a crisis that has
created a real opportunity: to bring some ra-
tionality to the way we spend tens of billion
of dollars on water projects in this country so
we can protect millions of Americans—

Millions of Americans—
whose lives are at risk.

Clearly, based on that mere series of
endorsements and statements, this
amendment has broad interest and im-
pact. The public clearly believes the
Congress should do a better job spending
billions of dollars on water projects. The
Feingold-McCain-Coburn-Carper-
Gregg-Sununu prioritization amendment
would help Congress in evaluating options for how to prioritize
Corps projects.

I also wish to remind my colleagues that modernizing all aspects of water
resources policy will help restore credi-
bility to a Federal agency that is
plagued by public skepticism in the
wake of Hurricane Katrina. The Corps
has admitted serious design flaws in
the levees it built in New Orleans, and
it is clear the Corps’ mistakes contrib-
uted significantly to the devastation in
that city.

I can tell my colleagues when I was
down in New Orleans, I heard even more complaints about the
Corps than I did about FEMA. As we
worked as a body to improve FEMA, we
must also work to improve the Corps.
Our constituents and the people of this
country deserve no less.

Of course, this does important work. The real problem this amend-
ment seeks to address is us in Con-
gress. Congress has too long used the
Army Corps of Engineers to facilitate
favored pork barrel projects while peri-
odically expressing a desire to change
its ways. If we want to change our
ways, we can start by passing the Fein-
gold-McCain-Coburn-Carper-Gregg-
Sununu prioritization amendment to
help us make sure the Corps continues
to do what is right for the environment,
and economy without wasting taxpayers’ dollars.

I will conclude my initial remarks
and again thank Senator BOXER and
also Senator INHOFE, Senator Baucus,
and Senator JORDAN for retaining the
reform provisions we worked so hard to
get included in last year’s Senate bill.
However, this bill authorizes an addi-
tional $15 billion worth of projects
which, coupled with an additional
backlog of $36 billion, would take 40
additional years to complete. I hope by adopting
this amendment we can also move this
bill in a direction that will truly ben-
efit the American taxpayers. I urge my
colleagues to support our amendment.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro temp-
ere, The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank
Senator FEINGOLD for his kind re-
marks. He and I are close colleagues.
We have worked very closely together
on so many issues. On Corps reform, we
worked closely together, and working
together we did get very important
peer review into the bill. I am very
proud of his work on this bill and
praise him for it.

It is very rare we find ourselves on
differing sides, but I am in strong oppo-
sition to his amendment, and I want to
lay out the reasons.

I describe the Senator’s amendment
as “we have met the enemy and it is
us.” I reject the fact that Members of
the Senate have to give us their judg-
ment and their views on what is impor-
tant in our own States to some politi-
cially appointed panel, probably politi-
cians, because they will be appointed
by politicians. I have other objections
to this amendment because I think it
creates a bias toward large projects. It
reduces the ability of the Corps to pur-
sue small ecosystem restoration pro-
grams. It reduces their ability to pur-
sue projects for the protection of fish-
ermen. Because, as it is drafted, it sets
up a tier system of priority rec-
ommendations, but each tier is limited
to 5 billion dollars’ worth of projects,
or 100 total projects. That means a
worthy food control project in my State,
or any State, could end up stuck in
the lowest tier. It is, if equally more impor-
tant projects in other States were
ranked in a higher tier. I think it is an
arbitrary system that can label a
project second tier despite critical
local public safety needs.

How does a project become second
tier if it is the only way to protect a
community? Such an arbitrary label
will inappropriately undermine an im-
portant project’s chances of receiving
appropriations, and I believe people’s
lives could be in jeopardy because of it.
I don’t think that is the kind of
prioritization we need when we have to
fight tooth and nail every year to get
critical funding for very important and
nearly every year to get
critical funding for very important and
critical local public safety needs.

The Senator named a lot of groups I
support and that support me, and I re-
spect that fact. But to be candid, a lot of
these groups don’t like water projects in general, and I think some-
times that will just undermine. Any-
thing to slow down these projects.

I believe Congress, not political ap-
pointees or a commissioner, should re-
tain this responsibility. I understand
the legislation has been changed to an
arbitrary system that can label a
project second tier despite critical
local public safety needs.

The Senator named a lot of groups I
support and that support me, and I re-
spect that fact. But to be candid, a lot of
these groups don’t like water projects in general, and I think some-
times that will just undermine. Any-
thing to slow down these projects.

I believe Congress, not political ap-
pointees or a commissioner, should re-
tain this responsibility. I understand
the legislation has been changed to an
arbitrary system that can label a
project second tier despite critical
local public safety needs.

The Senator named a lot of groups I
support and that support me, and I re-
spect that fact. But to be candid, a lot of
these groups don’t like water projects in general, and I think some-
times that will just undermine. Any-
thing to slow down these projects.

I believe Congress, not political ap-
pointees or a commissioner, should re-
tain this responsibility. I understand
the legislation has been changed to an
arbitrary system that can label a
project second tier despite critical
local public safety needs.
We did it because we care about fiscal responsibility and we care about keeping this economy moving, and I just don’t think we need this commission. We went through an exhaustive process to determine which projects and studies would be taken through this process. We have a very broad committee that has different ideologies. We represent broad areas of the country. Frankly, I think we all want to protect Americans. We have seen what happens when we look at Katrina, so we want to do our best.

I laud my colleague for his absolute commitment and dedication to finding ways to make this process work better, but I say this bill proves, in my opinion, his reasoning.

We did incorporate the fine Corps language that my friend worked on so hard, and he knows how strongly I feel about this particular amendment. But he incorporated it in this way. In his heart, he thinks it is important. I know he has some things he will say now about my comments, so I will yield to him with the understanding that I will be able to respond in due course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the chair of the committee. Of course, I have enjoyed working with her on so many issues, and I again compliment her for retaining key reforms in the underlying bill. She has provided a great deal of leadership on Corps reform, and for that I am truly appreciative.

In the past, the chairman has offered to work together on the issue of prioritization in the future, and I hope that is still something in which she is interested. I don’t think we should wait for the executive branch, but I do think it is important. This is not a new idea, I just thought of; rather, it is a critical reform that is still something in which she is interested.

I strongly believe that is a critical reform that is still something in which she is interested. I strongly believe prioritization is a critical reform that is still something in which she is interested. I strongly believe that is a critical reform that is still something in which she is interested. I strongly believe prioritization is a critical reform that is still something in which she is interested.

They have to meet a benefit-cost test, or have environmental benefits. So I believe it is the right thing to do. When we were out here together, the Senator from California and I were arm, literally, on ethics reform and lobbying reform, and some said that was trashing the Senate. Some said that was somehow saying we weren’t capable of regulating ourselves; that somehow we didn’t need these laws and we should be trusted. Well, this is an area just like the ethics and lobbying reform, where people have concerns.

I want to go through a couple for him, I would like to say to anybody wishing to speak on the Feingold amendment, please, I will make sure you get adequate time. I also want to say to my friend, as he leaves, because he has asked me to think about it, that I am going to ask him to think about it also. I want him to think about this: there are so many checks and balances on this WRDA bill. I want to go through a couple for him, I would like to say to anybody wishing to speak on the Feingold amendment, please, I will make sure you get adequate time. I also want to say to my friend, as he leaves, because he has asked me to think about it, that I am going to ask him to think about it also. I want him to think about this: there are so many checks and balances on this WRDA bill.

First of all, we have the local people who decide what it is they need and want to protect their communities. We have the State people who also want to have a say and have to issue a water quality certificate. So they are involved in it. We have the Corps that has to do the study based on a cost-benefit analysis and other issues. There are matching funds in every case—almost every case. So we have a big check there, if a local community is willing to put up the money. That is matching funds.

There is the executive branch that comes in. The executive branch comes in and they decide what to fund. We have the Appropriations Committee, after the authorizers get done with it, deciding what they want to fund. And we have every one of us Senators standing for reelection at some point who have to face up and say, we fought for this particular project. Also, I thank my colleague for something right now on ethics reform, and I want him to know something which he may not know. As a result of all his work on ethics reform, and so many other colleagues here and our leader and the rest, even though the ethics reform isn’t law yet—we hope it will soon be—the committee decided to act as if
it were law. We asked every Senator to put in writing the fact that they did or did not have any real or perceived conflict of interest that went along with their requests for these particular projects. Those letters are available for everyone to look at the office. We have also pointed it in the Record. It is large type—because at first it came out in small type—what each of us has asked for. So I want to thank my colleague for that. I want my colleague to understand that this bill is not only half the size that it was last year and not only is it a couple of billion less than the House, not only did we follow the ethics pros—pos, which isn’t law yet because we want people to feel good about this, but we have done all these things. And, of course, I have included my friend’s eth—is very important for us to move for—workers. It is one of the main reasons I ne—rived the Environmental Protection Agency’s efforts to repair—also a model for the Nation, showing us how the Corps has restored over 1,100 acres of wetland habitat. Popular Island was once a home to the Chesa— popolis and its channels. This project has been created. People would like to offer.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the Senate substitute for H.R. 1495, which I hope we will be getting to, the Water Resources Development Act. This legislation has been delayed for many years. I thank Senator BOXER and Senator INOWE for bringing together this legislation. It is an essential component of the restoration efforts underway in Cumberland, including the restoration of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and the restoration of the turning basin there.

For the first time, the Army Corps will update the model project. We have been able to take the dredge materials and put them onto the Poplar Island. It was once a home to residents and hunting lodges. Since the project’s authorization in 1996, the Corps has restored over 1,100 acres of remote island habitat. Popular Island has been restored. The project involves the waters of the Chesapeake Bay. Eight miles of dikes protect the island from severe wave action. There are over 570 acres of upland habitat at an elevation that sometimes exceeds 20 feet. An additional 576 acres of wetland habitat has been created.

Today, even as the project continues, the island is once again home to migratory shorebirds, mammals, reptiles, and even serves as a nursery for Maryland’s famous terrapins. The expansion of the project authorized in this bill will build upon this success. It will add an additional 415 acres, half uplands and half wetlands, to the restored island. The Nation has become increasingly aware of the important role wetlands and barrier islands play. We all witnessed the increased devastation that struck the coast of Louisiana, due in part to the loss of what we refer to as nature’s speed bumps, the wetlands and coastal islands that help absorb the shock from these horrific storms. The Poplar Island expansion project authorized in this bill is important to the future of the Poplar Island to the ecol—ogy of the Chesapeake Bay. It is also a model for the Nation, showing us how the Army Corps projects can be engines of economic success, while at the same time serving beneficial ecological functions.

This vital project points the way to the future of the Army Corps of Engi—ners. It is one of the main reasons I support this legislation. This is a well—written bill. It, yes, will help Maryland, but also help Maryland with projects in which I think are important to show the Nation what we can do in moving forward on the economic needs of our communities, such as the dredging of our ports, but also moving forward on the environmental issues such as restoring vital wetlands and islands that have disappeared.
It is important as far as dealing with storm damage. It is important to the restoration of our wildlife. It is important in so many different areas. I urge us to move forward with this legislation. Let's move it forward to consider the amendments, let's get it done, let's take it to the other body, and let's get it to the President as soon as possible. It has been delayed for years, we all know that. Thanks to the hard work of our leadership on the Environment and Public Works Committee, we have been able now to come forward with a bill that I think has the best chance for enactment. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this legislation, support this legislation, but, more importantly, let's get it moving.

It is well past time that we enact the WRDA bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCaskill): The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I want to speak on the bill, and I wanted to congratulate Senator BOXER for her work, and I wanted to congratulate Senator INHOFE was chairman. Now Senator INHOFE was chairman. Now Senator BOXER is the Chair.

It is now time for us to pass it again. It has only been 7 years since we have had a Water Resources and Development Act. We desperately need it for all of the water projects across the country that need to be authorized.

Of course, one of the ones I want to speak to not only affects our State of Florida, the Everglades restoration, but it clearly affects a lot of the ecosystem of planet Earth. We violated Mother Nature over the course of the last half century. As a result of massive hurricanes in the early part of the last century, particularly the hurricane of 1928 that killed over 2,000 people in Lake Okeechobee and many of them drowned—the emphasis back then was, when the floods came: Get the water off.

So over the course of the years, through then, up through the mid-1900s, you had all of this diking and draining that went on, to the point at which the mindset was: Get the water away when the floods come.

But, of course, everybody was ignoring Mother Nature and what she had created in this incredible system that starts south of Orlando in the center part of the State, and starts meandering water south into the Kissimmee River, meandering through its oxbow; then Lake Okeechobee; then many of them were cleansing the water, and then it reaches the big lake, Lake Okeechobee, which then Mother Nature had the water absolutely proceed south through very rich muck lands, in a slow slow sheet flow that flowed into what we now know as the Everglades.

Ultimately that water then flowed on out, in the southwest part of Florida, and in the south part of Florida, into what is known as Florida Bay, which is that area south of the tip of the peninsula of Florida and inside the bow created by the Florida Keys.

What mankind did was disrupt that natural flow. As a result, when the floods came: Get the water off. So we were now sending fresh water into tidewater in these very delicate brackish water situations that were so specific and marine life, and making it much too much fresh water, not brackish water, as a result, also dumping water that contained excessive nutrients, so that as this water flowed out, the tidewater in places like the Loxahatchee River and to the east the St. Lucie River, you suddenly have these rivers that had way too much fresh water and way too many nutrients.

What you got was the growing of algae, governments out of the oxygen, and creating nearly dead rivers. Everybody got concerned about this along about the 1980s and into the 1990s. The legislature and the Federal Government started realizing we have to go back to what was originally there. It was a lot different then in Florida than what Mother Nature first had created, because now there was a huge agricultural industry just to the south of Lake Okeechobee on all of that rich agricultural land, there were 6 million people living in South Florida who had to have a source of water.

So that is what was developed, the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, which will span over 20 years, and it is a project that needs funding, half from the Federal Government and half from the State Government and its entities, including the water management district, the local governments, and so forth. That half and half is how we are ultimately going to be able to restore the Everglades and still provide water for the agriculture industry as well as the 6 million people who live there.

Now, unfortunately, it’s very tough right now because we have a drought. It simply has not rained. Back in 2005, with Florida sm arting from the four hurricanes in 2004, hurricanes that filled up the lake to the point of being manmade overflow. The problem was, it is like the Amazon River. That certainly just does not affect Brazil; that has global climate effects.

I want to thank again the leadership for having brought out this bill. It cannot be soon enough for us to get it passed and get agreement with the House and to get it signed into law. Then we can start fleshing this out with the appropriations bills to fund these specific water projects.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the hour allocated to me in debate postcloture and which I have not used be allocated to Senator BOXER, the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. NELSON of Florida. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IRAQ

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, in the days ahead, this Congress and the President of the United States face a choice on the critical question of funding our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is a choice between brinksmanship and statesmanship. It is a choice between continuing to stalemate, largely along partisan lines, or uniting across partisan lines in support of our troops.

I all know what our most important responsibility is. Our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan are looking to us. They need the funding that only we in Congress can provide them. The money is running out.

I understand that many in this Chamber saw the supplemental appropriations bill as an opportunity to force a withdrawal of our troops from Iraq and that many of us argued vigorously against the amendments that attempted to do that. Each side has now had an opportunity to make its case. The result is clear: There are not enough votes in Congress to enact a mandatory date for withdrawal of American forces from Iraq. The time for having debates, therefore, and sending messages on this troop funding bill should be over. It is now time to get our troops the equipment, the training, the supplies they need—and without delay. We in this Chamber have a responsibility to make certain that no matter what disagreements and differences we have here in Washington, our men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan are not caught in the political crossfire.

Only a couple months ago, this Senate confirmed the new commander in Iraq, GEN David Petraeus. That new strategy is now being implemented, and it is achieving some encouraging, if early, signs of success. Indeed, progress has been won, even though the full complement of troops has not yet arrived in Iraq. Yet now many in Congress would pull the plug on this new strategy and thwart the work of our troops before they are given a fair chance to succeed.

I am aware public opinion has turned against the war in Iraq. The American people are deeply frustrated by the multiplicity of mistakes and errors that have been made. Progress has been too slow. The savagery of our enemy, which the American people witness on television every night, has been demoralizing. Many simply want to leave and wash our hands of what they perceive as a deadly mess. But leadership requires something more. We must not defy public opinion. We must act as if there is what is necessary to do what is right for our country. In fact, at a time such as this, we are required to do what each of us believes is right, and that might not be what is popular.

What is at stake, I firmly believe, is that we cannot allow our Nation to be defeated in Iraq by the same terrorist enemy with which we are now engaged in worldwide conflict. The global war on terrorism which we are waging is a worldwide struggle against a barbaric totalitarian foe that is al-Qaeda. And today, it is al-Qaida that we are fighting in Iraq. Al-Qaida itself has declared Iraq to be the central front of their larger war against our way of life. So all of us privileged to serve this great country in positions of leadership have a very serious choice to make. Our judgment can be guided by the public opinion polls, and we can withdraw in defeat. We can rationalize our action with reassuring but, I believe, falsely hopeful words such as “re-deployment.” No matter what we say, our enemy will know that America’s will has been broken by the barbarity of their blood lust, the very barbarity we declare we are fighting but from which we would actually be running.

My main point is this: Now is not the time for delay, for prolonged legislative posturing and bargaining over this supplemental appropriations bill. It is the time to do our duty, to fund our troops, stand by our allies, and do everything we can to help them win the war against al-Qaida in Iraq, rather than inventing new ways to vent our frustration with the war in Iraq or with the President of the United States, by handcuffing General Petraeus and undermining his strategy. Let us give him and his troops our support as they and their Iraqi allies fight to win for us.

Thank you. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. I first congratulate the new chairman of the committee, Senator BOXER, for taking her first bill to the floor. She is doing a great job. It is out of committee virtually unanimously. She brought out a bill that was carried out in advance and she is doing a terrific job. I highly commend her.

Benjamin Franklin once wrote:

When the well is dry, we know the worth of water.

Westerners, including the current occupant of the chair, have learned this painful lesson many times. Recently, several years of drought have plagued the State of Montana and many other parts of the country. Weathered switch grass and crops bring a terrible cost to producers in the West.

The West’s battle with drought highlights the president’s need to ensure our water resources are used efficiently. I remind my colleagues, it doesn’t rain a lot in the West. The annual rainfall west of the 100th meridian, down from Minnesota and across the country, is much less than in the eastern part of the country. In Montana, the average precipitation—rain, snow, all of it—in our towns is roughly about 13 inches a year. In Washington, DC, it is about 44 inches a year. That is a big difference, and that is in ordinary years. We have had a lot of drought in the West in the last several years.

Therefore, this Water Resources Development Act is long overdue. Although the Senate passed this legislation last year, the conference with the House has been long. We are here today to get this bill over the goal line. I think we will finally get there. The bill provides authority for the Corps of Engineers to move forward on many long overdue water resources projects.

In 1986, Congress enacted the Water Resources Development Act, or WRDA. Every 2 years since then, Congress received proposals from the administration seeking authorization for water resources projects—every 2 years, since 1986. Why? It is clearly because there are new needs every 2 years. This pattern of requests provided the Corps and local sponsors with a regular planning schedule, helped them know what was coming, and awarded both projects and funding. Those projects would be developed first and second, with some regularity, the planning for the development of needed resource projects in our country.

This administration, however, has yet to request one update of this legislation. Why is that? Well, I ask the question: Have all the water resources needs of the country been met? Clearly, the answer is no. Scores of water resources projects are awaiting authorizations.

Second, does this administration think this legislation costs too much? Perhaps, but remember, investing in our water resources infrastructure is a cost we cannot put off. This is not an annual recurring operating expense; it is an investment that pays huge dividends.

Levees are crumbling. People are living in harm’s way, waiting for this legislation to help provide them with protection. This bill authorizes projects that will provide needed flood and storm damage protection, navigation improvements and environmental restoration. All three are very important.
There is authority for rebuilding and restoring the coast of Louisiana generally, but this legislation provides specific authority for that rebuilding and restoration, devastated by Hurricane Katrina and Rita.

Authorizing the modernization of the lock and dam system on the Mississippi River is contained in here, and authority for ecosystem restoration projects, all the way from New Jersey, to Florida, to Colorado. There is a lot in this legislation.

The Corps of Engineers is charged with the management of America’s water resources. The Corps of Engineers built levees and floats barges. In my State of Montana, we see the Corps as restorers of the ecosystem. We see the Corps as guardians of America’s recreational assets, such as the Missouri River, Yellowstone River, and the Fort Peck Reservoir.

We in Montana have 11,000 miles of blue ribbon trout streams. Montana is home to Missouri River and the beautiful Yellowstone River. The Yellowstone is the longest remaining free-flowing river in our country. Montana’s Fort Peck Reservoir provides outstanding recreation for the eastern part of Montana. There is a huge fishing tournament in the Fort Peck Reservoir. The Corps helps make that happen.

We value the Corps’ expertise and their partnership in many of our water resource projects. Montana has several projects that are important and will continue that tradition in Montana: the Yellowstone River and Tributaries Recovery project; the lower Yellowstone project at Intake, MT; the Missouri River and Tributaries Recovery project; the upper basin of the Missouri River project. These projects will all provide improvements and provide valuable protection for the valuable resources in our State and, with all the tourism coming to our State, for a lot of Americans as well.

There is also an important authorization for the rehabilitation and improvement of a very important large aging water project on the Blackfeet Reservation in Glacier County called St. Mary Diversion. This system is rusting, cracking, and crumbling before our eyes. It is deteriorating, and 17,000 Montanans on the highline—the northern part of the State—depend on this system. It is a Federal system, but it is so important to Montana that in the United States we don’t have good drinking water in large parts of my State. That is an outrage.

These important water projects, and their importance to the communities the projects serve, underline the need to move this legislation forward. Our first priority, therefore, is to authorize the long overdue projects in the WRDA bill this year. I hope we can get the administration’s support to do that this year. We passed a bill last year. Let’s get it enacted this year. Let’s do our part to ensure that our water resources needs are met and let’s get back to the biennial practice of enacting a water development bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to rise following my good friend from Montana, with whom I served last year as the subcommittee leaders of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We worked in a bipartisan way, and I appreciate that working relationship this year again.

The EPW has worked on a bipartisan basis on this very important bill, and we have shown it by the number of people who signed letters asking that they move the bill. We have seen it in the vote on cloture. I thank the leadership of the Chairman BOXER and Ranking Member INHOFFE.

This bill before us today and next week, the Water Resources Development Act, or WRDA, is long overdue and badly needed. As has already been said, it authorizes projects under the jurisdiction.

Mr. BAUCUS. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. BOND. Yes, I am happy to.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I confirm what our good friend from Missouri that there has been close cooperation in putting the bill together. I commend the Senator from Missouri. He has done a super job and so has Chairman BOXER, who is our leader. She sets the tone and gets us working together, and Senator INHOFFE is right there with her. I thank the Senator for being helpful.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comments of my friend from Missouri. It is more than just the issues on which we could work so closely, but this one I view as a vital investment in our Nation’s future. This is something we ought to be able to come together on as Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, and say we need to build for the future.

As my colleague from Montana has said, the programs administered by the Corps are of tremendous value to the entire Nation. They provide drinking water, recreation, river transportation, recreation, flood protection, environmental protection and restoration, and emergency response.

Few agencies in the Federal Government touch as many citizens as the Corps does. The Corps provides one-quarter of our Nation’s total hydropower, if you are looking for pollution-free power, it is hydropower. The Corps operates 463 lake recreation areas; moves 630 million tons of cargo, valued at over $73 billion annually; manages over 5 million acres of public lands; manages over 12 million acres of land and water; provides 3 trillion gallons of water for use by local communities and businesses; and has prevented an estimated $706 billion in flood damage within the past 25 years with an investment one-seventh of that value. During the 1993 flood alone, an estimated $19.1 billion in flood damage was prevented by flood control facilities in place that year.

Regrettably, I have to tell my colleagues that as we debate this bill on the floor, a flood is currently striking Missouri. I talked with a top Corps official from Missouri yesterday, who said the flood and its impact now may be as great as the disaster of 1993. I will be going there tomorrow to survey the damage. Floods are a fact of nature, and a good levee system can reduce the damage.

The WRDA bill is a bipartisan bill traditionally produced by Congress every 2 years. As a matter of fact, you could say this is the 2002 WRDA bill about 5 years late. Better late than never.

The bill makes possible all of America’s major flood control projects, coastal protection, environmental protection and restoration, transportation and recreation on our major waterways.

Despite its importance, however, we have not passed a WRDA bill since 2000. The longer we wait, the more unmet needs pile up and the more complicated the demands upon the bill become. I think the public voice is loud, clear, and spoken often regarding how they need it and what they need it for.

The WRDA provides 3 trillion gallons of water for the production of key waterways and for navigation projects that create economic growth and keep our economy going.

The bill before us will create jobs, spur economic development and trade competitiveness, and improve the environment. It is financially responsible. The Corps projects are widely supported is an understatement. It passed the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee last year by a voice vote and, in the 109th Congress, 80 colleagues signed a letter urging floor action.

A few weeks ago, the House cleared a companion bill with a vote of 394 to 25, and in the 109th Congress, they passed it with 406 votes. Last year, we merely ran out of time in conference. That is why I am glad the bill was passed out of committee and on to the floor in a timely manner. We cannot afford to let the Senate run out on the bill in this Congress.

In the last 20 years, environmental protection has become a primary Corps mission. Our water resources systems are performing a variety of functions simultaneously. They can provide transportation and protection from floods and protect habitat for many species.

Similarly, when it comes to Corps projects, navigational and flood control projects can be environmentally sound. Environmental restoration can help prevent or minimize flooding during the next major storm.
The Corps is leading some of the world’s largest ecosystem restoration projects. The commanding feature of this bill is its landmark environmental and ecosystem restoration authorities. More than half the bill consists of authorities for environmental restoration projects.

Think of all the major waterways that are important to America, to our environmental heritage, to recreation, and to commerce. This bill affects all of them.

Among the projects, this bill restores wetlands in the upper Connecticut River basin in Vermont and New Hampshire, restores oyster habitats in the Chesapeake Bay, restores fisheries in the Great Lakes, implements an environmental management program for the Rio Grande River, continues restoration of the Florida Everglades, restores areas of coastal Louisiana damaged by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, restores the upper Mississippi and Illinois water systems, and restores oyster habitats on the Long Island Sound.

Flood control obviously is important. If we learned anything about Mother Nature in the last 15 years, it is that we very often need protection from our storms. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita obviously are devastating examples.

That is, that Corps projects have prevented an estimated $706 billion in flood damage within the last 25 years with an investment of one-seventh that amount.

During the 1993 flood alone, an estimated $706 million in flood damage was prevented by flood control facilities in place at the time.

This legislation authorizes flood control projects in California, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Minnesota, Kentucky, South Carolina, Idaho, Washington, Missouri, Iowa, New Mexico, and Arkansas, to name a few.

Transportation efficiency is another benefit. I believe the majority of this legislation is for environmental protection and restoration, a key bipartisan economic commission we include provides transportation efficiency and environmental sustainability on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers.

As the world becomes more competitive, America must also. From 1970 to 2003, the value of U.S. trade increased twenty-fourfold and 70 percent since 1994, an average annual growth rate of over 34 years. We must ask ourselves a fundamental question: Should we have a system that promotes growth or should we be committed to a transport jail designed not for 2050 but for 1950 or earlier with paddle wheel boats?

Further, we can ask ourselves if dramatic investments should be made to address environmental problems and opportunities that exist on these great waterways. In both cases, the answer to me, and I hope a majority of this body, must be, of course, we must modernize and improve.

Seventy years ago, some argued that a transportation system on the Mississippi River was not justified. But Congress bravely stepped forward and decided it would not try to predict the future but to shape the future and decide to invest in a system despite the naysayers. Over 84 million tons per year later, clearly the decision was wise.

A couple years ago, a veteran chief economist at the USDA, talking about transportation efficiency, noted the ability of farmers to win markets and higher prices, said that transportation is fundamentally related. He predicted that corn exports should rise over the next 10 years by 45 percent, and 70 percent of that will travel down the Mississippi River.

This decision to improve the waterways has not been taken lightly. All decisions have been documented and predicated with economic coordinating committees among the States, and a minimum of 44 meetings of the Navigation and Environmental Coordination Committee.

As we look 50 years into the future, we have to ask ourselves a fundamental question: Should we have a system that promotes growth or should we be committed to a transport jail designed not for 2050 but for 1950 or earlier with paddle wheel boats?

Further, we can ask ourselves if dramatic investments should be made to address environmental problems and opportunities that exist on these great waterways. In both cases, the answer to me, and I hope a majority of this body, must be, of course, we must modernize and improve.

Seventy years ago, some argued that a transportation system on the Mississippi River was not justified. But Congress bravely stepped forward and decided it would not try to predict the future but to shape the future and decide to invest in a system despite the naysayers. Over 84 million tons per year later, clearly the decision was wise.

A couple years ago, a veteran chief economist at the USDA, talking about transportation efficiency, noted the ability of farmers to win markets and higher prices, said that transportation is fundamentally related. He predicted that corn exports should rise over the next 10 years by 45 percent, and 70 percent of that will travel down the Mississippi River.

This decision to improve the waterways has not been taken lightly. All decisions have been documented and predicated with economic coordinating committees among the States, and a minimum of 44 meetings of the Navigation and Environmental Coordination Committee.

The Corps of Engineers spent $70 million completing an anticipated 6-year study that actually took 14 years to complete. That was only three times over budget. During that period, there have been no less than 35 meetings of Governors’ committees, 28 meetings of economic coordinating committees among the States, and a minimum of 44 meetings of the Navigation and Environmental Coordination Committee;
additionally, 130 briefings for special interest groups, 25 newsletters, at least 6 sets of public meetings in 46 locations with over 4,000 people in attendance.

There are some who say we ought to study it some more. Give me a break. To say that this has been a very long transparent and representative process, and while we have been studying, our competitors have been building.

One of the saddest sights I have seen recently is a picture of exports from New Orleans. Rather than exporting American commodities, do you know what they are exporting? Barges. They are exporting barges and tow boats that couldn’t operate efficiently on the existing lock system to Brazil and other areas so they can have modern transportation means that will eat our lunch both literally and figuratively.

Given the extraordinary delay so far and given the reality that large-scale consists do not weeks but months but decades, further delay is no longer an option. That is why I am very pleased to join a bipartisan group of Senators who agree we must improve the efficiency and the environmental sustainability of our great resources.

The transportation efficiency provisions are supported by a broad-based group of States, farm groups, shippers, labor, and those who pay taxes into the trust fund.

Of particular note, I appreciate the strong support from the carpenters, corn growers, farm bureau, soybean growers, energy and construction materials industry.

Additionally, I thank Senators McCaskill, Durbin, Obama, Grassley, and Harkin for their strong bipartisan support as well.

As for the budget, for some, this bill is too small; for others, it is too big. It is important to understand the budget implications of this legislation in the real world. We are contending with difficulties. It is critical that we be mindful of those realities as we make investments in the infrastructure that supports those who manufacture, grow, buy, and sell products so we can expand our economy, create jobs, secure our future, and pay the taxes our Government needs to continue providing support for the infrastructure.

This is an authorization bill. It does not spend $1—not $1. It makes projects eligible within budget constraints. With the provided Appropriations Committee, the Congress and the President will fund projects deemed to be of the highest priority. The remaining will not be funded because of budget issues. This WRDA process does not allow for projects to be considered during the process of appropriations. Some will measure up, some will not, although the ones in this bill have gone through rigorous examination to get this far.

I believe we strike a balance that disciplines the new projects to criteria fairly applied while addressing a great number of water resource priorities.

This legislation is supported by the National Waterways Alliance, the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, the California Coastal Coalition, AASHTO, and 250 other organizations.

My thanks to the Environment and Public Works Committee, its leadership, its staff, the staff of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work and the commitment to bring WRDA to the floor in a timely manner.

Again, I particularly thank Chairman Boxer and Ranking Member Inhofe for their forbearance. I look forward to debate and final passage. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have made some good progress on the bill today. A number of our colleagues have already come forward. I wanted to say a word about Senator Feingold for coming and debating his amendment on prioritization with me. We are going to have a vote on that, if all goes well, on Tuesday. That has not been finalized, but it looks as if that is what is going to happen.

I would say to colleagues that we did have a good, fair debate so far today, and we are going to continue this tomorrow and on Monday. I hope that those who have not come forward with their amendments would be so kind as to do that. We don’t have very many because we did take care of many issues between both sides of the committee, but if there are amendments, we urge our colleagues to please come forward and talk about those amendments. This way, they can have as much time as they want and we can hopefully get done.

We keep adding to the letters of support. I was just handed a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers in favor of this bill, so it is one of these rare moments in history where we have the manufacturers association, the labor unions, we have the farmers, we have the corn growers, and we have the water people. We just have a huge amount of support for this bill. It is one of those times that everybody is coming together, setting aside other matters, other issues that are so terribly contentious, such as Iraq, which tears at our heartstrings whenever we are on it, and other tough matters we deal with every day. That is one which does bring us together, I am happy to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter I just referred to printed in the Record, as follows:

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent there be a period of morning business with Senators not expected to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.