United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2007 No. 164

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 29, 2007, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2007

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Dr. Philip J. Parker.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of our lives, I stand before You this day in the presence of those who, along with our President and House of Representatives, are responsible for the governance of our Nation and, to a large extent, the welfare of our world. I am acutely aware, dear Lord, that they are grappling with momentous issues in these challenging times at home and abroad.

As on previous occasions throughout our Nation's history, O Lord, I believe that we stand in need of Your divine guidance. We need the kind of insight and wisdom that comes from on high. We need minds and hearts that are in tune with Your spirit. We need a renewed sense of purpose, which is founded upon those divinely ordained principles that were established by our forefathers.

So come now and guide the Members of this Senate in their deliberations this day. May their words and their actions reflect the mind and the heart of the One who loves us and who has redeemed us through His Son in whose Name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 26, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this morning we will return to the Amtrak legislation. I am not certain the managers have that many amendments to deal with, so I don't think we will be in session for a long time working on this bill, but we are open for business. While no rollcall votes will occur today, the majority manager, working with Senator LOTT, is expected to be here to work with any Members who want to offer amendments.

I am going to shortly file cloture on this bill. This cloture vote will occur during Tuesday's session, and it is the expectations of the managers it can be concluded during Tuesday's session. Let me say, this is a rare cloture petition. It is signed by Democrats and Republicans in equal numbers. This is an extremely important bill for our country, and the Senate realizes that. I am hopeful and quite confident that we will not need cloture, but if we do, we can go ahead and do that. If we don't, that will save us some time. We have lots to do here that is so important.

I am also going to—unless something untoward comes—move to the farm bill a week from Monday or thereabouts. The reason for that is this is a bill we need to do every 5 years. While I, like many, think the bill could be better, I think the committee did a tremendously good job. There are a lot of reforms in this bill. For some there are not enough, but for the farm bill, I have seen a number of them come through here. It is certainly an improvement. I look forward to having the managers work through it in the quickest time possible. I congratulate the committee. They worked very hard to come up with this bill.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

As previously announced, there will be no rollcall votes on Monday, but Members should be here Monday to offer amendments on Amtrak if they so desire.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2233, S. 2234, H.R. 505, H.R. 3963

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding there are four bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2233) to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

A bill (S. 2234) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses.

A bill (H.R. 505) to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the native Hawaiian governing entity.

A bill (H.R. 3963) to amend Title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to these bills, and I do so en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar.

PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 294, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Lautenberg (for Carper) amendment No. 3454 (to amendment No. 3452), of a perfecting nature.

Allard amendment No. 3455, to strike the provisions repealing Amtrak's self-sufficiency requirements.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 158, S. 294, AMTRAK Reauthorization.

Frank R. Lautenberg, Trent Lott, Joe Lieberman, Benjamin L. Cardin, S. Whitehouse, Robert Menendez, Daniel K. Inouye, Susan M. Collins, Mike Crapo, Larry E. Craig, John Warner, Byron L. Dorgan, Gordon H. Smith, Max Baucus, Bill Nelson, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Harry Reid.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, normally we waive the reading of the names, but I thought it was so refreshing to hear a cloture motion with Democrats and Republicans on it that I wanted to hear them. I am almost anxious to have the clerk do it again, but I think that is sufficient.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 294 occur on Tuesday, October 30 at a time determined by the majority leader—I will certainly consult with the Republican leader—and that the mandatory quorum rule under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that Members have until 3:30 p.m. Monday to file any germane first-degree amendments to S. 294.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, with cloture filed, we are hopeful we will be able to move with dispatch to the support and approval of S. 294, the Amtrak bill.

I wish to start this morning by thanking our colleague and my cosponsor and longtime Amtrak supporter, Senator TRENT LOTT, for the opportunity to work together to move this bill along. His support is essential, and I know he is pleased with the progress we have made this morning up to this point. Today is our third day on the bill. Yesterday we made very good progress. We were able to work through a number of amendments, some of which we were able to agree to and some of which we disposed of with votes. Now, this morning, cloture has been filed, which should put us on a schedule to finish this bill early next week. It is very important that we do so for the future of America's transportation systems.

Whether it is to reduce congestion on our roads or at our airports, or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that puts us at risk of global warming—our society and our world—or to give people another safe mode of transportation during an emergency, rail is critical. We cannot neglect the contribution it makes in the event of a calamity or disaster, whether it comes from a terrorist attack or from an erratic act of nature such as a storm or forest fires, and all of the things we see that call at times for evacuation.

Our bill, by authorizing $2 billion a year for Amtrak in the States over the next 6 years, will make all of that much easier for America to deal with the problem of a decaying infrastructure. It provides funding for Amtrak's capital needs as well as State grants for passenger rail.

While Amtrak had record ridership and revenues last year, our bill requires changes at Amtrak to make sure these funds will help the railroad to continue moving in the right direction. It would require Amtrak to reform its operations, to reduce its Federal operating subsidy by over 40 percent over the life of the bill.

We worked very hard to forge this bipartisan compromise plan. Last Congress, our plan was approved by the Senate as an amendment to the budget bill by a vote of 93 to 6. I hope that early next week we will get a strong vote in support of our bill so we can be one step closer to making it law.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3467, 3468, 3469, AND 3470 EN BLOC

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment and call up amendments Nos. 3467, 3468, 3469, and 3470 en bloc, on behalf of Senator DEMINT.

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

The clerk will report.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Bond], for Mr. DEMINT, proposes amendments numbered 3467, 3468, 3469, and 3470 en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3467

(Purpose: To require Amtrak to disclose the Federal subsidy of every ticket sold for transportation on Amtrak)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 224. DISCLOSURE OF PER PASSENGER FEDERAL SUBSIDIES.

Amtrak shall publicly disclose all the costs incurred for each Amtrak route that are subsidized by the Federal Government, including costs for maintenance, depreciation, and operations. The specific per-passenger Federal subsidy on each route shall be displayed on every ticket purchased for that route and on Amtrak's publicly accessible website.

AMENDMENT NO. 3468

(Purpose: To increase competition in the American rail system by allowing any qualified rail operator or transportation company to compete for passenger rail service)

On page 33, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 34, line 5, and insert the following:

''(1) any qualified rail operator or transportation company

AMENDMENT NO. 3469

(Purpose: To clarify the level of detail to be included in the modern financial accounting and reporting system required under section 203)

On page 15, line 21, strike ''(b)'' and insert the following:

(b) CATEGORIZATION OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Amtrak Board of Directors shall separately categorize routes, assigned revenues, and attributable expenses by type of service, including long distance routes, State-sponsored routes, commuter contract routes, and Northeast Corridor routes.

(2) NORTHEAST CORRIDOR.—Amtrak revenues generated by freight and commuter railroads operating on the Northeast Corridor shall be separately listed to include the charges per car mile assessed by Amtrak to other freight and commuter railroad entities.

(3) FIXED OVERHEAD EXPENSES.—Fixed overhead expenses that are not directly assigned or attributed to any route (or group of routes) shall be listed separately by line item and expense category.

(c)

AMENDMENT NO. 3470

(Purpose: To require the Performance Improvement Plan to address reaching financial solvency by eliminating routes and services that do not make a profit)

On page 31, strike line 21 and insert the following:

''(7) reaching financial solvency by eliminating routes and services that do not make a profit; and

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3464

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3464, which is at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes an amendment numbered 3464.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

(Purpose: To amend section 24101 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify Amtrak's mission)

On page 10, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 200. MISSION.

Section 24101 is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) MISSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The mission of Amtrak is to provide efficient and effective intercity passenger mobility in those travel markets in which passenger rail offers a trip-time and service quality competitive or complementary travel option consistent with the goal of continual reduction in Federal operating subsidies required to provide such service.

''(2) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—All measurements of Amtrak performance, including decisions on whether, and to what extent, to provide operating subsidies, shall be based on the Amtrak's ability to carry out the mission described in paragraph (1).''.

On page 33, line 3, strike ''may'' and insert ''shall''.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to S. 294, the Amtrak reauthorization bill. I applaud the authors of the bill for their hard work in putting this legislation together. As one who hopes to see a robust, efficient passenger rail service, I have long been a supporter and rider on Amtrak. As Governor of Missouri, I started the State support of Amtrak to run trains between Kansas City and St. Louis. As I have watched Amtrak over the years, I have been increasingly concerned about the rising costs and relatively stagnating ridership. As I look at this bill, I do not believe it includes all the needed reforms that are crucial to the success of Amtrak.

While there are many positive aspects of the bill, the fundamental problem with Amtrak is that it has no clearly defined mission. Is it supposed to provide only those services where it can make a profit? Is it supposed to supplement air service in specific markets regardless of cost? Is it supposed to serve rural markets regardless of cost? Is it supposed to provide tourist travel regardless of cost? All of these have been held out from time to time as reasons to subsidize Amtrak and as excuses for why it should not be held accountable for the effective use of the taxpayers' money. However, those are empty excuses. The money continues to flow out, and I believe strong reforms are necessary.

While Amtrak's revenue, ridership, and cash operating loss numbers improved this year, this improved financial performance reflects labor costs held low by the absence of a labor settlement. Once a settlement is reached, Amtrak's costs will jump up, reflecting the pay raises that have largely been deferred during the past 7 years during which time there has not been a labor contract.

Amtrak has made no significant progress in restructuring its operations to become less reliant on Federal funds. The pace of Amtrak's reform savings has slowed from $61 million in fiscal year 2006 to a planned $46 million in fiscal year 2008. There is little chance Amtrak will achieve anywhere near the $500 million in annual reform savings it promised when it adopted its 2005 plan.

GAO reports consistently cite that Amtrak has lost the focus of its statutory mandate to be operated and managed as a for-profit company.

Just last year, over 10 percent of Amtrak's operating subsidy was spent on food and beverages and a like amount subsidized first-class service. There is no critical public purpose associated with such expenditures. Yet there are some who assume they are OK because that is what Amtrak has always done.

S. 294, I regret to say, will not change this deplorable system. While section 208 would have FRA and Amtrak develop performance metrics, there is no clear statement of Amtrak's mission on which to base these metrics.

After 36 years, we should not miss the opportunity to finally and clearly state Amtrak's mission. It is for that reason that I offer as an amendment to S. 294 the establishment of Amtrak's mission. That mission should be:

To provide efficient and effective intercity passenger rail mobility in those travel markets where passenger rail offers a trip-time and service quality competitive travel option consistent with the goal of continual reduction in Federal operating subsidies required to provide service.

With this mission clearly established, then FRA and Amtrak can establish meaningful performance measures that hold Amtrak accountable for accomplishing that mission. Obviously, meaningful benchmarks will help both Amtrak and those of us in Congress measure its efforts at reform. In fact, failure to meet benchmarks will be a good reason to lessen or terminate these excessive subsidies.

My colleagues may say that the bill contains benchmark reforms under section 208, Metrics and Standards. The section reads:

Within 180 days . . . develop new or improve existing metrics and minimum standards for measuring the performance and service quality of intercity passenger train operations, including cost recovery, on-time performance and minutes of delay, ridership, on-board services, stations, facilities, equipment, and other services. Such metrics, at a minimum, shall include the percentage of avoidable and fully allocated operating costs covered by passenger revenues on each route, ridership per train mile operated, measures of on-time performance and delays incurred by intercity passenger rail.

Exactly what reforms are contained within these metrics and standards? There is no mission, no goals, and no benchmarks for operating subsidies and, as I said, quite frankly, no reform.

If the authorizers were truly offering operating metrics, they would have year-over-year improvement on metrics applied on a route-by-route business line or corporate basis on some of the following:

Operating ratio—operating revenues relative to operating costs, excluding depreciation to measure improvements in cost recovery; two, cash operating loss—would measure revenue expense improvements; three, savings from reform initiative—while the operating loss includes these savings, monitoring these savings allows for tracking the implementation of structural reform improvements; four, cash operating loss for passenger mile—an overall efficiency measure; five, labor productivity—passenger mile per employee; and finally, six, equipment reliability—percent of units out of service.

The other thing missing from Amtrak oversight has been real teeth. So I propose changing the language in section 210 from being permissive, which says the FRA ''may'' withhold grants from trains that don't measure up, to being mandatory, to say that FRA ''shall'' withhold grants from trains that don't measure up.

Today, the Secretary of Transportation has the ability to discontinue service on specific routes, but none have been proposed for elimination because perhaps there is no mission

statement for Amtrak on which to make a determination for closure.

This measure I propose does not push Amtrak off the cliff, but it recognizes we cannot afford for Amtrak to be all things to all people. It requires Amtrak to take a degree of responsibility that has been lacking in the use of the taxpayers' money. It would require Amtrak to improve efficiency and effectiveness of its service, to reduce the demands it makes of our taxpayers, including, where appropriate, recognizing that passenger rail is not the best option in all places.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be delayed until we finish this discussion.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to respond to Senator BOND's amendment, but I first ask the Senator from Missouri whether the delay he experienced this morning was due to congestion on the highways?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, that is what we all live with, I assure my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I just wanted to see whether there was any personal direct experience with congestion on the roads. I don't think there is a city or a town in this country, a highway that doesn't experience incredible pressure from its expanded use; will the Senator agree?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I agree with that. Of course, I would agree in some areas there are no rail lines available to relieve that congestion. While many metropolitan areas do have rail lines, they are definitely an efficient alternative. In many areas of the country, people do not have rail service, existing rails. So rails cannot solve all of our transportation congestion problems.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his suggestion that we expand rail service all across this country.

Mr. BOND. I didn't say that, no.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That was the interpretation. The Senator said there wasn't rail service available in lots of places. I take the positive side of that statement and say let's get on with our task of providing service.

While I appreciate the Senator's perspective, I believe there is no need for this amendment. It covers some of the same debate we have already voted on as part of the discussion. This amendment establishes a new mission for Amtrak and sets a new standard by which Amtrak and operating subsidies for Amtrak services should be judged. While I can agree with the general principles of the mission statement, it largely covers issues already contained in existing Federal law related to Amtrak and is, therefore, redundant.

We have seen Amtrak getting expanded use, but we have to look at what has happened in our society, what the conditions are that have put so much pressure on Amtrak. When we look at the growth in population alone, since Amtrak became a quasi-government corporation, the population of this country has expanded by 100 million people in barely over 35 years. It was never thought that our aviation system would be so strained because of inadequate infrastructure, and whatever the reasons, that it cannot be relied upon. One out of four flights is late, appointments are missed, crowding is standard, our highways are jammed. Maybe in some parts of the country we don't see the congestion we see in many of the metropolitan areas. But highways are notoriously slow-moving now because of expanded traffic.

So Amtrak has been under the same pressure. And thank goodness we have Amtrak in existence. We have seen more rapid service from Amtrak and more riders—over 26 million passengers in the last year. So when we look at Amtrak's performance, we have to consider under what conditions it operates. I think it is fair to say that Amtrak was never financed at the level it should have been to be an up-to-date, modern railroad in this country.

I have had the opportunity, as we know, to ride one of the French trains, TGV, in which a trip of just over 200 miles from Paris to Brussels, where our NATO headquarters exists, is 1 hour 20 minutes. If anything similar to that could ever be achieved with Amtrak, we would reduce the congestion in the sky substantially. It is so crowded in the air these days, separations are narrowed, and we are expecting over 5,000 new light jets into our system in the next 10 years.

We have to look at the expectations Amtrak has had to live with over this period of time. Insufficient capital, that is where it all started, and it has continued to make it very difficult for Amtrak to produce the kind of service we want. I believe they ought to be responsible for maintaining the quality of service, for providing the data that is required on what progress has been lacking. Current law already requires Amtrak to minimize Government subsidies and provide high-quality rail service.

I believe the real goal of this amendment is to reduce or eliminate Federal operating support for long-distance routes and other services where current infrastructure problems or ontime performance limits the service quality. Of course, as I said earlier, these problems resulting from insufficient capital expenditures and also hosting freight railroad delays are addressed by this bill.

Most of the accountability Senator BOND desires is already in our bill through requirements of a 5-year plan, through the reduction of the operating subsidy by 40 percent. Our bill calls for changes that are significant as we attempt to put them in place. That is where we are going.

While the Senator's amendment also requires the Secretary to eliminate funding for any route not meeting Amtrak's long-distance plan required under the bill, S. 294 already gives the Secretary this authority. But our bill preserves some flexibility for the Secretary to continue a long-distance route if Amtrak could not implement a plan or did not meet the goals of a plan for legitimate reasons or events beyond Amtrak's control. Heaven forbid if we have another serious hurricane or terrorist attack. The Secretary should have the ability to take these situations into consideration when judging whether Amtrak meets the requirements demanded under the law.

I look forward to debating this amendment further. I certainly am open to discussion with the Senator from Missouri on his amendment. But as it is currently drafted, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to respond to my friend from New Jersey and point out that while I may have had some operating delays coming into downtown Washington this morning because of the rain, I am not the only one. Service reliability continues to plague Amtrak. Amtrak systemwide in 2007 had ontime performance through August at only 68 percent and long-distance ontime performance was only 40 percent.

The Senator points out that there are constraints on Amtrak. With the exception of Connecticut, which I believe has its lines, most of the Amtrak lines run on lines established, bought, and paid for by freight railroads. For the lines to be kept operating, they have to continue to use freight.

If the chairman of the subcommittee is proposing that we build a national network of passenger rails—buy the land, buy the equipment, install the rails—I will be happy to take a look at the numbers that would be involved, whether they are billions or trillions, but I question whether we could make that investment.

What I have stated only in this amendment is that we should come to an agreement on what the mission of Amtrak is. What is it supposed to do? If you don't know where you are going, it is hard to tell when you have gotten there. Yes, we put money into a capital operating plan, a 5-year plan in 2005. There were supposed to be operating savings. The operating savings are not being realized. What I propose is simply good management techniques.

My colleague has run a successful business, and I assume to run a business he had to have a mission and he had to have standards and goals by which to judge the achievement of that mission. S. 294 talks about all kinds of metrics, but it doesn't say there are any goals. How do you know if you

have gotten there? Where are you going? You don't know.

Maybe I have missed it, but I don't think any of us are clear on the clearly stated mission of Amtrak and any standards by which the achievement of that mission should be judged. I would be happy to have a discussion—and this is the appropriate place to do it—on what should be the mission of Amtrak. Maybe for my edification, I ask my friend from New Jersey to cite to me what the written mission of Amtrak is because I will have to admit, I am not familiar with that specific mission statement and the standards and goals by which Amtrak and the FRA and we in Congress can judge the effective accomplishment of the objectives within the parameter of that mission. Through the Chair, I ask my friend from New Jersey to enlighten me.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for asking this question at this moment because I have here existing law, which is continued in S. 294. Here, in existing law, it says the purpose of the management is:

> By using innovative operating and marketing concepts, Amtrak shall provide intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation that completely develops the potential of modern rail transportation to meet the intercity and commuter passenger transportation needs of the United States.

The first goal is to:

> use its best business judgment in acting to minimize the U.S. Government subsidies, including—

And it lists a number of these things which I will submit for my colleague and friend to take a look at and see if these questions are not already dealt with.

Yes, we have to be more diligent. There is no doubt we have to fill the board of Amtrak's open positions. We have not done that. We want to expand the board to a more significant body of opinion. We are doing all kinds of things.

I have an affection for the State of Missouri, having been a soldier there many years ago and trying to dig foxholes in the Ozark Mountains. We know what steels the spine of those people who live in Missouri now. It is the depth and the quality of the rock upon which most of Missouri is built. That is why the railroad contributes so much, for instance, from Chicago to St. Louis, Kansas City to Kansas City.

But in the final analysis, I think it is important to note a significant difference between business operations. I was fortunate enough to run a fairly large company; but business to business. However, it is clearly stated that Amtrak is a not-for-profit organization. When we look at what happens with good business operations and think of the subsidy that has been given to the airlines—it was as a result of a terrible calamity in American history, 9/11—but over $20 billion has been given to the airlines, for-profit businesses. They are doing very well right now, I might add, and still getting subsidies.

I think, in fairness, we will have a chance to look at this further. We are pressed by several things, not the least of which is that there are others who would like to be included in the debate. I will be happy to loan the Senator from Missouri my copy of the existing law, if he would like to borrow it for a while.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if I may respond, I don't see any clearly defined mission. If my colleague doesn't agree that Amtrak should be providing efficient and effective passenger service in those travel markets in which passenger rail offers a trip time and service quality, competitive or complementary travel option consistent with the goal of continuing to reduce Federal operating subsidies—we are not saying it should be a for-profit company, but it certainly should not be a continual growing loss operation.

I believe we must have some discipline that I do not see in the law and particularly saying ''best business practices''—best business practices to do what?

I hope we can continue this discussion, and I thank the Chair and my colleagues for the time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I understand we are ready to go to morning business.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I had previously requested the right to speak for 30 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That had been granted.

AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk this morning about the President's request for $190-plus billion in emergency funding for the war in Iraq and for activities in Afghanistan.

Before I do that, however, I wish to mention the subject of Iran. I notice in the paper this morning, and I noticed the other day in a press conference by President Bush, he made a reference to world war III in a description of the issues with Iran. I am very concerned about what I hear from this administration. This administration has had a history of describing for us how they see the world. Many of us have spent a lot of time in classified, top-secret briefings with members of this administration, some of whom are now speaking out now about Iran. They include Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Vice President DICK CHENEY, and others. We have had plenty of experience in top-secret briefings with them in which they described circumstances with respect to the country of Iraq.

It turns out what we were told in top-secret briefings about Iraq was not accurate. No one has done the in-depth investigation to find out why that was the case. It appears to me, in some cases that which was described to us by top-level folks in this administration about Iraq prior to the Iraq war—in some cases, it turns out they either should have known, and in some cases may have known, that what they were saying to the Congress and to the American people was not accurate.

My point is this. I think there is precious little credibility on the part of the administration on these issues. I do not—I would say most of my colleagues feel the same—do not want this administration moving off precipitously based on information they have, to take military action of any type against another country. They certainly cannot in my judgment do that without the consent of Congress. I believe they would have a very difficult time getting the consent the Congress, given the lack of credibility in this administration on many of these issues.

These are important issues. Preventing the country of Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon is a very important mission, in my judgment. But we will best accomplish that through diplomatic means with other countries, particularly with the Europeans and the Russians and many others. I must say my own view is that the foreign policy of this administration—I regret to say it—has largely been an inept and a clumsy foreign policy at best. We face, as a result of it, very substantial challenges around the world. My hope is that we see much more action on diplomacy and negotiation and working to form alliances and much less front-page headlines by members of this administration.

Now I wish to talk about priorities. I wish to talk about the President's request for $196 billion in emergency funding, none of it paid for. But first I want to talk about this little girl. This little girl, her name is Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight. Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight is from the Crow Nation in Montana. She loved to dance, as you can see—sparkling, beautiful eyes, 5 years old, loved to dance the Indian dances.

Ta'shon's grandmother testified at a hearing I held at the Crow Reservation in Montana, with my colleague, Senator TESTER. Her grandmother told us a story about Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight. Ta'Shon died, by the way. This little girl with the bright eyes and the love of dancing isn't with us anymore. Ta'Shon had health problems. Last year she was taken, many times, to the Crow Indian Health Service clinic. They were treating her—after they had diagnosed various things—they were treating her for depression. It turned out this little girl didn't have

depression, this little girl had a cancerous tumor, terminal cancer.

At one point, her grandfather, who was with her at the clinic, pointed out the bulbous condition of her fingertips and toes and said to the health care folks that it appeared to him this reflected a lack of oxygen to the body and they ought to check on what was causing that. That concern was dismissed.

On another visit, her grandmother asked the doctor to eliminate the possibility that this child was suffering from cancer or leukemia, but the family's concerns went unheeded. In August of 2006, Ta'Shon was rushed from the Crow clinic to the St. Vincent Hospital in Billings, MT, airlifted to the Denver Children's Hospital, diagnosed with an untreatable, incurable form of cancer. Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight lived 3 more months after the tumor was discovered, in what the grandmother said was unmedicated pain, and then died.

I show you this picture of this beautiful young girl because her family said it was all right for me to use her image to describe the serious problem of health care on American Indian reservations. Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight didn't get the health care we would expect, and she died. We had, on the floor of the Senate, a bill that would have provided 3.8 million American kids who do not now have health insurance coverage—it would have provided them health insurance coverage. But the President says that is not the priority, so he vetoed the bill. I am trying to bring a bill to the floor of the Senate right now that extends and reauthorizes the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. It has been 8 years, and I am likely to have to have a cloture motion filed on the motion to proceed to it, because for some it may not be a priority, apparently.

This ought to be a priority. Yes, for this little girl, her memory, and the health of other children similar to her, it ought to be a priority in this country. I hope this Senate will make it a priority. We certainly did on the Children's Health Insurance Program, and we came up short in the House of being able to override the President's veto. But we will try again.

Isn't this something most of us believe represents an urgency? As I have said before, I don't know what is in second, third or fourth place in what is important in people's lives, but I know what is in first place. It is their children and their children's health.

Having said that about priorities and values and about someone looking at what we spend our money on 100 years from now, looking back, the historians, through the rearview mirror, will say: What was that group of people—what were they doing? What was their value system? What were they about? They said they didn't believe—at least some of them didn't believe covering children with health insurance was the most significant priority. They didn't believe that adequate funding for the Indian Health Service was the most significant priority. Nobody knew that Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight lived several months in unmedicated pain, lived many months before that in an undiagnosed condition, with a terminal illness; nobody knew that, so that wasn't a priority.

So let's look at the priorities. The President has proposed to us, in this year, that we spend $196 billion in emergency funding to continue in Iraq and Afghanistan. By my calculation, that is nearly $16 billion a month, $4 billion a week, and not one penny of it is paid for. The President said: I declare an emergency. Put it on top of the debt.

Then the President went to Arkansas, at exactly the same time, and held a press conference at a political rally and said: I am going to be the fiscally responsible President, and I am going to stop this profligate spending.

I don't know, maybe he thinks people are not paying attention, people are not reading what is going on. Here is what the Congressional Budget Office says. They estimate a $2.4 trillion long-term war cost.

> The U.S. wars in Iraq and Afghanistan could cost taxpayers a total of $2.4 trillion by 2017 when counting the huge interest costs because combat is being financed with borrowed money, according to the . . . the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

We are borrowing the money because the President wants to spend the money, but he doesn't want to ask anybody to pay for it. Here is what this war is costing, all of it borrowed. The soldiers fight at the order of the Commander in Chief, and when they come back, they and their children can pay the bills. That is not a value system that makes much sense to me.

Now, the President says: I want another $196 billion, and, by the way, if you do not agree with that, you do not support the troops. He says: We will see who supports the troops.

Let me make another construct here. This is in some ways about supporting the troops, but it is much more than that. It is about supporting the contractors, because a substantial portion of this war is contracted out. I want to go through with my colleagues about whom we are supporting with this money as well, contractors for whom there is no oversight.

The Secretary of State was up here yesterday answering questions about that. I hope the Secretary of State is properly chastened, reading the stories and finally understanding what these contractors have been doing, with no oversight and virtually no accountability.

Let me go through a list of these contract issues so that people understand, and the President would understand. This is not just about ''are you supporting the troops,'' it is about are you supporting the contractors with virtually no oversight.

This is from September 21, 2007, the New York Times:

> Military officials said that contracts worth $6 billion to provide essential supplies to American troops in Kuwait, Iraq and Afghanistan, including food, water and shelter were under review by criminal investigators. In addition, $88 billion in contracts and programs, including those for body armor for American soldiers and material for Iraqi and Afghan security forces, are being audited for financial irregularities.

So when the President says: Are you supporting the soldiers? My question is this: Are you watching the contractors? Because the American taxpayer is getting fleeced. This does not support soldiers, this undermines the soldiers. Of $6 billion in contracts reviewed, the Pentagon says: The Army reported that it had 78 cases of fraud and corruption under investigation, had obtained 20 criminal indictments, and had uncovered over $15 million in bribes. That is from the same article.

Contract abuse. Of the enormous expenditures of American and Iraqi money on the Iraq reconstruction program, at least $40 billion overall has been criticized for reasons that go well beyond the corruption cases that have been uncovered so far.

Weak oversight, poor planning, and endless security problems have contributed to many of the program's failures. Some $40 billion has been spent. No, this is not in support of troops. This is in support of the administration's mission by which they hire contractors and shovel the money in their direction.

Most of us have read the stories about this, but they are pretty unbelievable. We sent 185,000 AK–47s to Iraq; 185,000. They can only account for 75,000 of them, so 110,000 AK–47s, bought and paid for by the American taxpayers, are missing. Some undoubtedly will land in the hands of the insurgents being aimed at American troops. We sent 170,000 pistols; 80,000 of them are missing. That is unbelievably inept on the part of those whom we ought to expect to be accountable and to make certain the taxpayers' money is spent wisely, No. 1; No. 2, that if you are sending weapons to Iraq, they end up in the right hands, not the wrong hands.

It is unbelievable that we have a couple hundred thousand AK–47s and pistols that we sent to Iraq, we do not have the foggiest idea where they are, yet we know some of them end up in the wrong hands.

We have trained about 360,000 police and soldiers for security in the armed forces and the police forces. We have trained 360,000 of them. We believe there are somewhere around 180,000 to 273,000 still around, but no one knows. Absenteeism is up around 50 percent. There is no official document in the Federal Government that tells us how many exist in the security forces at the moment; and, by the way, today we are only training about one-third of the number of Iraqis as we were training before the surge. So we have reduced by two-thirds the number we are now training, even as we are losing a substantial portion of the 360,000 who have

already been trained for security, which begs the question: When we leave Iraq, and we will, is it up to the Iraqis to provide for their own security? After you have trained 360,000 people to do so, have you not trained enough Iraqis, so if the Iraqis have the will to provide for their own security, they can do that? One would expect so.

Between April of 2003 and June of 2004, $12 billion of U.S. currency was hauled to Iraq in C–130s on big pallets. It was disbursed by what was called the Coalition Provisional Authority, which we created.

At least $9 billion of that is missing. Some have said: So what? It does not matter. This money was Iraq's own money. This was the oil money we had for safekeeping. So if we lost the money that came from Iraq oil, so what?

Well, here is the ''so what.'' Retired ADM David Oliver, then the CPA's director of management and budget, when asked by a BBC reporter about the cash that they airlifted.

I have no idea. I can't tell you whether the money went to the right things or didn't, nor do I actually think it's important.

Tuesday, October 23, that is this week, an independent oversight agency said it could not complete an audit of a $1.2 billion contract to train Iraqi policemen because the records kept by the State Department and by DynCorp International, the contractor, were inaccurate and in disarray. . . . The documents were not sufficient in order for us to do an audit.

The Secretary of State is up here this week testifying. I do not know whether she was asked about this. But this is under her stewardship, her responsibility.

The State Department paid $43.8 million for manufacturing and temporary storage of a residential camp that has never been used. The State Department's payment of $36.4 million for weapons and equipment, including body armor, armored vehicles, and communications equipment could not be accounted for.

This week again: Among the problems identified before the audit was suspended were duplicate payments, the purchase of a never used $1.8 million x-ray scanner, and payments of $387,000 to DynCorp officials in hotels rather than other available accommodations.

I should have brought a towel that Henry Bunting brought to a hearing I held last year to show you symbolically what has been fundamentally wrong. Henry Bunting was a purchaser for Halliburton or Kellogg, Brown and Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton. He said: I worked in Kuwait. I was supposed to buy the equipment and so on. They wanted towels, hand towels for the troops. So I made out an order for hand towels, because Halliburton was furnishing the towels for the troops. My supervisor said: No, you cannot order that particular hand towel, you have to order a hand towel with a logo on it that was embroidered that says KBR. We want the logo of our company on the hand towel.

Bunting said: But it will triple the price. The supervisor said: It doesn't matter. The taxpayer is paying for this. This is a cost-plus contract. Then Bunting went on to tell us about $7,600 a month for leasing an SUV, about paying $40 or $45 a case for Coca-Cola. He went on to tell us all these stories: It does not matter, the taxpayer is paying for it. '

It is unbelievable, if you take the lid off this and smell a little bit about what is happening with these contracts.

The President says: I want $196 billion in additional funding. I want it as an emergency. I do not want anybody to pay for it. I want to put it on top of the debt. That is almost $16 billion a month this year, $4 billion a week, and I do not want any questions about it, and we are going to see, he says, who supports American troops.

Well, that money is also going to support the same kind of incompetence in contracting that has been facing the American taxpayer now for about 4 years. I think hard questions need to be asked, yes, of the President, the Vice President, the heads of agencies who are responsible for this: How do you justify this? How do you justify insisting that this Congress come up with $196 billion and then tell us that we cannot afford, we do not have enough money to care for Ta'Shon Rain Littlelight? She died because the health care did not exist for her. That is not a priority for this administration. The President says we cannot afford it, despite the fact that the bill was fully paid for, Children's Health Insurance. We cannot afford sufficient money for the Indian health care system, so Ta'Shon died.

What is the value system here? What are the priorities? Once again the President says: Well, the priorities are we need the $196 billion. It is an emergency. If you do not support it, you do not support the troops. The fact is, this entire Senate supports our troops. We have demonstrated it time and time and time again. But it is also time for us to tell the President: We do not support a strategy that says: Let's keep spending money and not paying for it. We do not support a strategy that has us in the middle of a civil war, going door to door in Baghdad, when Osama bin Laden last week sent us another tape. Osama bin Laden is the one who boasted about attacking our country. He is the one who boasted about killing innocent Americans. Our National Intelligence Estimate of July of this year says the greatest threat to our country is al-Qaida and its leadership, and they are reconstituting themselves and developing new training camps, and rebuilding. They are in a ''secure'' or safe hideaway in northern Pakistan. There ought not be one acre of ground on this planet that is secure or safe for those who murdered innocent Americans. But instead of dealing with the greatest threat to this country, and that is eliminating the leadership of al-Qaida, this administration has us going door to door in Baghdad, in the middle of a civil war, and now says—they say they want $196 billion in additional funding, and they want it as emergency funding, $4 billion a week for the next year.

I think there is something horribly wrong with what is going on here. I think this Congress has to tell this President that change is on the way.

I want to mention something that relates to this, because I do not know what this Congress is going to do with all of these funding requests. But I know the next time we vote on emergency funding requests by the President, I am going to offer a couple of amendments. They may be out of order, they may be blue slipped, they may be whatever, but we are going to vote on them one way or the other. That is, we need to start paying for that which we are spending money on.

The President can go to a political rally down in Arkansas and say: This is a new George W. Bush, and now I am going to be fiscally conservative. But the fact is, he has recommended all of this spending, the highest amount of spending in the history of our country from this administration. He now suggests that we continue to spend but not pay for it.

I want to talk about a couple of payfors. My colleagues have often heard me speak about this, but I am going to offer this again the next time we have an emergency funding bill.

There is an enterprising reporter named David Evans from Bloomberg. David Evans went to the Cayman Islands, and he went to this little place on Church Street, a quiet little five-story building, and reported that there are 12,748 corporations living here in this little four-story white building.

They are not there. This is a legal fiction created by lawyers so companies could avoid paying taxes. Well, I have got some legislation that would stop that dead in its tracks. You cannot move an address for the purpose of not paying U.S. taxes you rightfully owe. If you are not doing your central business there, you cannot claim this is where you are; we tax you as if you never left. I intend to offer that as an amendment to what the President would suggest we spend money for, and not pay for. I would suggest that: Let's begin paying for some of this.

Runaway manufacturing plants, that is another one. I have a piece of legislation I have introduced on runaway manufacturing plants.

We actually pay somebody, if they close their American manufacturing plant, fire their workers, move the jobs to China, we say: Good for you. We want to give you a tax cut.

That is totally nuts. I have tried four times to close it down. There are over 50 Senators who actually support this perverse tax break. About 44 Senators

have supported me, and I am going to keep pushing this until we have a deep reservoir of common sense that says it is crazy for us to say, if you close your plant in our country and ship your jobs overseas to China, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Indonesia, we will give you a tax break for doing so. That makes no sense at all.

Third, I have a bill I have introduced ending benefits of abusive foreign cross-border leasing transaction. The most pernicious of all of the things going on is American companies buying foreign assets belonging to foreign governments. Let me give an example. Wachovia Bank, formerly First Union, one of the big banks, entered into a sale in-lease out transaction to purchase a sewer in Bochum, Germany. Why would an American bank want to buy a sewer—not a sewer in America, a German city sewer system? Because they want to take ownership and be able to get large depreciation on property that otherwise would not be depreciated because it is owned by a government. So they lease the sewer back to the city which will continue to use the sewer system as if they still own it, but that financial transaction turns out to be about a $175 million tax savings to an American bank. Of all of the unbelievably pernicious tax cuts that exist, this is it. The Finance Committee has taken some action. Good for them. They need to take more action. I testified a couple of weeks ago. I say shut it off, even retroactively. There is no sense supporting something that was fundamentally wrong. No one can justify this nonsense.

I am going to offer these three and several other provisions to anything we have on the floor of the Senate that calls for emergency funding. The emergency funding request in itself needs to be inspected carefully. Is there a change of course in Iraq? If not, why not? Is this support of the troops, or is it to support contractors?

A young woman named Bunnatine Greenhouse had the courage to give her job up because she was willing to stand up and say: This is the most blatant contract abuse I have witnessed as an employee of the Federal Government. She was the highest ranking civilian official in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They are the ones who monitor and approve the contracts. She stood up to the old boys network and said: What you are doing is wrong. It is the most blatant abuse. She is talking about contracts that were worth billions of dollars, many of them awarded sole source to Halliburton; Kellogg, Brown & Root; and other companies. She blew the whistle. She paid for it with her job. She was an outstanding public official. She had the courage that was necessary to speak out.

We need to have similar courage. We need to say to the President: This $196 billion is not about demonstrating whether one supports the troops. All of us support the troops. A substantial portion of this money is also going to go to contractors for which there has been no oversight. There is the greatest waste and fraud and abuse in the history of this country in recent years under this administration's contracting out virtually everything, much of it sole-source, very large, no-bid contracts. This Congress needs to weigh in on these issues.

With respect to the value system, the President says we can't afford to cover 3.8 more children who don't have health insurance with a bill that we fully pay for. He says: We can't do that. That is not important. I am not willing to sign that. I will veto it. I will stop it.

Then he goes to Arkansas and says: I am a fiscal conservative. I want to shape everybody up.

Then the next day he sends us a $196 billion request. Give me some emergency money, $16 billion a month, $4 billion a week, none of it paid for, piled on top of the debt.

That is not a fiscal conservative where I come from. That is not what they call those kinds of actions. All of us want this country to succeed. All of us want this country to do well. We need to put this country on track. Yes, we need fiscal responsibility, absolutely. We also need a foreign policy that makes sense. We need to change course in Iraq. We need to describe our values at home through the legislation we pass that represents the best of what America can do. Yes, that includes providing health insurance for children who don't have it, so that young girls such as Ta'Shon have a chance at life.

There is so much debate these days that is thoughtless rather than thoughtful at a time when we so desperately need thoughtful discussion about so many important issues that deal with America's future. My hope is that in the coming weeks, we can engage in some very thoughtful discussion about public policy and how to advance this country's interests. All of us want the same thing. We want this country to succeed, to provide expanded opportunity for people. But we face enormous challenges. Those challenges will not be met and resolved by the kind of sloganeering we hear too often these days and by chaining ourselves to certain public policies that we already know do not work. We must force change.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have some comments I want to make about the FISA legislation. But before doing so, I commend my colleague from North Dakota. I have joined with him on so many occasions in the past. Once again, his eloquence and passion about these issues is evident this morning. We have worked together. We have sponsored legislation on a number of matters. I will join him in the efforts he raised today. He has described a situation that most Americans find horrific.

As to the point he makes on the issue of supporting our troops, I find it offensive that anyone would suggest, because we disagree with the policy, we are somehow putting our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen at risk. I strongly suggest, as does my colleague from North Dakota, that our continuing policy in Iraq has made us less safe, less secure, more vulnerable, more isolated in the world and, in fact, the very soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines we admire are in greater jeopardy because of a continuation of this policy. I will be joining with him and others as we try to bring this to a halt, not in 2009 or 2013 but hopefully this year. I commend him for his comments.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for 6 years the President has demonstrated time and again that he doesn't respect the role of Congress, nor does he respect the rule of law. It is the latter point that I want to address this morning because it is the rule of law which draws us all together, regardless of politics, ideology, or party. It is the rule of law, not of men, which we swear to uphold when we take the oath of office in this Chamber, as Members do in the other Chamber, and certainly as the President does on January 20 every 4 years.

For 6 years this President has used scare tactics to prevent the Congress from reining in his abuse of authority. A case in point is the current direction in which this body appears to be headed as we prepare to reform and extend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Many of the unprecedented rollbacks to the rule of law by this administration have been made in the name of national security.

The Bush administration has relentlessly focused our Nation's resources and manpower on a war of choice in Iraq. That ill-conceived war has broken our military, squandered our resources, and emboldened our enemies.

The President's wholesale disregard of the rule of law has compounded the damage done in Iraq, made our Nation less secure, and as a direct consequence of these acts, we are far less secure, far more vulnerable, and certainly far more isolated in the world today.

Consider the scandal at Abu Ghraib, where Iraqi prisoners were subjected to inhumane, humiliating acts by U.S. personnel charged with guarding them.

Consider Guantanamo Bay. Rather than helping to protect the Nation by aggressively prosecuting prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, these individuals have instead become the symbol of our weakened moral standing in the world. Who would have ever imagined it?

Consider the secret prisons run by the Central Intelligence Agency and the practice of extraordinary rendition that allows them to evade U.S. law regarding torture.

Consider the shameful actions of our outgoing Attorney General who politicized prosecutions in the U.S. Attorney's Office, who was more committed to serving the President who appointed him than laws he was sworn to uphold as Attorney General.

Consider the Military Commissions Act, a law that allows evidence obtained through torture to be admitted into evidence.

It denies individuals the right to counsel.

It denies them the right to invoke the Geneva Conventions.

And it denies them the single most important and effective safeguard of liberty man has ever known, the right of habeas corpus, permitting prisoners to be brought before a court to determine whether their detainment is lawful.

Warrantless wiretapping, torture, the list goes on.

Each of these policies share two things in common.

First, they have severely weakened our ability to prosecute the global war on terrorism, if for no other reason than they have made it harder, if not impossible, to build the kind of international support and cooperation we absolutely need to succeed in our efforts against stateless terrorism.

And second, each has only been possible because the U.S. Congress has not been able to stop the President in his unprecedented expansion of executive power, although, I might add, some in this body have certainly tried.

Whether these policies were explicitly authorized is beside the point. In every instance, Congress has been unable to hold this administration to account for violating the rule of law and our Constitution. In each instance, Republicans in the Congress have prevented this body from telling this administration that a state of war is not a blank check.

And those are not my words. Those are the words of Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, nominated by President Ronald Reagan.

And today, it appears that we are prepared to consider the proposed renewal of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, a law that whatever form it eventually takes will almost certainly permit the Bush administration to broadly eavesdrop on American citizens.

Legislation, as currently drafted, that would grant retroactive immunity to telecommunications companies that helped this administration violate the civil liberties of Americans and the law of this Nation.

While it may be true that the proposed legislation is an improvement over existing law, it remains fundamentally flawed because it fails to protect the privacy rights of Americans or hold the Executive or the private sector accountable if they choose to ignore the law.

That is why I will not stand on the floor of the Senate and be silent about the direction we are about to take.

It is time to say: No more.

No more trampling on our Constitution.

No more excusing those who violate the rule of law. These are fundamental, basic, eternal principles. They have been around, some of them, for as long as the Magna Carta.

They are enduring.

What they are not is temporary. And what we do not do in a time where our country is at risk is abandon them.

My father served as executive trial counsel at the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals in 1945 and 1946.

What America accomplished at those historic trials was not a foregone conclusion. It took courage. When Joseph Stalin and even a leader as great and noble as Winston Churchill wanted to simply execute the Nazi leaders, we didn't back down in this country from our belief that these men, as terrible as they were—some of the worst violators in the court of history of mankind—ought to have a trial. We did not give in to vengeance.

As then, the issue before us today is the same.

Does America stand for all that is still right with our world or do we retreat in fear?

Do we stand for justice that secures America or do we act out of vengeance that weakens us?

I am well aware this issue is seen as political. I believe Democrats were elected to help strengthen our Nation, elected to help restore our standing in the world.

I believe we were elected to ensure that this Nation adheres to the rule of law and to stop the administration's assault on our Constitution.

But the rule of law is not the province of any one political party. It is the province of each and every one of us as American citizens, on our watch and our generation, to make sure we are safer because of its inviolable provisions.

Mr. President, I know this bill has not been reported out of the Judiciary Committee yet.

But I am here today because if I have learned anything in my 26 years in this body, particularly over the last 7 years, it is that if you wait until the end to voice your concerns, you will have waited too long. That is why I have written the majority leader informing him that I will object to any effort to bring the legislation to the Senate floor for consideration.

I hope my colleague, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY is able to remove this language from the FISA bill. PAT LEAHY is as strong a defender of the Constitution as any Member of this body.

But if he is unable to do so, I am prepared to filibuster this bill.

President Bush is right about one thing: The debate is about security but not in the way he imagines it.

He believes we have to give up certain rights to be safe.

I believe the choice between moral authority and security is a false choice.

I believe it is precisely when you stand up and protect your rights that you become stronger, not weaker, as a nation.

The damage that was done to our country on 9/11 was stunning. It changed the world forever.

But when you start diminishing our rights as a people, you compound that tragedy. You cannot protect America in the long run if you fail to protect our Constitution. It is that simple.

History will likely judge this President harshly for his war of choice and for fighting it with a disregard for our most cherished principles.

But history is about tomorrow. We must act today and stand up for the Constitution and the rule of law.

Mr. President, this is the moment. At long last, let us rise up to it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in morning business.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, a phrase has been used recently called ''the tipping point.'' The American people will very soon be asked to support a type of global warming cap-and-trade bill, legislation that has already had a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee. There are a couple other bills in the background.

These bills come at a time when the science is overwhelmingly taking away the basis for alarm. I am going to use terms this morning. The alarmists are the ones who are mostly out in California, the far-left extremists, the Hollywood elitists, and others who feel this is a great alarm, the world is coming to an end—the same ones who said that another ice age was coming back in the middle 1970s. So we need to know what terms we are using.

An abundance of new peer-reviewed studies, analyses, and data-error discoveries in the past several months have prompted scientists to declare that fear of catastrophic manmade global warming—I am using their terms now, the scientists' terms—''bites the dust'' and the scientific underpinnings for alarm are ''falling apart.''

I have addressed this subject on this floor about a dozen times since 2003.

But I want to talk to you today about something that is really kind of unprecedented; that is, to talk only about things that have happened this year, or mostly in the last 7 months, that people are just not aware of.

The media is very much opposed to the idea there might be another side to the global warming story. So we are going to be talking about a ''tipping point'' in a little different relationship than you have been hearing about it recently. I will detail how even committed leftwing scientists now believe the environmental movement has been ''co-opted'' into promoting global warming as a ''crisis,'' and I will expose the manufactured facade of ''consensus.''

The interesting thing is that everything I am going to be using is going to be what has happened just in the last 6 months. I will also address the economic factors of the so-called solutions to global warming and how they will have no measurable impact on the climate. But these so-called solutions will create huge economic harm for American families and the poor residents of the developing world who may see development hindered by unfounded climate fears.

We are currently witnessing an international awakening of scientists who are speaking out in opposition to former Vice President Al Gore, the United Nations, the Hollywood elitists, and the media-driven ''consensus'' on manmade global warming.

We have witnessed Antarctic ice grow to records levels since satellite monitoring began in the 1970s. We have witnessed NASA temperature data errors that have made 1934—instead of 1998—the hottest year on record in the United States. We have seen global average temperatures flat line since 1998 and the Southern Hemisphere cool in recent years.

When they talk about global warming, I have always conceded that the Northern Hemisphere is going through a warming period, as it did a cooling period back in the 1970s. But the Southern Hemisphere actually has been getting colder. This is all new stuff, as I say, in the last few months. These are new developments. They are but a sample of the new information coming out that continues to debunk the United Nations, former Vice President Al Gore, and the media-promoted ''consensus'' on global warming. But before we delve into these dramatic new scientific developments, it is important to take note of our pop culture propaganda campaign aimed at children, the most vulnerable of all of us.

In addition to Gore's entry last year into Hollywood fictional disaster films, other celebrity figures have attempted to jump into the game. Hollywood activist Leonardo DiCaprio decided to toss objective scientific truth out the window in his new scarefest ''The 11th Hour.'' DiCaprio refused to interview any scientists who disagreed with his dire vision of the future of the Earth. In fact, his film reportedly features physicist Steven Hawking making the unchallenged assertion that:

> The worst-case scenario is that Earth would become like its sister planet, Venus, with a temperature of 250 degrees centigrade.

I guess these worst-case scenarios pass for science in Hollywood these days. It also fits perfectly with DiCaprio's stated purpose of the film. DiCaprio said on May 20 of this year:

> I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future.

While those who went to watch DiCaprio's science fiction film may see his intended ''bleak future,'' it is DiCaprio who has been scared by the bleak box office numbers, as his film has failed to generate any significant audience interest.

Children are now the No. 1 target of the global warming fear campaign. DiCaprio announced his goal was to recruit young, eco-activists to the cause. ''We need to get kids young,'' he said, in a September 20 interview with USA Weekend.

Hollywood activist Laurie David, who is Vice President Gore's coproducer of ''An Inconvenient Truth,'' recently coauthored a children's global warming book with Cambria Gordon for Scholastic Books, entitled ''The Down-To-Earth Guide to Global Warming.'' David has made it clear that her goal is to influence young minds with her new book when she recently wrote an open letter to her children stating: ''We want you to grow up to be activists.'' Apparently, David and other activists are getting frustrated by the widespread skepticism on climate as reflected in both the United States and the U.K., according to the latest polls. It appears the alarmists are failing to convince adults to believe their increasingly shrill and unscientifically unfounded rhetoric, so they have decided to go after the kids.

But David should worry less about recruiting young activists and more about scientific accuracy. A science group found what it called a major ''scientific error'' in David's new kids' book on page 18. According to a Science and Public Policy Institute release on September 13—and I am going to quote right now—this is very significant:

> The authors (David and Gordon) present unsuspecting children with an altered temperature and CO_2 graph that reverses the relationship found in the scientific literature. The manipulation is critical because David's central premise posits that CO_2 drives temperature, yet the peer-reviewed literature is unanimous that CO_2 changes have historically followed temperature changes.

That is the reverse of the reality.

David has now been forced to publicly admit this significant scientific error in her book.

A Canadian high school student named McKenzie was shown Gore's climate horror film in four of her classes. Her response was:

> I really don't know why they keep showing it. It scares me.

In June, a fourth grade class in Portland, Maine's, East End Community School issued a dire climate report: ''Global warming is a huge pending global disaster'' read the elementary school kids' report, according to an article in the Portland Press Herald on June 14 of 2007. Remember, these are fourth graders issuing a dire global warming report.

This agenda of indoctrination and fear aimed at children is having an impact.

Nine-year-old Alyssa Luz-Ricca was quoted in the Washington Post, on April 6 of 2007, as saying: ''I am worried about it because I don't want to die.''

The same article explained: ''Psychologists say they're seeing an increasing number of young patients preoccupied by a climactic Armageddon.''

I was told by the parent of an elementary school kid last spring—this is kind of interesting because we had a 3-hour discussion with Al Gore, and afterwards, after it was over, a lady came up to me and she was from Maryland. She was a mother of an elementary school student, and she said they were required to actually watch this film, ''An Inconvenient Truth'' about once a month at school, and her child would come home and have nightmares about drowning in the film's predicted scary sea level rise.

The Hollywood global warming documentary ''Arctic Tale'' ends with a child actor telling kids: ''If your mom and dad buy a hybrid car, you'll make it easier for polar bears to get around.''

Unfortunately, children are hearing the scientifically unfounded doomsday message loudly and clearly. But the message kids are receiving is not a scientific one, it is a political message designed to create fear, nervousness, and ultimately recruit them to liberal activism.

There are a few hopeful signs. A judge in England has ruled that schools must issue a warning before they show Gore's film to children because of scientific inaccuracies and sentimental mush. This is a court. It is a judge in the U.K. Before they see it, they have to sign a disclaimer. In addition, there is a new kids' book called ''The Sky's Not Falling! Why It's OK to Chill About Global Warming.'' The book counters the propaganda from the pop culture.

The chart here shows ''The Sky's Not Falling!''

Objective, evidence-based science is beginning to crush hysteria. My speech today and these reports reveal that recent peer-reviewed scientific studies are totally refuting the ''Church of Manmade Global Warming.''

Meteorologist Joseph Conklin, who launched the skeptical Web site climatepolice.com in 2007, recently declared the ''global warming movement is falling apart.'' All the while, activists such as former Vice President Al Gore repeatedly continue to warn of a fast-approaching climate ''tipping point.''

I agree with Gore in this respect. Global warming may have reached a ''tipping point.'' The manmade global warming fear machine crossed the tipping point in 2007—this year. That is the reason today I am talking about things that are happening this year, things in the last 6 months. I am convinced the future climate historians will look back on 2007 as the year the global warming fears began to crumble. The situation we are now in is very similar to where we were in the late 1970s, when the coming ice age fears began to dismantle. Remember, it was Newsweek magazine which in the 1970s first proclaimed that meteorologists were almost unanimous in their view that a coming ice age would have negative impacts. It was also Newsweek in 1975 which originated the eerily similar ''tipping point''—they called it a tipping point at that time—rhetoric they are using today, except it was an ice age at that time.

Newsweek wrote on April 28, 1975, about coming ice age fears. They said:

> The longer the planners delay, the more difficult will they find it to cope with climatic change once the results become grim reality.

Of course, Newsweek essentially retracted their coming ice age article 29 years later in October of last year, 2006. People don't see the retractions, they get the hysteria of the moment.

Today, the greatest irony is that the U.N. and the media's climate hysteria grows louder as the case for alarmism fades away. While the scientific case grows weaker, the political and rhetorical proponents of climate fear are ramping up to offer hefty tax and regulatory solutions, both internationally and domestically, to solve the so-called crisis.

Skeptical climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball, formerly of the University of Winnipeg in Canada, wrote about the current state of the climate change debate earlier this month. This is a quote, I say to my colleagues:

> Imagine basing a country's energy and economic policy on an incomplete, unproven theory—a theory based entirely on computer models in which one minor variable (CO_2) is considered the sole driver for the entire global climate system.

How minor is that manmade CO_2 variable in the atmosphere?

Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo, the first director of Meteorology at the Weather Channel and former chairman of the American Meteorological Society's Committee on Weather Analysis and Forecasting, explained in August how minuscule mankind's CO_2 emissions are in relation to the Earth's atmosphere. This is what he said, and keep in mind we are talking about a guy who was the first director of meteorology at the Weather Channel.

> If the atmosphere was a 100 story building, our annual anthropogenic CO_2 contribution today would be equivalent to the linoleum on the first floor.

We use terms such as ''anthropogenic''—and many Members of this body are not sure that manmade gases are anthropogenic gases—and those who want to blame man for all of these problems that they try to make us believe are happening are saying anthropogenic gases are the problem.

Here are scientists who are totally debunking this.

Now, there are four essential components to debunking climate fears. Debunking catastrophic manmade global warming fears can be reduced to four essential points. Now, what I am going to do is read these points and go back and elaborate on each one.

First, recent climate changes on Earth lie well within the bounds of natural climate variability. Even the New York Times concedes this. U.N. temperature data shows that the late 20th century phase of global warming ended in 1998; new data for the Southern Hemisphere shows that a slight cooling is underway.

By the way, when we talk about IPCC, that is the United Nations; they are synonymous. That is where all this stuff started. A lot of things come from the United Nations. Currently, we are looking at a treaty called the Law of the Sea Treaty. It started in the United Nations—not in America's best interests. But the first thing we are going to do is talk about the recent climate changes on Earth, and we are going to talk about how they lie within natural variability.

The second thing we will talk about is almost all current public fear of global warming is being driven by unproven and untestable computer model fears of the future, which now even the United Nations concedes that the models—these are computer models; that is what all this stuff is based on—they do not account for half of the variability in nature and, thus, their predictions are not reliable. Even the United Nations agrees with that.

The third thing is debunking the relationship that the more CO_2 you have, the warmer the world is. That is very simplistic and it is untrue. Scientists are reporting in peer-reviewed literature that increasing CO_2 in the atmosphere will not have the catastrophic impact doomsters have been predicting. In fact, climate experts are discovering that you cannot distinguish the impact of human-produced greenhouse gases from natural climate variability. That is extremely significant and something that has come around in the last 6 or 7 months.

The fourth thing we will talk about is consensus. We hear so much about consensus. The more things that come out of science, where the scientists are saying, wait a minute, we were wrong. In a minute, I will be naming names of scientists who were marching the streets with Al Gore 10 years ago who now say they were wrong. When you talk about that today, those who are promoting this type of fear from the left, they use the word ''consensus.'' The climate change ''consensus'' exists. Well, it does not exist. Instead, the illusion that it does has been carefully manufactured for political, financial, and ideological purposes.

These four basic points form the foundation of the rational, evidence-based approach to climate science that has come to be called global warming skepticism.

Let's talk about the first one, essential point No. 1, that the Earth's climate is within the natural variability. On April 23, 2006, the article in the New York Times by Andrew Revkin stated—and I am quoting now from the New York Times:

> Few scientists agree with the idea that the recent spate of potent hurricanes, European heat waves, African drought and other weather extremes are, in essence, our fault—

Manmade gases.

> There is more than enough natural variability in nature to mask a direct connection, scientists say.

The Times is essentially conceding that no recent weather events fall outside the range of natural climate variability. On a slightly longer time scale, many scientific studies have shown the medieval and earlier warm periods were as warm or warmer than the Earth's current temperature—when there were no influences that were due to manmade gases. There were no SUVs around at that time.

Now, everything is blamed on global warming. Right now, the fires that are finally subsiding out in California, the disaster that has taken place, the first thing they say is it is due to global warming. It has nothing to do with global warming. When Al Gore made his global warming speech a year ago in February in New York—and coincidentally, it was on a day that set a new cold record for all time throughout the history of New York—a 2006 National Academy of Science, NAS, report discredited the now infamous ''hockey stick'' temperature graph. The study was created by the U.N. IPCC lead author Michael Mann. They took the temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere and showed that they were flat for 1,000 years. They then started spiking in the 20th century and causing them to go up. On this graph, this is the blade of the hockey stick.

The problem is, they didn't take into consideration things such as the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age. The NAS found evidence of both the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age, which is on the lower chart. It also expressed little confidence in Mann's conclusion that the 1990s were the hottest decade of the last millennium, and even less confidence that 1998 was the hottest year. In fact, we will show in a minute that NAS has come around and said we were wrong, that 1998 wasn't the hottest year; 1934 was.

There have been recent studies refuting claims that the 20th century has seen unprecedented warmth. A June 29, 2007, paper by Gerd Burger of Berlin's Institute of Meteorology in the peer-reviewed Science Magazine challenged a

2006 study that claimed the 20th century had been unusually warm.

Ivy League geologist, Dr. Robert Giegengack, the chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania, noted on May 27, 2007 that extremely long geologic timescales reveal that ''only about 5 percent of that time has been characterized by conditions on Earth that were so cold that the poles could support masses of permanent ice.''

Giegengack added:

For most of Earth's history, the globe has been warmer than it has been for the last 200 years. It has rarely been cooler.

That is the chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania. These guys know what they are talking about, and they have been ignored.

Greenland has actually cooled since the 1940s. In fact, the current temperatures in Greenland—a ''poster boy'' for climate change alarmists—are cooler. It wasn't too long ago that there was a delegation from the Senate that went to Greenland. They came back with all these statements, but I cannot figure out where they came from because that is not what the facts show. Even though Greenland has been a ''poster boy'' for climate alarmists, it is now cooler there than the temperatures were in the 1930s and 1940s. It is cooler there now. You heard correctly.

Greenland reached its highest temperatures in 1941, according to a peer-reviewed study published in the June 2006 issue of the Journal of Geophysical Research. Keep in mind that 80 percent of the manmade CO_2 came after these high temperatures. Eighty percent came after the 1940s. That is a very interesting thing because, if you look at it, you would say if 80 percent of the CO_2 came after the 1940s, would that not precipitate a warming period—if they are right—in terms of CO_2 affecting warmer climate change? That didn't happen. That precipitated a cooler period.

According to a July 2007 survey of peer-reviewed literature on Greenland:

Research in 2006 found that Greenland has been warming since the 1880s, but since 1955, temperature averages at Greenland stations have been colder than the period of 1881–1955. Another 2006 peer-reviewed study concluded the rate of warming in Greenland from 1920 to 1930 was about 50 percent higher than the warming from 1995 to 2005.

That is the time they say this crisis is taking place.

One 2005 study found Greenland gaining ice in the interior higher elevations and thinning ice at the lower elevations. In addition, the often media promoted fears of Greenland's ice completely melting and a subsequent catastrophic sea level rise are directly at odds with the latest scientific studies.

That is not me saying this; these are scientists. These are scientific facts you will not hear from the U.N. scientists, Gore, or the hysterical liberal left.

Yet despite all of this evidence, the media and many others still attempt to distort the science in order to create hysterical fears about Greenland.

Environmental activist Robert Corell, who works for Teresa Heinz Kerry's foundation, the Heinz Center, recently tried to stir alarm by stating:

I spent four months on the [Greenland] ice cap in 1968 and there was no melting at all.

If Corell, a former fellow with the American Meteorological Society, had desired to give a balanced historical view, he would have noted that Greenland in the 1930s and 1940s was much warmer. This is typical of how many activists mislead the public by presenting utterly meaningless bits of information and avoiding inconvenient facts. Corell is also on record for giving former Vice President Gore's 2006 science fiction film two thumbs up for accuracy.

Keep in mind, he is paid by the Heinz Foundation.

Corell's assertion in a September 8, U.K. Guardian article that the earthquakes triggered by melting ice are increasing in Greenland was rebuffed by the University of North Carolina's Jose Rial. Rial is a prominent climatologist/seismologist working on glacial seismic activity in Greenland.

Corell's erroneous claim prompted Rial to take the unusual step of writing a letter to the U.K. Guardian:

I also know there is no evidence to suggest that these quakes ''are happening far faster than ever anticipated.'' [As Corell claimed].

Rial wrote that in a September 13 letter. He criticized the newspaper for presenting a ''sky-is-falling'' alarmist perspective, and he added:

It will take years of continued surveying to know whether anything here [in Greenland] is ''accelerating'' toward catastrophe, as the article [featuring Corell] claims.

So much for Greenland. Let's look at Antarctica for more evidence on the Earth's current climate. It is not changing in an alarming manner, and you need to look no further than the South Pole.

Scientists monitoring ice in Antarctica reported on October 1 that the ice has grown to record levels since 1979, when satellite monitoring began. So the ice levels have grown to record levels since that time, according to an announcement by the University of Illinois Polar Research Group Web site.

The Southern Hemisphere sea ice area has broken the previous maximum of 16.03 million square kilometers and is currently at 16.26 million square kilometers.

There is more. A February 2007 study reveals Antarctica is not following predicted global warming temperature or precipitation models. This is a quote from the scientists studying that:

A new report on climate over the world's southernmost continent shows that temperatures during the late 20th century did not climb as had been predicted by many global climate models.

The study was conducted by David Bromwich, professor of atmospheric sciences in the Department of Geography, and research with the Byrd Polar Research Center at Ohio State University.

How inconvenient that the two poster children of alarmism—Greenland and Antarctica—trumpeted by Al Gore and the climate fear mongers have decided not to cooperate with the computer models.

There is much more evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variability.

The Southern Hemisphere is cooling, according to U.N. scientist, Dr. Madhav Khandekar. Keep in mind this is a U.N. scientist, a retired environmental Canadian scientist, and an expert IPCC reviewer in 2007. He explained this on August 6, 2007, and these are all new scientific findings:

In the Southern Hemisphere, the land-area mean temperature has slowly but surely declined in the last few years. The city of Buenes Aires in Argentina received several centimeters of snowfall in early July, and the last time it snowed in Buenos Aires was in 1918. Most of Australia experienced one of its coldest months in June of this year. Several other locations in the Southern Hemisphere have experienced lower temperatures in the last few years. Further, the sea surface temperatures over world oceans are slowly declining since mid-1998, according to a recent worldwide analysis of ocean surface temperatures.

I don't think many people would disagree. The Southern Hemisphere is part of the globe, and it has been getting cooler over the past few years.

The media would not report on the historical perspective of Greenland, the ice growing in Antarctica, or the Southern Hemisphere cooling. Instead, the media's current fixation is on hyping Arctic sea ice shifts.

What the media is refusing to report about the North Pole is that according to a 2003 study by an Arctic scientist, Igor Polyakov, the warmest period in the Arctic during the 20th century was the late 1930s through the early 1940s. We are talking about the Northern Hemisphere now. Many scientists believe if we had satellite monitoring of the Arctic back then, it may have shown less ice than today.

According to a 2005 peer-reviewed study in the Geophysical Research Letters by an astrophysicist, Dr. Willie Soon, solar irradiance appears to be the key to Arctic temperatures. The study found Arctic temperatures follow the pattern of increasing or decreasing energy received from the Sun. That is a unique thought—that the Sun is causing warmth.

In another 2005 study published in the Journal of Climate, Brian Hartmann and Gerd Wendler linked the 1976 Pacific climate shift to a very significant one-time shift upward in Alaskan temperatures. These evidence-based scientific studies debunk fears of manmade warming in the Arctic and in Alaska.

I have covered the latest science on both poles. In the Southern Hemisphere, scientists are finding nothing to be alarmed about. It is important to point out that the phase of global warming that started in 1979 has itself been halted since 1998, which is nearly

a decade. In other words, the warming that took place, which I believe is from natural causes, stopped in 1998. It is not getting warmer anymore. You can almost hear my critics skeptical of that assertion.

According to the temperature data that the U.N. relies on, paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter, who testified before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, noted this on June 18 of this year, and this is significant:

> The accepted global average temperature statistics used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change show that no ground-based warming has occurred since 1998. Oddly, this eight-year-long temperature stability has occurred despite an increase over the same period of 15 parts per million (or 4 percent) in atmospheric CO_2. Second, lower atmospheric satellite-based temperature measurements, if corrected for non-greenhouse influences, such as El Nino events and large volcanic eruptions, show little if any global warming since 1979, a period over which atmospheric CO_2 has increased by 55 parts per million (17 percent).

Yet it is true that 1998 was influenced by the warming effect of particularly strong El Nino. But lest you think Dr. Carter somehow misinterpreted the data, I have more evidence to bury any skepticism.

The U.K. Met Office, the British version of our National Weather Service, was finally forced to concede the obvious in August of this year: Global warming has stopped.

After the U.K. Met Office—a group fully entrenched in the global warming fear movement—was forced to acknowledge this inconvenient truth in August, they could not help but whip up a way to continue stoking manmade climate alarm.

How can you do that if you are saying it is no longer warming? This is how they did it.

Their response was to promote yet more unproven dire computer model projections of the future. They now claim climate computer models predict ''global warming will begin in earnest in 2009'' because greenhouse emissions will then overtake natural climate variability.

What he is saying is, they are admitting—it hurts them to do this—that the warming has stopped. But they say, well, it is going to start again in 2009.

Hyping yet more unproven computer models of the future in response to inconvenient real-world, evidence-based data is the only thing they have left for promoters of manmade climate doom. But it is a bit refreshing to hear climate doomsters be forced to utter the phrases such as ''natural climate variability,'' something they do not like to talk about and never have.

Meteorologist Joseph Conklin recently weighed in on these new developments.

Conklin wrote in August:

> A few months ago, a study came out that demonstrated global temperatures have leveled off. But instead of possibly admitting that this whole global warming thing is a farce, a group of British scientists concluded the real global warming won't start until 2009.

Here is somebody else talking about it.

This new claim that ''global warming will begin in earnest in 2009'' sounds like the reverse of the 1930s Great Depression slogan of ''Prosperity is just around the corner.'' Only in this instance the wording has been changed, ''A climate catastrophe is just around the corner.''

Again, I was quoting meteorologist Joseph Conklin.

This is not to say that global average temperatures may not rise again—change is what the Earth naturally and continually does, and part of this is temperatures fluctuating both up and down. However, the awkward halting of global warming since 1998 despite rising emissions is yet another indication that CO_2 levels and temperature are not the simple relationship many would have us believe.

Another key development in 2007 is the research led by metrologist Anthony Watts of surfacestation.org which has revealed massive U.S. temperature collection data errors biasing thermometers to have warmer readings.

Meteorologist Conklin explained on August 10—a couple months ago—2007:

> The (U.S.) National Climate Data Center is in the middle of a scandal. Their global observing network, the heart and soul of surface weather measurement, is a disaster. Urbanization has placed many sites—

Measuring sites he is talking about—

> in unsuitable locations—on hot black asphalt, next to trash burn barrels, beside heat exhaust vents, even attached to hot chimneys and above outdoor grills. The data and approach taken by many global warming alarmists is seriously flawed. If the global data were properly adjusted for urbanization and station siting, and land use change issues were addressed, what would emerge is a cyclical pattern of rises and falls with much less of any background trend.

That is all a quote by meteorologist Conklin.

Adding to the further chilling of warming fears is a NASA data error correction that made 1934 the warmest year, and not 1998. Always before, they had been talking about 1998. Now NASA has come back—and no one seems to be refuting this—and said it was 1934 that was the hottest year.

Perhaps the most humorous reaction to this inconvenient correction came from NASA's James Hansen who tried to minimize the data error in August when he wrote:

> No need to read further unless you are interested in temperature changes to a tenth of a degree over the U.S.

This comment was particularly outlandish, given that Hansen has become a media darling in recent years by hyping temperature differences of ''tenth of a degree'' to any reporter within ear shot.

I now move to central point No. 2, the unproven computer models that are driving climate fears.

It is hard to describe what a computer model is. But anytime you try to make a projection into the future, you try to have a model you can rely on instead of relying on data that is current and accurate. Even the New York Times has been forced to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variation. This inconvenient reality means all the climate doomsdayers have to back up their claims, their climate fears are unproven computer models predicting future doom. Of course, you can't prove a prediction of the climate in 2100 wrong today, which reduces the models to speculating on what could or might or may happen 50 or 100 years from now.

But prominent U.N. scientists publicly questioned the reliability of computer models.

Again, only a few months ago, in June of this year, in a candid statement, IPCC scientist—this is a U.N. scientist—Dr. Jim Renwick, a leading author of the U.N. IPCC 4th Assessment Report, publicly admitted that climate models may not be so reliable after all.

Renwick stated:

> Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don't expect to do terrifically well.

Let me say that again. A U.N. scientist admitted ''half the variability in the climate system is not predictable. . . .''

In June, another high profile U.N. IPCC lead author, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, echoed Renwick's sentiments about the climate models by referring to them as nothing more than ''story lines.''

Climate models made by unlicensed software engineers are of great concern to a lot of people. A leading scientific skeptic, meteorologist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute, recently took the critique of climate computer models one step further.

Tennekes said in February of 2007:

> I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are, in fact, software engineers. They are unlicensed, hence unqualified to sell their products to society.

Meteorologist Augie Auer of the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, former professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Wyoming, agreed, describing models this way:

> It's virtual science, it's virtual reality.

Auer joked:

> Most of these climate predictions are models, they are about a half a step ahead of PlayStation 3.

I guess that is some kind of kid's video game.

> They're really not justified in what they are saying. Many of the assumptions going into [the models] are simply not right.

Auer said this in May of 2007 in New Zealand in a radio interview.

Predictions simply cannot happen. Prominent scientist Professor Nils-Axel Morner also denounced computer models in August of 2007, saying:

The rapid rise in sea levels predicted by computer models simply cannot happen.

They are not going to happen.

Morner is a leading world authority on sea levels and coastal erosion who headed the Department of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics at Stockholm University. Morner, who was president of the Commission on Sea Level Changes and Coastal Evolution from 1999 to 2003, has published a new booklet refuting climate model claims of catastrophic sea level rise.

Physicist Dr. Syun-Ichi Akasofu, the former director of both the University of Alaska Fairbanks' Geophysical Institute and International Arctic Research Center, told a congressional hearing in 2006 that highly publicized computer models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than ''science fiction.'' Akasofu has twice been named one of the ''1,000 Most Cited Scientists.''

It gets kind of boring and hard to understand when I talk about the qualifications of these scientists. I have to say it because the other side is using people who are not of this caliber. This is what the real scientists are saying today.

Geologist Morten Hald, an Arctic expert at the University of Tromso in Norway, has also questioned the reliability of computer models that predict a future melting of the Arctic. He says:

The main problem is that these models are often based on relatively new climate data. The thermometer has only been in existence for 150 years and information on temperature which is 150 years old does not capture the large natural changes.

Hald, who is participating with a Norwegian national team in Arctic climate research, made this statement in May of 2007.

Physicist Freeman Dyson, professor emeritus of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, called himself a ''heretic'' on global warming and slammed computer models as unreliable. Keep in mind, I am talking about a professor emeritus at the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton University. These are smart guys. ''The fuss about global warming is grossly exaggerated,'' writes Dyson in his 2007 book called ''Many Colored Glass: Reflections on the Place of Life in the Universe'' published in August.

Dyson is a fellow of the American Physical Society, a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow in the Royal Society of London.

Dyson focuses on debunking climate model predictions of climate doom. There is no one more qualified than the man I just described. He said:

They do not begin to describe the real world that we live in. The real world is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. It is much easier for a scientist to sit in an air-conditioned building and run computer models than to put on winter clothes and measure what is really happening outside in the swamps and the clouds. That is why the climate model experts end up believing their own models.

Gore was recently challenged to a bet on climate model accuracy. Internationally known forecasting pioneer, Dr. Scott Armstrong of the Ivy League University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School—that is the Wharton School of Economics—challenged Gore to a $10,000 bet in June over the accuracy of climate computer model predictions. Armstrong and his colleague, Professor Kesten Green of Monash University's business and economic forecasting unit in Australia, found ''claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying it will get colder.'' According to Armstrong, the author of ''Long-Range Forecasting,'' the most frequently cited book on forecasting methods, ''of 89 principles [of forecasting], the [UN] IPCC violated 72.'' That is the United Nations. They violated 72 of the 89 principles of forecasting.

Internationally renowned scientist Dr. Antonino Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, has also taken climate models to task.

According to an April 27, 2007 article, Zichichi, who has published over 800 scientific papers, said:

The mathematical models used by the [United Nations] IPCC do not correspond to the criteria of the scientific method.

IPCC reviewer and climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand, an expert reviewer on every single draft of the IPCC reports going back to 1990, ridiculed the United Nations process as ''dangerous scientific nonsense.'' Gray, the author of ''Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of Climate Change 2001,'' explained on April 10, 2007:

My greatest achievement was the second [U.N.] report where the draft had a chapter ''Validation of Climate Models.'' I commented that since no climate model has ever been ''validated'' that the word was inappropriate. They changed the word to ''evaluate'' 50 times, and since then they have never ''predicted'' anything. All they do is make ''projections'' and ''estimates.''

In fact, so much of climate computer modeling is based on taking temperature data from a very short timeframe and extrapolating it out over 50 or 100 years or more and coming up with terrifying, scary scenarios. There is often no attempt to look at the longer geologic record.

But much of this type of modeling has about as much validity as me taking my 5-year-old granddaughter's growth rate from the last 2 years and using that to project her height when she is 25. My projections may show she will be 12 feet high at that time. Yet that is exactly how many of these computer model fears of the future are generated for sea level rise estimates on ice melt projections in places such as Greenland and the Arctic and other locations.

Once again, computer model predictions are not evidence.

Earlier this month, yet another report was issued based on future computer models finding that polar bear populations are allegedly going to be devastated by 2050 due to global warming. The report was issued as part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service consideration of listing the polar bear under the Endangered Species Act.

This is a classic case of reality versus unproven computer model predictions. The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the polar bear population is currently at 20,000 to 25,000 bears, whereas in the fifties and sixties, estimates were as low as 5,000 to 10,000 bears. We currently have an estimated four or five times more polar bears than 50 years ago.

We have a 2002 U.S. Geological Survey of wildlife in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain that noted the polar bear populations ''may now be near historic highs.''

Top biologists and wildlife experts are dismissing unproven computer model concerns for polar bears. Yet we still see the polar bears out there. Everybody feels sorry for the polar bears. There are some 13 populations of polar bears and all but 2 of them are thriving, many increasing rapidly.

In 2006, Canadian biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor, the director of wildlife research with the Arctic government of Nunavut, dismissed these fears with evidence-based data on Canada's polar bear populations.

''Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present,'' Taylor said, noting that Canada is home to two-thirds of the world's polar bears.

In other words, they are in Canada under his jurisdiction.

Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present.

He added:

It is just silly to predict the demise of polar bears in 25 years based on media-assisted hysteria.

In September, Taylor further debunked the latest report hyping the fears of future polar bear extinctions. He said, ''I think it is naive and presumptuous,'' referring to the recent report on the U.S. Government warning that computer models predicted a dire future for the bears due to projected ice loss.

Taylor also debunked a notion that less sea ice means less polar bears by pointing out that southern regions of the bears' home with low levels of ice are seeing booming bear populations. He noted that in the warmer southern Canadian region of Davis Strait with lower levels of ice, a new survey will reveal that bear populations have grown from an estimated 850 bears to an estimated 3,000 bears. And despite the lower levels of ice, some of the bears measured in this region are among the biggest ever on record.

''Davis Strait is crawling with bears.'' I am quoting him again. ''It is not safe to camp there. They are fat. The mothers have cubs. The cubs are in good shape,'' he said, according to a September 14, 2007 article.

He added, ''That's not theory. That's not based on a model. That's just observation of reality.''

Other biologists are equally dismissive of these computer model-based fears. Biologist Josef Reichholf, who heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich, rejected climate fears and asserted any potential global warming may be beneficial to both humans and animals.

In a May 8, 2007 interview, Reichholf asked, ''How did the polar bear survive the last warm period?'' Reichfolf also debunked the entire notion that the warmer world will lead to a mass species extinction.

> Warming temperatures promote biodiversity. The number of species increases exponentially from the regions near the poles, across the moderate latitudes and to the equator. To put it succinctly, the warmer the region is the more diverse are its species.

Botanist David Bellamy—this is kind of interesting because David Bellamy used to be on the other side. He was a famous U.K. environmental campaigner and former lecturer at Durham University and host of a TV series on wildlife. He also dismissed fears of a global warming driving polar bear demise.

Keep in mind, this is David Bellamy of the U.K., who was at one time marching down the streets hand in hand with Al Gore, saying the world is coming to an end.

> Why scare the families of the world with tales that polar bears are heading for extinction when there is good evidence that there are now twice as many of these iconic animals . . . than there were 20 years ago?

Bellamy asked on May 15. There are twice as many as there were 20 years ago.

Bellamy concluded:

> The climate change people have no proof for their claims. They have computer models which do not prove anything.

The bottom line is that the attempt to list the polar bear under the Endangered Species Act is not based on any evidence that the polar bear populations are declining or in trouble. It is based on computer models fraught with uncertainties. I hope we made that point very clear. The truth is we clearly don't know enough about polar bear populations to make an argument about their listing. What we do know is their populations have dramatically increased over the past 30 or 40 years. It is about trying to bring about climate change regulation using the most powerful, development-stopping law of the land, the Endangered Species Act. Polar bears are being used to achieve long-sought leftwing environmental regulatory policies.

We had four essential points. The third essential point is debunking the relationship that the more CO_2, a warmer world. The third critical point on global warming is to debunk the notion that the more CO_2, the warmer the world as simplistic. Scientists and peer-reviewed scientists are increasingly revealing that catastrophic climate fears of rising CO_2 are simply unsustainable.

In May 2007, the ''father of meteorology,'' Dr. Reid Bryson, the founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at the University of Wisconsin, dismissed the rising CO_2 fears very bluntly. He said:

> You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide.

Bryson has been identified by the British Institute of Geographers as the most frequently cited climatologist in the world. He explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO_2 in the atmosphere.

Climatologist Dr. Ball described how CO_2's warming impact diminishes. A quote from Dr. Timothy Ball:

> Even if CO_2 concentration doubles or triples, the effect would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO_2 is like painting a window black to block the sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. The second and third reduce very little more. The current CO_2 levels are like the first coat of black paint, Ball explained in June of 2007.

Environmental economist Dennis Avery, co-author with climate scientist Dr. Fred Singer of the new book ''Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 years,'' details how solar activity is linked to the Earth's natural temperature cycles. These two scientists are quoted as saying, in their book:

> The Earth has warmed only a net of .2 degrees centigrade of net warming since 1940. Human-emitted CO_2 gets blamed for only half of that—

Even those who are the hysterical people say only half of that would go to manmade gases, anthropogenic gases, CO_2, methane, as we talked about earlier.

> —or one tenth of 1 degree centigrade of warming in 65 years. We've had no warming at all since 1998. Remember, too, each added unit of CO_2 has less impact on the climate. The first 40 parts per million of human-emitted CO_2 added to the atmosphere in the 1940s had as much climate impact as the next 360 parts per million.

Perhaps the most inconvenient fact for the promoters of climate doom is the abundance of new peer-reviewed papers echoing these many more scientists' skeptical views. Keep in mind, these are new studies, the debunking of alarmism that have been published since 2007.

That is this year, I say to the distinguished occupier of the chair, that we have been talking about, just what has happened in the last 6 or 7 months.

A new peer-reviewed study by Brookhaven National Lab scientist Stephen Schwartz, accepted for publication in the Journal of Geophysical Research, finds that even a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide would not have the previous predicted dire impacts on global temperatures. In fact, this paper implies that we have already seen almost all of the warming from CO_2 that mankind has put into the atmosphere.

The study is in agreement with the views of the 60 prominent scientists who advised the Canadian Prime Minister to withdraw from Kyoto in 2006. The 60 scientists noted global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remain impossible to distinguish from this natural ''noise.''

Astronomer Dr. Ian Wilson proclaimed in August of 2007 that the new Schwartz study means ''Anthropogenic—that is man-made global warming—bites the dust.''

Those are their words, not mine.

American Enterprise Institute scientist Joel Schwartz also agreed. He said:

> Along with dozens of other studies in the scientific literature, this new study belies Al Gore's claim that there is no legitimate scholarly alternative to climate catastrophism. Indeed, if [this study's] results are correct, that alone would be enough to overturn, in one fell swoop, the United Nations scientific consensus—I say in quotes—the ''environmentalists'' climate hysteria, and the political pretext for the energy-restriction policies that have become so popular with the world's environmental regulators, elected officials, and corporations. The question is, will anyone in the mainstream media notice?

This is all a quote by the scientist.

A former Harvard physicist, Dr. Lubos Motl, said the new study has reduced proponents of manmade climate fears to ''playing the children's game to scare each other.''

Now, just look at a sampling of the recent peer review studies debunking the issues. There are many others I could talk about, but I am just going to name a few here, things all happening this year, 2007.

No. 1, an August 2007 peer-reviewed study Published in Geophysical Research Letters finds global warming over last century linked to natural causes. Excerpt: The study, by scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, was entitled ''Synchronized Chaos: Mechanisms For Major Climate Shifts.'' The author's found that ''By studying the last 100 years of these [natural] cycles' patterns, they find that the systems synchronized several times.'' The authors show that this mechanism explains all global temperature tendency changes and El Nino variability in the 20th century.''

No. 2, a September peer-reviewed study counters global warming theory, by finding carbon dioxide did not end the last Ice Age. The study found: ''Deep-sea temperatures rose 1,300 years before atmospheric CO_2, ruling out the greenhouse gas as driver of meltdown. The lead author geologist Lowell Stott, explained: ''The climate dynamic is much more complex than simply saying that CO_2 rises and the temperature warms.''

No. 3, an October 2007 study by the Danish National Space Center Study concluded: ''The Sun still appears to be the main forcing agent in global climate change.'' This study was authored by Physicist Henrik Svensmark and Eigil Friis-Christensen.

No. 4, a Belgian weather institute's August 2007 study dismissed the decisive role of CO_2 in warming. Here is an excerpt about the study: ''CO_2 is not the big bogeyman of climate change and global warming. This is the conclusion of a comprehensive scientific study done by the Royal Meteorological Institute, which was published this past summer. Climate scientist Luc Debontridder explained: ''Not CO_2, but water vapor is the most important greenhouse gas. It is responsible for at least 75 percent of the greenhouse effect. This is a simple scientific fact, but Al Gore's movie has hyped CO_2 so much that nobody seems to take note of it.''

No. 5, an August peer-reviewed study finds clouds may greatly reduce global warming. Paragraph No. 2, a new peer-reviewed—

I use ''peer reviewed'' quite often to show these are documented. These are studies that have been reviewed by the peers, by other scientists, and found to be true.

No. 5, an August peer-reviewed study finds clouds may greatly reduce global warming: Here is an excerpt about the study: ''This study published on August 9, 2007 in the Geophysical Research Letters finds that climate models fail to adequately take into account the effects of clouds. The study shows that tropical rainfall events are accompanied by a decrease in high ice clouds, thus allowing more infrared heat radiation to escape to space. Author Dr. Roy Spencer of the University of Alabama Huntsville said: ''At least 80 percent of the Earth's natural greenhouse effect is due to water vapor and clouds, and those are largely under the control of precipitation systems. Until we understand how precipitation systems change with warming, I don't believe we can know how much of our current warming is manmade. Without that knowledge, we can't predict future climate change with any degree of certainty.''

Spencer, formerly a senior scientist for climate studies at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center where he received NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal, believes that the Earth self-regulates its own temperature.

In fact, for the amount of solar energy available to it, our climate seems to have a ''preferred'' average temperature, damping out swings beyond one degree or so. I believe that, through various negative feedback mechanisms, the atmosphere ''decides'' how much of the available sunlight will be allowed in, how much greenhouse effect it will generate in response, and what the average temperature will be.

No. 6, a new peer-reviewed study finds that the solar system regulates the earth's climate—The paper, authored by Richard Mackey, is published August 17, 2007, in the Journal of Coastal Research. Here is an excerpt about the paper: ''According to the findings reviewed in this paper, the variable output of the sun, the 31 sun's gravitational relationship between the earth (and the moon) and earth's variable orbital relationship with the sun, regulate the earth's climate.''

No. 7, Chinese scientists Lin Zhen-Shan, and Sun Xian's 2007 study, published in the peer-reviewed Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics, noted that CO_2 impact on warming may be ''excessively exaggerated.'' Here is an excerpt: ''The global climate warming is not solely affected by the CO_2 greenhouse effect. The best example is temperature obviously cooling however atmospheric CO_2 concentration is ascending from 1940s to 1970s. Although the CO_2 greenhouse effect on global climate change is unsuspicious, it could have been excessively exaggerated. It is high time to reconsider the trend of global climate change,'' the two scientists concluded.

No. 8, a Team of Scientists Question The Validity of a ''Global Temperature''—The study was published in Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics. A March 18, 2007 article in Science Daily explained: ''Discussions on global warming often refer to 'global temperature.' Yet the concept is thermodynamically as well as mathematically an impossibility, says Bjarne Andresen, a professor at The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen.

''It is impossible to talk about a single temperature for something as complicated as the climate of Earth'', Bjarne Andresen says, an expert of thermodynamics. According to Andresen: ''The Globe consists of a huge number of components which one cannot just add up and average. That would correspond to calculating the average phone number in the phone book. That is meaningless.''

No. 9, an April 2007 study revealed the Earth's climate ''seesawing'' during the last 10,000 years, according to Swedish researchers at Lund University. An excerpt of the study states: ''During the last 10,000 years climate has been seesawing between the North and South Atlantic Oceans. As revealed by findings presented by scientists at Lund University in Sweden, cold periods in the north have corresponded to warmth in the south and vice verse. These results imply that Europe may face a slightly cooler future than predicted by IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

No. 10, a new peer-reviewed study on Surface Warming and the Solar Cycle published in Geophysical Research Letters by scientists from the University of Washington claims to be ''the first to document a statistically significant globally coherent temperature response to the solar cycle,'' according to an August 2, 2007 Science Daily article. The paper found ''that times of high solar activity are on average 0.2 degrees C warmer than times of low solar activity.'' Despite the fact that one of the co-author's protests this study being used to chill climate fears, this paper is an important contribution to establishing the solar climate link.

No. 11, in 2007, even the alarmist UN IPCC reduced its sea level rise estimates significantly, thus reducing man's estimated impact on the climate by 25 percent. Meanwhile, a separate UN report in late 2006 found that cow emissions are more damaging to the planet than all of the CO_2 emissions from cars and trucks. Stating it in a different way, the gasses released by stock actually exceed the CO_2 in the atmosphere from all the cars and trucks in the transportation sector.

No. 12, the UN Climate Panel has been accused of possible research fraud. Here is an excerpt: Douglas J. Keenan, a former Morgan Stanley [finance man] and current independent mathematical researcher, accused the UN of ''fabrications'' and ''discovered that the sources used by the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) have disregarded the positions of weather stations.'' Keenan has accused the UN of ''intentionally using outdated data on China from 1991 and ignoring revised data on the country from 1997.''

No. 13, a study in the summer 2007 American Association of Petroleum Geologists publication debunked global warming fears. The study by Geologist C. Robert Shoup, was entitled ''Science Under Attack.'' It concluded: ''The hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming does not yet meet the basic scientific standards of proof needed to be accepted as a viable hypothesis, much less as accepted fact.''

Again, I stress that these research studies are but a sampling of the new science flowing in that is starting to overwhelm the fear campaigns of the global warming alarmists.

I frequently get asked by warming activists whether I can name a single peer-reviewed study disagreeing with Gore or the UN Summary for Policymakers.

As you can see, the skeptic's cup overflows with recent scientific studies.

Everything I mentioned refutes that.

In addition to the above recent sampling of new studies, I also refer to the more than 100 scientific studies by more than 300 coauthors that are cited in the new book ''Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Years'' by the climate scientist Dr. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery. The book details extensive research going back decades to reveal how solar activity is linked to the Earth's natural climate cycle. Again, we are talking about the sun, we are talking about natural variants.

Geophysicist Dr. David Deming, associate professor of arts and sciences at the University of Oklahoma—very proud of him—explained in January of this year:

No one has ever died from global warming. What kills people is cold, not heat. For more

than 150 years, it has been documented in the medical literature that human mortality rates are highest in the winter when temperatures are the coldest.

Perhaps the most scathing indictment of the ''more CO_2 equals a warmer world'' simplicity comes from Ivy League geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack, the chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science at—I call to the attention of the Presiding Officer—the University of Pennsylvania. Giegengack voted for Gore in 2000, says he would do so again. He is a Gore fan, but he is appalled by Gore's ignorance of climate science. Here is a guy who—he voted for him, and he would vote for him again. He says to his undergraduates: Every single one of you knows more about global warming than Al Gore.

This is the chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania, a very fine, well-known institution. Giegengack said:

Gore claims that temperature increases solely because more CO_2 in the atmosphere traps the sun's heat. That's just wrong. It is a natural interplay. It's hard for us to say that CO_2 drives temperature. It's easier to say temperature drives CO_2.

He said:

The driving mechanism is exactly the opposite of what Al Gore claims, both in his film and in that book. It's the temperature that, through those 650,000 years, controlled the CO_2; not the CO_2 that controlled the temperature.

I do not think anyone refutes that anymore. If I said this a year ago, everyone would be up in arms. But now all of them are agreeing. It is the temperature that is controlling the CO_2.

Now, this might be a bit technical, but what Giegengack is saying here is that it is temperatures that control CO_2. This is crucial to the understanding of the reason why the scientific underpinnings of manmade global warming fears are utterly collapsing and the climate models are continuing to fail.

Let me repeat a key point Dr. Giegengack makes. He said: If we reduced the rate at which we put carbon into the atmosphere, it will not reduce the concentration in the atmosphere; CO_2 is just going to come back out of these reservoirs.

There are various natural reservoirs such as oceans, soils, permafrost, et cetera. Giegengack is explaining the heart of the scientific skepticism about CO_2's role in the Earth's climate system.

He is not finished. He said:

In terms of global warming's capacity to cause human species harm, I don't think it makes it into the top 10. [Giegengack said in an interview in the May/June 2007 issue of the Pennsylvania Gazette.]

So it is entirely appropriate that a man who supports Gore politically may be putting the final nail in the coffin of manmade global warming fears.

The global warming scare machine is now so tenuous that other liberal environmental scientists and activists are now joining Giegengack and condemning the entire basis for manmade global warming concerns.

This is kind of interesting. I am going to be quoting Denis Rancourt, a professor of physics and an environmental science researcher at the University of Ottawa. He believes that the global warming campaign does a disservice to the environmental movement. He is a big environmentalist. He wants people to be concerned about the environment. He says: But they are a doing a disservice.

Rancourt wrote, on February 27, 2007:

Promoting the global warming myth trains people to accept unverified, remote, and abstract dangers in the place of true problems that they can discover for themselves by becoming directly engaged in their workplace and by doing their own research and observations. It trains people to think lifestyle choices, in relation to CO_2 emission, rather than to think activism in the sense of exerting an influence to change societal structures.

Rancourt believes that global warming:

Will not become humankind's greatest threat until the sun has its next hiccup in a billion years or more in the very unlikely scenario that we are still be around.

He also noted that even if CO_2 emissions were a grave threat, Government action and political will cannot measurably or significantly ameliorate global climate in the present world.

Most significantly, however, Rancourt, a committed leftwing activist and scientist—that is whom we are talking about—he believes environmentalists have been duped into promoting global warming as a crisis. This is a far leftwing environmentalist type. He said:

I argue that by far the most destructive force on the planet is profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might; and that the global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth. In my opinion, activists who, using any justification, feed the global warming myth have effectively been co-opted, or at best neutralized. Global warming is strictly an imaginary problem for the First World middleclass.

Again, this is a very well-known far leftwing scientist by the name of Rancourt.

Finally, Rancourt asserted that in a warm world, life prospers.

There is no known case of a sustained warming alone having a negative impact on an entire population. As a general rule, all life on earth does better when it is hotter. Compare ecological diversity and biotic density, or biomass, at the poles and at the equator.

Indeed, 2007 has turned into the ''tipping point'' for unsubstantiated fears and gross distortion of science by activists who have committed decades trying to convince the world it faced a manmade climate crisis. Rancourt so eloquently describes the entire movement as one featuring unverified, remote, and abstract dangers.

Perhaps the biggest shock to the global warming debate was the conversion of the renowned French geophysicist Dr. Claude Allegre from a believer in the dangerous manmade warming fears to a skeptic just last year. This is a guy—Dr. Claude Allegre, former French Socialist Party leader and a member of both the French and the U.S. Academies of Science—who was one of the first scientists around to sound global warming fears 20 years ago. Now, this is a guy who was walking down the streets with Al Gore 10 years ago holding hands, saying: The world is coming to an end, the heat is upon us now, and we are going to have to do something. That was the 20 years ago and 10 years ago. But he now says—this is as of this year, 2007—the cause of climate change is unknown. He ridiculed what he termed the ''prophets of doom of global warming'' in a September 2006 article.

Allegre has authored more than 100 scientific articles and written 11 books and received numerous scientific awards, including the Goldschmidt Medal from the Geochemical Society of the United States. He now believes the global warming hysteria is motivated by money.

The ecology of helpless protesting has become a very lucrative business for some people.

I find it ironic that a free market conservative Member of the Senate such as myself and a French Socialist scientist both apparently agree that sound science is not what is driving this debate; it is money.

I just say bravo for the growing scientific dissent. It is not easy for these guys who took a hard position just a few years ago to change their minds. You do not have to believe me. In October, Washington Post staff writer Juliet Eilperin conceded the obvious, writing that the climate skeptics ''appear to be expanding rather than shrinking.''

These are the people, the climate science skeptics, those individuals who believed that global warming was causing all of those problems, that manmade gases, methane, CO_2, were causing climate change. They are on the other side now.

Washington Post's Eilperin wrote—and, of course, the Washington Post is not known to be a very conservative publication:

In late May, Michael Griffin, Administrator of NASA, which conducts considerable amounts of climate research, told National Public Radio that he was not sure climate change was a problem we must wrestle with and that it was rather arrogant to suggest that the climate we have now represents the best possible set of conditions.

Alexander Cockburn, a maverick journalist who leans left on most topics, lambasted the global warming consensus last spring on the political Web site counterpunch.org, arguing that there is no evidence yet that humans are causing the rise of global temperature.

These are liberals we are talking about, in fairly liberal publications.

Leftwing professor David Noble of Canada's York University has joined

the growing chorus of disenchanted liberal activists. Noble now believes that the movement has ''hyped the global climate issue into an obsession.'' Noble wrote a May 8 essay entitled ''Corporate Climate Coup'' which details how global warming has ''hijacked'' the environmental left and created a ''corporate climate campaign'' which has ''diverted attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movement.''

Finally, I would say that world leaders such as Czech President Vaclav Klaus and former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt have been outspoken in their climate skepticism. Schmidt said on June 4 of this year that fears of global warming were ''hysterical'' and ''overheated.'' He called efforts to control the earth's temperature ''idiotic.''

Former Vice President Gore's biggest worry is now coming true; previously committed believers in manmade global warming are now converting to skeptics after reviewing the new science.

Well, the new science is changing minds. The 60 prominent scientists, many of whom advised the Canadian Prime Minister—I mentioned this before. This is very significant. These are the guys in the 1990s who were advising the Prime Minister. These 60 scientists advised the Prime Minister to ratify Kyoto, the treaty we did not ratify, and now they have come back and said:

> Significant scientific advances have been made since the Kyoto protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases. If, back in the mid 1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it is not necessary.

These are the 60 scientists who advised the Prime Minister; they have all changed their minds. They are now advising him not to sign on any successor treaties to Kyoto.

The climate skeptics have welcomed many scientists from around the world into the fold recently, including previously noted Claude Allegre. There are others. If you go to my Web site, you can see some of the rest of them. But in addition to Claude Allegre, you have the top Israeli astrophysicist Nir Shaviv, Australian mathematician David Evans, Canadian climate expert Bruno Wiskel, paleoclimatologist Ian D. Clark, environmental geochemist Jan Veizer, and climate scientist Chris de Freitas of New Zealand—the list goes on and on—just to name a few.

Please go to epw.senate.gov for a full report and stay tuned to the upcoming blockbuster Senate report detailing the hundreds of scientists who have spoken out recently to denounce manmade global fears. The list is unending. It is larger every day. These people were all on the other side of this issue, vocally, with all their scientific background. They have now come over. They are skeptics now. Skeptics mean that there is no conclusive proof. Instead of that, it is national variances, within national variability, I would add.

We come now to the last point, the central point No. 4, debunking the consensus. The fourth and final essential point deals with how the media and the climate doomsters insist that there is an overwhelming scientific consensus of manmade global warming. The notion of a consensus is carefully manufactured for political, financial, and ideological purposes. Its proponents never explain fully what consensus they are referring to. Is it a consensus that future computer models will turn out correct? Is it a consensus that the Earth has warmed? Proving that parts of the Earth have been warming doesn't prove that humans are responsible.

While it may appear to the casual observer that scientists promoting climate fears are in the majority, that is because most of the media wants to believe this. By the way, this sells papers; we all know that. Evidence continues to reveal this is an illusion. Climate skeptics, the emerging silent majority of scientists, receive much smaller shares of university funds. They don't get university research funds, foundation funds.

You think the Heinz Foundation is going to give funding to somebody unless they agree with their hysteria? Climate skeptics also receive smaller shares of Government grants and are not plugged into the well-heeled special interest lobby. If you are part of that lobby, you get all these funds. If you are not, they will not play with you. On the other side of the climate debate, you have a comparatively well-funded group of scientists, the activists who participate in the U.N. conferences, receiving foundation moneys, international government support, and fawning media treatment. The number of skeptics at first glance may appear smaller, but the skeptics are increasingly becoming vocal and turning the tables on the Goliath that has become the global warming fear industry.

Key components of the manufactured consensus, as they keep saying, fade under scrutiny. We often hear how the National Academy of Sciences and the American Meteorological Society issued statements endorsing the so-called consensus view that man is driving global warming. What you don't hear is that both the NAS and the AMS never allowed member scientists to vote on these climate statements because they know that if it doesn't come out this way, they will not get the money they would otherwise get. Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the consensus statements. It appears that the governing boards of these organizations caved in to pressure from those promoting the politically correct view of the United Nations and Gore-inspired science. The Canadian Academy of Sciences reportedly endorsed a consensus global warming statement that was never even approved by its governing board.

Rank-and-file scientists are now openly rebelling. James Spann, a certified meteorologist with the AMS, openly defied the organization when he said in January he does not know a single TV meteorologist who buys into the manmade global warming hype. In February, a panel of meteorologists expressed unanimous climate skepticism, and one panelist estimated 95 percent of his profession rejects global warming fears.

This is big, a survey of recent peer-reviewed studies. This is something you better get ready for because it is something you don't know about yet. It hasn't been revealed yet, but it will be.

In August 2007, a comprehensive study of peer-reviewed scientific literature from 2004 to 2007 revealed less than half of all published scientists endorse global warming theory. ''Of 539 total papers on climate change, only 38 or 7 percent gave an explicit endorsement of the consensus.'' That consensus being that manmade anthropogenic, CO_2, methane gases are causing climate change. Only 7 percent of these 539 total papers since 2004.

In addition, a September 26, 2007, report from the international group Institute of Physics finds no consensus on global warming. Here is an excerpt:

> As world leaders gathered in New York for a high-level UN meeting on climate change, a new report by some of the world's most renowned scientists urged policymakers to keep their eyes on the ''science grapevine'' arguing that the understanding of global warming is still far from complete. The IOP is also urging world leaders to remain alert to the latest scientific thought on climate change.

In May the United Nations special climate envoy, Dr. Harlem Brundtland, declared ''it's completely immoral, even, to question'' the U.N.'s alleged global warming consensus.

Let's examine whether immorality plays a role in this process. There are frequently claims that the U.N. IPCC ''Summary for Policymakers'' is the voice of hundreds or even thousands of the world's top scientists, but such claims do not hold up even to the light of scrutiny. According to the Associated Press, during the United Nations ''Summary for Policymakers''—after they have their process, which is a publication that comes out, then it is many months after that that scientists get to say something.

According to the Associated Press, during the IPCC ''Summary for Policymakers'' meeting in April of 2007, the most recent, only 52 scientists participated. The April 9, 2007, AP article by Seth Borenstein reported:

> Diplomats from 115 countries and 52 scientists hashed out the most comprehensive and gloomiest warning yet about the possible effects of global warming, from increased flooding, hunger, drought and diseases to the extension of species.

Many of the so-called hundreds of scientists who have been affiliated with

the U.N. as expert reviewers are, in fact, climate skeptics. They are on our side. Skeptics such as Virginia State climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels, Alabama State climatologist Dr. John Christy, New Zealand climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray, former head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo Tom V. Segalstad, and MIT's Dr. Richard Lindzen have served as IPCC expert reviewers but were not involved in writing the alarmist summary. These are the people who were part of this process but were excluded from talking about the summary. The summary is put together by politicians.

An analysis released in September of 2007 on the United Nations scientific review process by climate data analyst John McLean revealed that the U.N. peer-review process is an illusion. A new study found that very few scientists are actively involved in the U.N. peer-review process. The report contained devastating revelations to the central IPCC assertion that ''it is very highly likely that greenhouse gas forcing has been the dominant cause of the observed global warming over the last 50 years.''

What do the real scientists say about this statement? According to the analysis by McLean:

> The IPCC leads us to believe that this statement is very much supported by a majority of reviewers. The reality is that there is surprisingly little explicit support for the key notion. Among the 23 independent reviewers just 4 explicitly endorsed the chapter with its hypotheses, and one other endorsed only a specific section. Moreover, only 62 of the IPCC's 308 reviewers commented on the chapter at all.

Only four out of 23 endorsed the statement that manmade gasses are the primary cause of global warming. Let me repeat the key point, only four U.N. scientists in the U.N. peer-review process explicitly endorsed the key chapter blaming mankind for warming the past 50 years, according to recent analysis. This analysis was echoed by U.N. scientist Dr. Madhav Khandekar. He is a retired Environment Canada scientist. In an August 13, 2000, letter, Khandekar lashed out at those who ''seem to naively believe that the climate change science exposed in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change documents represents scientific consensus.'' He said:

> Nothing could be further from the truth. As one of the invited expert reviewers for the 2007 IPCC documents, I have pointed out the flawed review process used by the [United Nations] scientists in one of my letters. I have also pointed out in my letter that an increasing number of scientists are now questioning the hypotheses of Greenhouse gas induced warming on the earth's surface and suggesting a stronger impact of solar variability and large-scale atmospheric circulation patterns on the observed temperature increase than previously believed.

Khandekar concluded:

> Unfortunately, the [United Nations] IPCC climate change documents do not provide an objective assessment of the earth's temperature trends and associated climate change.

Keep in mind, the IPCC, the United Nations, are the ones who brought all this to start with.

Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formally of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, participated in the past U.N. IPCC process and now calls the concept of consensus on global warming a sham. Reiter, a professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris, had to threaten legal action to have his name removed from the IPCC. They were not even letting him withdraw because he disagreed scientifically with what they are coming up with. He called it a sham. People who are going to review what I am saying here today will call it a sham. I am not calling anything a sham. That is what the scientist called this last report. ''That is how they make it seem that all top scientists are agreed,'' he said in 2007. He said: ''It's [just] not true.''

Hurricane expert Christopher Landsea of NOAA's National Hurricane Center was both an author and a reviewer of the IPCC's second assessment report back in 1995 and the third assessment report in 2001 but resigned from the fourth assessment report after charging the U.N. with playing politics with hurricane science. Landsea wrote a January 17, 2005, public letter detailing his experience with the U.N. Keep in mind, he is one of the top scientist on hurricanes.

> I am withdrawing [from the U.N.] because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns. I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound.

The IPCC's own guidelines explicitly state that the scientific reports have to be ''changed'' to ''ensure consistency with'' the politically motivated ''Summary for Policymakers.'' We have already said that the ''Summary for Policymakers''—that is the political arm, not the scientific but the political arm. In addition, the IPCC more closely resembles a political party's convention platform battle, not a scientific process. During an IPCC ''Summary for Policymakers'' process, the political delegates and international bureaucrats squabbled over the scientific wording of a phrase or assertion.

Steve McIntyre, one of the individuals responsible for debunking the infamous hockey stick theory temperature graph, slammed the IPCC ''Summary for Policymakers'' process in January of 2004.

> So the purpose of the three-month delay between the publication of the (IPCC) Summary for Policy-Makers and the release of the actual [Working Group 1] is to enable them to make any ''necessary'' adjustments to the technical report to match the policy summary. Unbelievable. Can you imagine what securities commissions would say if business promoters issued a big promotion and then the promoters made the ''necessary'' adjustments to the qualifying reports and financial statements so that they matched the promotion. Words fail me.

That is the scientist, not me.

As you continue to scratch beneath the surface of the alleged global warming consensus, more discoveries await. Alabama's State climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville served as a U.N. IPCC lead author in 2001 for the third assessment report and detailed how he personally witnessed U.N. scientists attempting to distort the science for political purposes.

This guy, keep in mind, was a scientist who participated in that process. He said:

> I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol.

That is what Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007, just this year.

Former Colorado State climatologist, Dr. Roger Pielke, Sr., also detailed the corruption of the U.N. IPCC process. This is what he said on September 1—just a month ago—2007:

> The same individuals who are doing primary research in the role of humans on the climate system are then permitted to lead the [IPCC] assessment! There should be an outcry on this obvious conflict of interest, but to date either few recognize this conflict, or see that since the recommendations of the IPCC fit their policy and political agenda, they chose to ignore this conflict. In either case, scientific rigor has been sacrificed and poor policy and political decisions will inevitably follow.

This is Dr. Pielke.

He added:

> We need recognition among the scientific community, the media, and policymakers that IPCC process is obviously a real conflict of interest, and this has resulted in a significantly flawed report.

What we have been talking about is the United Nations at work.

Politics appear to be the fuel that runs this process—the U.N. process we have been talking about—from the scientists to the bureaucrats to the delegates, and all the way to many of the world leaders involved in it.

What is the motivation of these distortions? I am often asked, if we know that the costs are going to be so great, and we know the science is now flawed, and people are now waking up to it, what is the motivation? I would have to say there is a lot of motivation overseas on things like this.

Former French President Jacques Chirac stated in 2000 that as to Kyoto, we are not talking about climate change. He said Kyoto represents ''the first component of an authentic global governance.''

These growing critiques of the politicized IPCC process have been echoed by the U.K.'s Lord Nigel Lawson. He is former Chancellor of the Exchequer and a member of the House of Lords Committee that reviewed the IPCC process. Lawson called for the abolishment of the U.N.'s IPCC process. He said:

I believe the IPCC process [U.N. process] is so flawed, and the institution, it has to be said, so closed to reason, that it would be far better to thank it for the work it has done, close it down, and transfer all future international collaboration on the issue of climate change [to something else].

This is a statement he made in 2005.

The huge organizational and funding advantage that proponents of climate alarmism enjoy over scientific skeptics has led to a pretty elaborate and impressive facade of ''consensus.'' Many climate skeptics have been excluded from key roles in the politicized IPCC process and largely ignored by the media unless they are being demonized as ''flat Earthers'' or accused of being part of a well-funded industry campaign. But in reality, it is the climate fear peddlers who enjoy an overwhelming funding advantage over skeptics.

Since the late 1980s, when global warming fears rose out of the scorched frost of the 1970s coming ice age scare—the same ones, I might add—an international organized effort and tens of billions of dollars have been spent promoting the warming fear gravy train.

Paleoclimate scientist Bob Carter estimates proponents of global warming fears worldwide have received over $50 billion from international sources and the United States over the last two decades. This is what he said:

In one of the more expensive ironies of history, the expenditure of more than [50 billion U.S. dollars] on research into global warming since 1990 has failed to demonstrate any human-caused climate trend, let alone a dangerous one.

That was a quote from him on June 18, 2007.

The U.S. alone spends over $5 billion a year on research directly or indirectly related to global warming. Adding to these totals of funding manmade climate fears are large foundations such as the Heinz Foundation, international governments, the United Nations, worldwide universities, the Pew Foundation, and individuals such as billionaires Richard Branson and George Soros.

In fact, if you want to get a study funded today on anything from suicide to butterflies, researchers are finding they better somehow link the issue of global warming, and it will increase their chances of securing funding automatically.

James Spann is a meteorologist, certified by the American Meteorological Society. He suggests scientific objectivity is being compromised by the ''big cash grab'' for money flowing to proponents of manmade climate fears. I previously noted that NASA's James Hansen received a $250,000 award from the Heinz Foundation.

It is kind of interesting. One of my favorite liberals—and I think he is kind of the darling on the left on CNN—is Miles O'Brien. We are fellow pilots. We have a lot in common, so I enjoy being on his program. I have been on many times.

He asked me the last time I was on: Well, how do you respond to the assertions that NASA's James Hansen made these statements, and they must be true?

I said: Because he was given $250,000 in cash by the Heinz Foundation, and I think he would say anything they wanted him to say.

Spann explained:

Billions of dollars of grant money are flowing into the pockets of those on the manmade global warming bandwagon. No manmade global warming, the money dries up. This is big money, make no mistake about it. Always follow the money trail and it tells a story.

That is what Spann wrote in January of this year.

The imbalance of money between the promoters of climate fears and skeptics is so large that one 2007 U.S. Department of Agriculture grant of $20 million to study how ''farm odors'' contribute to global warming exceeded all of the money the groups skeptical of climate fears allegedly received from ExxonMobil over the past two decades.

The money is clearly coming from the far left environmental extremists, from the Hollywood elitists.

Later this fall, my EPW Committee will also release a report detailing the hundreds of scientists—many of them affiliated with the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change process—who have spoken out recently to oppose climate alarmism. The report will feature the scientists—many of them who have finally had it with claims that ''all scientists agree''—in their own words. The report will be complete with the scientists' biographies and Web links for future reading.

Keep in mind that is in addition to the names we have identified today. Look at them all, as shown on this chart. Those are many of the scientists now—and not even a complete list.

This new research and the hysteria created by the U.N. and by Gore and the media have prompted frustrated scientists to finally fight back in the name of a rational approach to science.

Climate rationalists or skeptics do not need to engage in smoke and mirrors to state their case, and we will be offering the world a chance to read and decide for themselves, unfiltered from the increasingly activist and shrill lens of media outlets such as NBC, Newsweek, Time, CBS, ABC, and CNN.

I have stood on the floor for years detailing all the unfolding science that has debunked climate alarmism. These scientific developments of 2007 are the result of years or decades of hard work by scientists skeptical of manmade climate fears. Finally reaching the point where we can watch the alarm crumble is very satisfying.

All these scientists have come up with the same response.

Despite the massive scientific shift in favor of skeptics, proponents of climate fears are increasingly attempting to suppress dissent by skeptics. During Gore's Live Earth concert—which was a dismal failure, I might add—that he had in July, environmental activist Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., said of climate skeptics:

This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors.

I have been personally attacked by Anderson Cooper. It is taking place right now, even this week, calling me every kind of name, all kinds of threats. This is what—you people say: Why don't more Members of the House and the Senate tell the truth about climate change? This is the reason. This is what we are subjected to. I have a big family at home who has to watch all this.

Heidi Cullen of the Weather Channel—she is a lovely girl—but she called on the American Society of Meteorologists to deny certification of any of the scientists or any of the Weather Channel people or the meteorologists who do not agree with her.

In August, NASA's resident alarmist, James Hansen—whom we already talked about—he called skeptics ''deceitful'' and ''court jesters.'' This is the same activist Hansen who conceded in a 2003 issue of Natural Science that the use of ''extreme scenarios'' to dramatize global warming ''may have been appropriate at one time'' to drive the public's attention to the issue—a disturbing admission by James Hansen. In other words, he is saying: Exaggerate this. Scare people.

Other climate fear promoters have called for Nuremberg-style trials for those expressing manmade global warming skepticism.

In September, the Virginia State climatologist skeptical of global warming lost his job after a clash with the Governor. Dr. Patrick Michaels claims he was censored by the Governor because he held a different view of climate science.

Michaels said:

I was told that I could not speak in public on my area of expertise, global warming, as state climatologist.

He was fired. If the advocates for climate change alarm are so confident, why are they so afraid of the debate? Why do they resort to such low-brow name calling and intimidation?

The reason is obvious. The latest scientific findings are refuting climate fears and prompting many global warming activists to try desperate measures to silence the debate. When they do agree to debate the scientific facts, the alarmists lose, and lose badly.

In March—this is really significant—in March of this year, an audience of several hundred in the New York City area were persuaded to the view that global warming was not a ''crisis'' following a public debate with scientists on both sides.

Now, what we are saying here is, we had several hundred people just off the street, people in New York City; and most of them, when they were surveyed at the beginning of this—like 75 percent of them—said: We believe manmade gases are causing climate

change. Then, after the debate took place, it reversed, and a majority of them said that was not true. So people—when they hear the debate and listen to the science on both sides, there is a wake-up call.

When I became chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee—that was 4½ years ago—I vowed to make science one of the cornerstones of my agenda to ensure policy based on sound science. And as I continue on as the ranking member, I have continued this goal.

I think it is probably fair to say that no other Federal legislator has devoted so many hours addressing Congress about the science of climate change. I have spent this time because sound policy requires understanding, and what climate policy direction we choose will have enormous consequences not only for our Nation but for the world.

I would like now to address a question that I am asked repeatedly: Senator INHOFE, what if you are wrong and the alarmists are right? Isn't it better to adopt carbon restrictions to stop carbon dioxide emissions, just in case? My answer is always the same: What if I am right, and there is no response to that?

But let me address their question. Let's assume for a moment that the alarmists are right, which, of course, they are not, but let's assume for the sake of discussion they are. It still makes absolutely no sense to join Kyoto or any successor treaty or to adopt climate restrictions on our own. Not only does it not make economic sense, it does not make environmental sense.

Let me explain that.

First, going on a carbon diet, for us, would do nothing to avert climate change. After the United States signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997—it was never ratified, but we signed it—Al Gore's own scientist—this is what happened to Al Gore when he was Vice President of the United States. His own scientist, Tom Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, calculated—he said: Let's assume we signed on to the Kyoto treaty—this is back in 1997—and all other developed nations—not China, not Mexico, just the developed nations—signed on to it and lived by the emission requirements. How much would it lower the temperature in 50 years? His answer was 0.07 degrees Celsius by the year 2050.

Mr. President, 0.07 degrees is not even measurable, and that is if we took all these drastic steps, and we are not going to be doing that.

Of the 15 original European Union countries, only two are on track to meet their targets. One of these is Great Britain, and they are starting to increase their emissions again, not decrease them.

Similar calculations have been done to estimate other climate bills. The Climate Change Stewardship Act that was defeated 38 to 60 last year in this Chamber would have only reduced temperatures by 0.03 degrees Celsius, and another bill modeled on the National Commission on Energy Policy report would have only reduced temperatures by 0.008 degrees Celsius. That is right—that is less than 1 percent of 1 degree.

Now, I think when we come to the significant part of this—and that is the lesson on economics—the high costs that would be borne under carbon constraints are unjustifiable to achieve minuscule temperature reductions, and that is if the alarmists are right about the science. How much more unjustifiable would it be if I and the growing number of skeptical scientists are right, which I believe we are?

The fearmongering about global warming has turned common sense on its head. In its December 7, 1998, issue, Time magazine named Henry Ford one of the 20th century's 100 most influential builders. Yet, just this month, ''Time'' named the 1909 Model-T car the worst environmental product of the century. ''Time'' acknowledges that the car supercharged the American economy and put it on its wheels but states: ''That's just the problem, isn't it?'' The consequences keep piling up, it says. In short, ''Time'' now endorses the view that our world would be better off if we had never advanced technologically and if we were still dependent upon the horse and the cart as we were in 1909.

Now, most people don't agree with such extremist views, but at the core of the question: ''Shouldn't we do something just in case''—that is the question they ask—the same calculus is at work. What if Henry Ford had not created the Model-T out of fear of unknown consequences, just in case?

It isn't just that our major cities don't each have to deal with the sanitation disposal issues of tens of millions of pounds of horse manure—one of the many real environmental problems a century ago that the automobile eliminated. It extended to every aspect of life.

When the Model-T first rolled off the assembly lines near the beginning of the 20th century, the average American's life expectancy was 53 years. Today, the average American's life expectancy is 78 years, or 25 more than it was a century ago. We are not just living longer lives but healthier and more secure lives. The average American's real standard of living climbed from $5,300 a year in 1913 to $33,000 a year in 2005. That is an enormous jump. The carbon-based society is responsible for that.

Advances in medicine and food production, building construction, services, and the manufacturing of clothing, furniture, and other goods have all been made possible by the mobility brought about by the transportation sector and the electricity provided by our powerplants.

The advances over the last century are not simply interesting historic facts, they show us not only why we are a prosperous nation, but a roadmap to a prosperous future. Threats to prosperity have real consequences and for how well and how long Americans will live. Whatever actions we take today, we must also safeguard the well-being of America's families now and into the future.

The Senate acknowledged this when it passed two similar resolutions on the floor right here in the Senate Chamber. In 1997, the Byrd-Hagel sense of the Senate passed 95 to nothing, a resolution that the United States should not be a signatory to any kind of a treaty that reduced—that had the result of costing a lot of money for the United States and that did not involve the developing nations. In other words, something that involved us and the developing nations but left Mexico and India and China and these countries alone. That was passed 95 to nothing. Similarly, the Bingaman sense-of-the-Senate resolution passed in 2005 resolved that the United States should address global warming as long as it will not significantly harm the United States economy and encourages comparable action by other nations that are major trading partners and key contributors to global emissions.

Neither the Kyoto protocol nor a single bill before Congress meets these criteria. They range from costly to ruinous. But they all fail to meet the requirement of Byrd-Hagel and Bingaman.

Both the Energy Information Administration—that is the EIA—and the Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates—that is the Wharton School of Economics—analyzed the cost of Kyoto when it was signed and the costs were staggering. For instance, EIA found that the annual cost would be up to $283 billion a year. That is in 1992 constant dollars. Wharton put the cost even higher—more than $300 billion a year. Now, that equates out to an increase in taxes $2,700 a year for every family of four in the United States.

The estimated costs to comply with carbon legislative proposals in the United States would be unreasonable. The NCEP approach would do nothing to lessen global warming, even according to the alarmists. But according to the EIA, it would still cost more than 118,000 American jobs simply to make this symbolic gesture.

As I recall from our debate, I say to the Presiding Officer, the highest job loss was actually in the State of Pennsylvania if we had passed that bill 2 years ago.

According to the MIT study—this is a different study than the one we just talked about—the Sanders-Boxer bill would cost the energy sector consumers an amount equal to $4,500 per American family of four. This is a bill that is now pending in the Environment and Public Works Committee. The same study found the Lieberman-McCain bill would cost consumers $3,500 per family of four. Similarly, the EIA found that it would have a cost of

1.3 million jobs. A new EPA analysis shows the Lieberman-McCain bill would also cost up to a half a trillion dollars by 2030, and $1.3 trillion by 2050.

Let me in all fairness say it is no longer called the Lieberman-McCain bill; it is the Lieberman-Warner bill now.

So the environmentalists will now tell you that is OK. Dan Lashof of the National Resource Defense Council says the EPA's analysis of the Lieberman-Warner bill shows it is affordable, although EPA finds that fuel will increase by 22 percent, because he calls fuel impacts ''pretty modest.'' Activists inside the Beltway may think that big jumps in gas prices is not a big deal, but I doubt people living in the real America would agree.

What few Americans realize is that the impact of these policies would not be evenly distributed. The Congressional Budget Office recently looked at the approach taken by most global warming proposals in Congress, known as cap and trade—cap and trade the CO_2 emissions—that would place a cap on carbon emissions, allocate how much everyone could emit, and then let them trade those emissions. Let me quote from the CBO report:

> Regardless of how the allowances were distributed, most of the cost of meeting a cap on CO_2 emissions would be borne by consumers, who would face persistently higher prices for products such as electric and gasoline. Those price increases would be regressive in that poor households would bear a larger burden relative to their income than wealthier households would.

Think about that. Even relatively modest bills would put enormous burdens on the poor. The poor already face energy costs much higher as a percentage of their income than the wealthy. While most Americans spend about 4 percent of their monthly budget on heating homes and energy needs, the poorest one-fifth of Americans spend 19 percent of their budget on energy. Why would we adopt polices which disproportionately force the poor and working class to shoulder the higher costs?

To put this in perspective as to what the costs would be, we go back—on this chart we show that these right here represent the last four of the largest tax increases in this country. This one right here, a $32 billion tax increase, was the Clinton-Gore tax increase of 1993. You remember that: Increased marginal rates, corporate rates affected all of the capital gains tax and all that. I came down here and stood at this podium in outrage trying to fight that tax increase of 1993. By contrast, the Kyoto protocol would actually be 10 times greater. So it is a tax increase 10 times greater than the largest tax increase in recent history.

Carbon caps would also fundamentally alter the way we live. Take the case of the cement industry and its relationship to our daily lives. Cement is experiencing a tremendous growth in daily demand with new jobs that are created. Cement is essential to the maintaining and revitalization of our aging infrastructure. Highways, bridges, water and sewer systems are built with cement. Already, our ability to meet our energy needs is under tremendous stress due to the cost. I think we understand that. I have several things I will put in the RECORD talking about how that is going to hurt the economy.

But I wish to move on here and say that many times I have heard America is the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide. They have been saying this up until a month ago. They said that America is the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide, and thus, we are the problem. That is no longer true. Earlier this year, China surpassed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon. Only 6 years ago, it was estimated that China's emissions would still lag those of the United States in 2040. China's emissions growth is explosive and climbing upward.

To put things in perspective, the United States did not build a single new coal-fired powerplant in the last 15 years, up until 2006—not one—although there are now some efforts underway to change that. By comparison, according to the New York Times, China last year built 117 government-approved coal-fired powerplants at a rate of roughly 1 every 3 days according to official figures. So they are putting up 1 every 3 days and we crank out none in 15 years. You talk about the main motivator of that. India's emissions increases are not far behind China, and Brazil is not far behind them. The fact is if these countries do not curb their rapidly accelerated emissions growth, then embracing a carbon diet and sluggish economic growth by developed countries will accomplish nothing. Moreover, many of the carbon reductions achieved through most manufacturing jobs in developing countries are simply emitted elsewhere, as jobs are created to make the same product in countries that don't ration energy. The U.S. emissions as a measure of productivity are far lower than China. Cement manufacturing is a perfect example. Every job sent there will increase emissions, not lower them.

What we are talking about here is they don't have all these safe terms—the technologies in China—that we have to lower the emissions. So if we force them overseas to China, emissions will have a net increase.

China is growing at such a rate that even if the United States, Europe, and the rest of the developing world were to eliminate every ton of its emissions and become zero emitter countries within a few decades—a clearly ruinous goal—emissions would still be higher than today because of rapidly growing emissions in the developing world. We are talking about China and other countries.

Some will say we simply need to educate the developing countries, but the fact is they understand all too well that there are more important priorities. As the Director General of China's Office of Global Environmental Affairs said in October 2006:

> You cannot tell the people—

Talking about his Chinese people—

> who are struggling to earn enough to eat that they need to reduce their emissions.

The Secretary of India's Environmental Ministry expressed the same sentiment when he said:

> Removal of poverty is the greater immediate imperative.

These views are consistent with the findings of the Copenhagen Consensus. In 2004, a Danish environmentalist who believes global warming is a serious problem got together eight of the world's leading economists, including four Nobel laureates and 30 specialists on many of the world's leading problems. They analyzed the world's biggest issues and ranked them on the cost-effectiveness of directing societal wealth or resources toward these problems. Of the 17 issues studied, HIV/AIDS, malnutrition, malaria and sanitation topped the list as the best investments, while climate came in dead last. It was ranked as a bad use of resources.

So what is the path forward? I categorically will oppose legislation or initiatives that will devastate our economy, as well as those that will cost jobs simply to make symbolic gestures to the far left.

I believe such measures would be defeated because the approach is politically unsustainable. We are seeing the first signs of that in Europe right now. Even if the alarmists were right on the science—which they are not—their command and control approaches sow the seeds of their own failure. As long as their own policies put national economy in the crosshairs, they will stoke the fires of opposition and eventually collapse under their own weight.

Stabilizing emissions cannot happen in 20, 40, 60 years because our world infrastructure is built on fossil fuels and will continue to be so for a long time to come. The powerplants and other facilities being built now and in the future will emit carbon for half a century once they are complete. Quite simply, the technology does not exist to cost-effectively power the world without emitting carbon dioxide. I and many others who reject the climate alarmism or ineffective yet expensive solutions will block efforts to implement mandatory carbon restrictions.

I find it unfortunate that so many politicians and climate advocates focus on trying to resurrect a mandatory carbon policy in the face of its demonstrated failure in practice in the countries that have adopted it. In the process, they are ignoring the best path forward.

There is only one approach so far I have seen that will work, which is called the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. Why is this? It is because this approach serves multiple purposes. There are

some real pollutants out there. CO_2 is not a pollutant; it is a fertilizer. But there are real pollutants out there, SO_X, NO_X, and mercury. By working with our partners, the Asia-Pacific partners, we can expand our energy supply, increase trade, and along with these other goals, reduce greenhouse gases as a byproduct, along with reducing real pollutants such as SO_X, NO_X, and mercury. Others might put this list together differently in terms of priority, but my point is that the Asia-Pacific Partnership meets the criteria for success.

It is a politically and economically sustainable path forward that addresses multiple issues in the context of their relation to other issues. Perhaps other approaches in the future will meet this criteria as well, but this partnership is currently the only one that does.

Any international post-Kyoto agreement the United States enters into must make the concepts embodied in the APP a cornerstone of that agreement.

Let me conclude. I point out that climate alarmism has become a cottage industry in this country and many others. But a growing number of scientists and the general public are coming around to the idea that climate change is natural and that there is no reason for alarm. It is time to stop pretending the world around us is headed for certain doom and that Kyoto-style policies would save us—when, in fact, the biggest danger lies in these policies themselves. Again, new studies continue to pile up and debunk alarm and the very foundation for so-called solutions to warming.

I know this has been a long speech. I want the real people—not the money-driven liberals and the Hollywood elitists but the real people out there raising their families and working hard and paying taxes for all the stuff we are doing in Washington—we want to tell them that help is on its way and that all the U.N.- and media-driven hype to sell America down the river will fail.

During the past 2 hours, I have named hundreds of scientists who were Al Gore followers in the past and now who are skeptics; and they realize this issue is driven by money and the far left. The truth is coming out loudly and clearly.

As Winston Churchill said:

> Truth is incontrovertible, ignorance can deride it, panic may resent it, malice may destroy it, but there it is.

Why am I willing to subject myself to the punishment by the alarmists and elitists? It is because of this. My wife and I have 20 kids and grandkids who are living in this world. I don't want them to have to pay a tax 10 times greater than they should because of something that is based on flawed science and contrived science. It is for them that we are doing it.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry. What is the Senate's current posture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I will speak for a couple of minutes. If somebody else comes to the floor and wants to be heard, I will yield at that time.

I think it is very important we realize something else is looming out there. As everyone knows, I am a conservative Republican. I have seen a thing called the Law of The Sea Treaty. It is coming at us again. This started back in the 1960s and 1970s. During the Reagan administration, President Reagan was able to stop it.

What this treaty would do, in one sentence, is this: It would relinquish our sovereignty to over 70 percent of the world—again, it is another United Nations initiative—to a superagency that will have the ability to tax globally.

During the last 2 years, I have talked about the problems we are having with the hyped global warming debate. It all came from the U.N. That is where a lot of these things come from. The U.N. is less and less accountable to any of the member countries than they were at one time.

One of the things we have done, and I have done personally, is every time we have had a problem where the U.N. is coming out with a policy not in the best interest of the United States, since the United States pays for 25 percent of the budget of the U.N., I have been able to pass a resolution that says that if the U.N. doesn't back down from this program, we will hold back 50 percent of our dues. It is the only leverage we have. Of course, they are outraged.

The people running the U.N. do not want to be accountable to anyone. The reason and the motivations of the Law of the Sea Treaty is to set up this superagency that does have taxing powers—global taxing powers. Their goal has been stated that if they are able to pass this, and they can run the U.N. on a global tax, then they don't have to be accountable to anyone. Here we are paying for 25 percent of it now. But we would not be at that time. It would be paid for independently.

I believe that of all of the bad things coming from this treaty, that is the worst. I think that is the motive of many of them. There are many other problems. By giving up the authority of over 70 percent of the Earth's surface, it has huge military risks. It puts us into a position where if we in the United States know there is a ship on the high seas that has a terrorist aboard or has a weapon of mass destruction, we could no longer stop and search and try to seize it. It states there are only four conditions under which we could stop a ship, and none have to do with national security.

It does say it should not affect the military, but there is no defining term of military effort. Instead, that would be determined by this new high court that would be established—this high court that would be established by the U.N.

I know many people in this Chamber will say: Of course, it is coming from our Republican administration and the military says they want it. I question that when I go back and study what happened during the 1980s and see what the consequences could be. It is now a popular thing. We are saying we have made all the corrections and everything is satisfied now, and if President Reagan were here, he would sign off on it. That is not true. He had five objections to it. Not one of the five has been met.

So I suggest we have something very serious coming. I don't know why it is that the majority of Members of this body, the Senate, think that no idea is a good idea unless it is made by some big multinational organization, that nothing is good unless it is something that addresses a problem from a multinational perspective.

When I go back to Oklahoma, they ask me: What happened to sovereignty in America? I have to say I don't know, but we are going to try to keep it as much as possible. The best way to do that is to not ratify the treaty called the Law of the Sea Treaty. It is going to be a tremendous effort for us to get a number of Senators—34—to sign a letter saying we would oppose this treaty. It takes two-thirds to pass a treaty.

I think this is coming, and I want America to be ready for it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUDAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have repeatedly come to the floor to speak about one of the worst human tragedies in recent memory—the crisis in Darfur.

For 4 long years the world has watched this tragedy. We have witnessed the killing of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, the torching of entire villages, rape, torture, and untold human suffering.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle and in the international community have repeatedly called for greater U.S. and global action.

Upon taking office in January of this year, U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said that ending the violence in Darfur was going to be one of his top priorities. President Bush has rightly called the situation in Darfur genocide. British Prime Minister Gordon Brown has said that, ''Darfur is the greatest humanitarian crisis the world faces today.''

Today, I speak once again about this crisis.

Quite simply, we are at a critical juncture in Sudan.

The situation in Darfur has become increasingly complex. Rebel groups are jockeying for power and fighting amongst themselves. Banditry and lawlessness are on the rise and humanitarian workers remain at great risk. In late September, a rebel group brutally killed ten African Union peacekeepers in a surprise raid.

Just last week, reports surfaced of a new, appallingly violent massacre in southern Darfur. According to reports, more than 30 civilians were killed, including a young boy who was shot in the back while trying to run away.

And now the peace agreement between North and South Sudan—a U.S. brokered accord that might have formed a blueprint for a political settlement in Darfur—appears increasingly in jeopardy.

Sadly, without action, Sudan may be on the verge of even greater instability and human misery.

Yet thanks in part to the tireless work of Secretary General Ban, we also have two critical opportunities to bring about a long-term resolution to this crisis.

First, in late July the U.N. Security Council voted to implement a significantly increased U.N./African Union peacekeeping force.

This peacekeeping force is desperately needed and the United States should work with the U.N. and the global community to make sure it is deployed as soon as possible.

I commend the White House for including funding for this urgent mission in its supplemental appropriations request.

But the peacekeepers are only one important step. Sudan also needs a long-term political agreement. As Secretary General Ban said recently in Sudan, ''There must be a peace to keep.''

This weekend in Tripoli, a first round of peace talks between the various factions and the Sudanese government will begin.

The peacekeeping forces and the Tripoli negotiations are two critical steps toward ending the violence, and they deserve our strongest support.

We must make it clear that we expect all factions to stop the violence and participate in good faith in the peace talks.

We must demand that China and Russia immediately halt the sale of weapons in Sudan. That's right, two permanent members of the U.N. Security Council are the primary arms suppliers in Sudan. Global leaders have a responsibility to halt such sales.

But ultimately, we must hold the Sudanese government accountable. Its culpability in the years of violence and stonewalling of international efforts is well known.

Sudanese President Bashir must be held to his commitment to allow peacekeepers in the country and to participate in the peace talks. He must also work to ensure the North-South peace agreement does not collapse.

Early statements by his government said that it would ''contribute positively to secure the environment for the negotiations'' and ''facilitate the timely deployment'' of the 26,000 member peacekeeping force.

Sadly, we have every reason to be skeptical of the regime's intentions.

It is therefore critical that we maintain pressure on the Sudanese government to honor its commitments. The administration should continue its diplomatic efforts and we in Congress should consider tightening economic sanctions if the Sudanese government does not cooperate with the peacekeepers or the upcoming peace negotiations.

The stakes are too high, and the humanitarian crisis has dragged on too long to allow any more delay in Sudan.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

• Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, today, President Bush is meeting with President Joseph Kabila of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, DRC.

This meeting is very important. The DRC symbolizes the hope that so many Africans have for the future of their continent. The country is also emblematic of so many of the challenges facing Africa.

Stabilizing the DRC and fostering democracy are high priorities for American objectives in Africa. Given the country's size, efforts at political and economic reform, and wealth of natural resources, it is imperative that we support the Congolese Government to end more than a decade of warfare and several decades of unaccountable and nontransparent government.

For this reason, I attached an amendment to the 2006 Iraq supplemental appropriations bill, together with Senator LEAHY, that provided $13.2 million to the Congo, including $8.2 million for military reform and $5 million to support free and fair elections. In December 2006, the Democratic Republic of the Congo Relief, Security, and Democracy Promotion Act passed into law. I was proud to have introduced this legislation, which authorized $52 million in U.S. assistance for the Congo, called for a special envoy to resolve ongoing violence, and urged the administration to strengthen the U.N. peacekeeping force.

Unfortunately, the administration has ignored the call by Congress to appoint a special envoy, and it has done little to strengthen the U.N. peacekeeping force which is working to stabilize the eastern part of the Congo.

Over the past several months, there have been reports of the mobilization of military forces in the eastern Congo. These reports are deeply disturbing. It is my hope that all Congolese leaders will recommit themselves to the search for peace in this part of the country. The pursuit of military solutions in the eastern part of the country will inevitably prove elusive and will only yield more bloodshed and misery for the civilian population.

The seriousness of the situation in eastern Congo was recently highlighted by a devastating report about the escalation of sexual violence against women in the region. For this reason, I wrote a letter to Secretary of State Rice earlier this month to express concern about the escalation of sexual violence in eastern DRC. Specifically, I asked the Secretary to respond to nine questions concerning steps that the administration is taking to help end the sexual violence and make the perpetrators accountable. To date, I have not received a reply to my letter. For the DRC's transition to democratic governance to be successful, the U.S. and its partners will have to intensify their commitment to work with the Congolese Government to enhance security, resolve conflicts, and spur the country's social and economic reconstruction.

Despite the success of last year's elections, the first in 40 years, the international community must be actively engaged in the country for the foreseeable future not only to bring an end to the conflict in the east but to assist in the emergence of institutions that will ensure accountability and economic development. It is a sobering fact that nearly 80 percent of the country's 56 million people live in absolute poverty and more than 70 percent are undernourished.

At the same time, the Kabila government must be encouraged to adopt inclusive and transparent political processes, involving opposition parties and civil society organizations. Moreover, I welcome the return of American investors to the DRC, to help develop and add value to the country's natural resources. It is imperative, however, that American businesses, as well as investors from every other country, especially China, commit to a zero tolerance for corruption while implementing effective measures to preserve the nation's environment.•

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SACRAMENTO PUBLIC LIBRARY

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Sacramento Public Library in Sacramento, CA.

The Sacramento Library opened on November 8, 1857, for members who paid dues equivalent to $300 a year today. It served 260 members with an annual circulation of 4,234 books. On June 14, 1879, the city of Sacramento assumed ownership of the library and residents were given the opportunity to utilize the library at no cost. In 1914, with the help of a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the original building for the current Sacramento Central Library was built with a volume collection of 65,000.

In addition to serving the reading needs of the community, the Sacramento Public Library also provides other important educational tools. It provides access to books on tape, learning exhibits, computers, and college and career counselors. The library also offers literacy services and has staff available to answer questions seven days a week.

The Central Library has come a long way since its beginning; it had a multistory building addition in 1992 and now houses over 300,000 volumes, 1,000 periodical subscriptions and a garden reading area for an outdoor reading environment. Over the years, the Sacramento Public Library added locations in 11 other cities in Sacramento County, with 27 total branches and bookmobiles now serving over 1 million residents.

As the community and staff gather to celebrate the Sacramento Public Library's sesquicentennial, I would like to congratulate the whole community on this wonderful achievement and wish them luck on another 150 years of successful learning.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 505. An act to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity.

H.R. 3963. An act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2233. A bill to provide a permanent deduction for States and local general sales taxes.

S. 2234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the depreciation classification of motorsports entertainment complexes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 635. A bill to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–207).

By Mr. DORGAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1347. A bill to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to modify the date as of which certain tribal land of the Lytton Rancheria of California is deemed to be held in trust and to provide for the conduct of certain activities on the land (Rept. No. 110–208).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 2248. An original bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–209).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 2246. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend eligibility for Federal TRIO programs to members of the reserve components serving on active duty in support of contingency operations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the depreciation classification of motorsports entertainment complexes; read the first time.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 2248. An original bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2249. A bill to establish the Northern Border Economic Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 2250. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2251. A bill to ensure that individual homeowners that were not previously required to purchase flood insurance that are now required to do so because of the updating of flood insurance program rate maps receive a discount for the purchase of such insurance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CASEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 357. A bill designating the week of November 11 through November 17, 2007, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 702

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 702, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to State courts to develop and implement State courts interpreter programs.

S. 790

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 790, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to permit the simplified summer food programs to be carried out in all States and by all service institutions.

S. 1160

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1160, a bill to ensure an abundant and affordable supply of highly nutritious fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops for American consumers and international markets by enhancing the competitiveness of United States-grown specialty crops.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to establish on behalf of consumers a fiduciary duty and other standards of care for mortgage brokers and originators, and to establish standards to assess a consumer's ability to repay, and for other purposes.

S. 1382

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1512

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to expand Federal eligibility for children in foster care who have attained age 18.

S. 1734

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1734, a bill to provide for prostate cancer imaging research and education.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to authorize and facilitate the improvement of water management by the Bureau of Reclamation, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy to increase the acquisition and analysis of water resources for irrigation, hydroelectric power, municipal, and environmental uses, and for other purposes.

S. 2227

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2227, a bill to provide grants to States to ensure that all students in the middle grades are taught an academically rigorous curriculum with effective supports so that students complete the middle grades prepared for success in high school and postsecondary endeavors, to improve State and district policies and programs relating to the academic achievement of students in the middle grades, to develop and implement effective middle school models for struggling students, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 22

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services within the Department of Health and Human Services relating to Medicare coverage for the use of erythropoiesis stimulating agents in cancer and related neoplastic conditions.

S. RES. 346

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 346, a resolution expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2251. A bill ensure that individual homeowners that were not previously required to purchase flood insurance that are now required to do so because of the updating of flood insurance program rate maps receive a discount for the purchase of such insurance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senators LOTT and COCHRAN to introduce legislation that will help make flood insurance more affordable for working families across the country.

This bill makes a substantial change to the National Flood Insurance Program by reducing flood insurance premiums for those living near recently decertified levees.

This is critical in California and the Gulf States, where several levees no longer meet national certification standards.

Here is how the bill works: If a national flood map update results in the decertification of a levee, those living nearby will be required to purchase flood insurance. This legislation makes those now required to pay flood insurance eligible for a 50 percent discount on premiums for 5 years. Levee decertification will force some homeowners to pay upwards of $1,000 per year for new flood insurance policies from the National Flood Insurance Program; according to FEMA premium estimates for high-risk residential areas.

This bill will save most families in a newly zoned high-risk residential area more than $500 each year, or roughly $40 each month.

The goal of the 5-year reprieve is to give the responsible agencies time to bring the levees up to standard.

When the levees are strong again, the homeowners will no longer be required to purchase flood insurance. The financial burden would be lifted.

This grace period helps those who need it most and softens the harsh and expensive consequences that accompany FEMA's Map Modification process.

Additionally, the 5-year limit allows this legislation to accomplish these objectives in a manner that is fiscally responsible.

Our colleagues in the House recently passed legislation H.R. 3121, that seeks to ensure the continued viability of the National Flood Insurance Program.

My colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman DENNIS CARDOZA, authored an amendment similar to this legislation, which passed by voice vote and is now included in the House's proposed changes.

The House bill encourages broader participation, increases financial accountability, and eliminates unnecessary rate subsidies.

Additionally, the bill makes the updating and modernization of flood maps a priority, and requires a thorough review of the Nation's flood protection systems.

Under the new requirements, FEMA will work in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers and local communities to inventory their flood control systems and reassess their levels of protection.

However, as FEMA remaps and reexamines flood threats, many households will find that they are no longer as safe as they thought.

In California alone there are more than 136 communities that contain at least one levee that will be impacted by the deaccreditation process.

These communities contain levees that will be, or may have already been, remapped and decertified for not providing protection from the 1 percent annual chance flood.

Many of the families in these impacted communities have lived in their homes for years, and believed that the levees in their backyards protected them from the threat of dangerous and costly flooding.

As a result of the changing risk, homeowners who were previously exempt from mandatory flood insurance may now be required to purchase flood insurance.

That is why I believe this bill is necessary. The Homeowners Flood Insurance Protection Act lightens this burden.

For nearly 40 years, the National Flood Insurance Program has been instrumental in making flood insurance readily available to all Americans: Communities have partnered with the Federal Government to adopt and enforce floodplain management and, in turn, receive federally-backed insurance policies; and through the development of effective floodplain management strategies, millions of families have been protected from flooding and saved from the devastating costs associated with flood damage.

But today, the program is in danger.

After the record-breaking losses of nearly $20 billion suffered as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, it is clear that the program needs to be updated.

This expansive project will allow communities to formulate responsible floodplain development plans and prepare for catastrophic flooding. The project will also ensure that the National Flood Insurance Program charges fair rates for their flood insurance premiums.

Now, I support the National Flood Insurance program and recognize the importance of mandatory purchase requirements.

The problem is that homeowners who have paid their taxes and helped to pay for the upkeep of these levees, will now find themselves forced to pay an additional insurance premium because of a failing levee.

Many of these individuals in my State and across the country are low-income earners and this increasing burden threatens to break the bank.

Coupled with rising energy, health care and home mortgage costs, the unexpected additional expense of flood insurance may be too much for some families.

That is why we need to offer this assistance.

We must act soon to overhaul our Nation's flood insurance program.

However, it is also our responsibility to mitigate the impact of the levee decertification process on thousands of unsuspecting families across the country.

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

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

S. 2251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Homeowner's Flood Insurance Protection Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. 5-YEAR DISCOUNT OF FLOOD INSURANCE RATES FOR FORMERLY PROTECTED AREAS.

Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by inserting ''and subsection (g)'' before the first comma; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) 5-YEAR DISCOUNT OF FLOOD INSURANCE RATES FOR FORMERLY PROTECTED AREAS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, in the case of any area that previously was not designated as an area having special flood hazards because the area was protected by a flood protection system and that, pursuant to any updating, reviewing, or remapping of flood insurance program rate maps under this Act or any other subsequent Act, becomes designated as such an area as a result of the decertification of such flood protection system, during the 5-year period that begins upon the initial such designation of the area, the chargeable premium rate for flood insurance under this title with respect to any property that prior to the date of enactment of the Homeowner's Flood Insurance Protection Act of 2007 was located within such area shall be equal to 50 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any new property or structure developed, constructed, or otherwise built after the date of enactment of the Homeowner's Flood Insurance Protection Act of 2007 on any property described in such paragraph shall not be eligible for the chargeable premium rate discount under such paragraph.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 357—A BILL DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 11 THROUGH NOVEMBER 17, 2007, AS ''NATIONAL VETERANS AWARENESS WEEK'' TO EMPHASIZE THE NEED TO DEVELOP EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS REGARDING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF VETERANS TO THE COUNTRY

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CASEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 357

Whereas tens of millions of Americans have served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the past century;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Americans have given their lives while serving in the Armed Forces during the past century;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of the men and women who served in the Armed Forces have been vital in maintaining the freedoms and way of life enjoyed by the people of the United States;

Whereas the advent of the all-volunteer Armed Forces has resulted in a sharp decline in the number of individuals and families who have had any personal connection with the Armed Forces;

Whereas this reduction in familiarity with the Armed Forces has resulted in a marked decrease in the awareness by young people of the nature and importance of the accomplishments of those who have served in the

Armed Forces, despite the current educational efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the veterans service organizations;

Whereas the system of civilian control of the Armed Forces makes it essential that the future leaders of the Nation understand the history of military action and the contributions and sacrifices of those who conduct such actions; and

Whereas in each of the years 2000 through 2006 the Senate has recognized the need to increase the understanding of the contributions of veterans among school-aged children by approving a resolution rcognizing the week containing Veterans Day as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of November 11 through November 17, 2007, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' for the purpose of emphasizing educational efforts directed at elementary and secondary school students concerning the contributions and sacrifices of veterans; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Veterans Awareness Week with appropriate educational activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3471. Mr. REID (for Mr. COLEMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 346, expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3471. Mr. REID (for Mr. COLEMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 346, expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title to read as follows: ''Expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes.''

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to move to proceed to Calendar No. 450, H.R. 3963.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 3963 and send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Cal. No. 450, H.R. 3963, Childrens' Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007.

Max Baucus, Harry Reid, Benjamin L. Cardin, S. Whitehouse, Robert Menendez, Daniel K. Inouye, Jack Reed, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Bernard Sanders, Ken Salazar, Kent Conrad, Ron Wyden, Byron L. Dorgan, Debbie Stabenow, Bill Nelson, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum as required under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. I now withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 336 through 356; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as followed:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George E. Pataki, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kelly G. Knight, of Kentucky, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Rodger D. Young, of Michigan, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

William H. Frist, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of two years. (Reappointment)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David T. Johnson, of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs).

Robin Renee Sanders, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Barry Leon Wells, of Ohio, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Mark M. Boulware, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

James D. McGee, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Ronald K. McMullen, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Eritrea.

P. Robert Fannin, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Christopher Egan, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

Louis John Nigro, Jr., of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Paul E. Simons, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

Gail Dennise Mathieu, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia.

Dan Mozena, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Angola.

Eunice S. Reddick, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

Daniel V. Speckhard, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Thomas F. Stephenson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Portuguese Republic.

Vincent Obsitnik, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one of the nominations we approved is Dr. William H. Frist to be a member of the board of directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of 3 years. This is Bill Frist who worked with us in the Senate for 12 years, who was majority leader and somebody with whom I worked very closely. He is a very fine man, a great reputation. He entered public service for the right reason. He was a prominent surgeon. He is

a man who was one of the pioneers in transplant surgery.

I have such fond memories of working with him. We had our battles, but he was always a gentleman. I wish him well with his job. I know he will do a very good job.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

MEASURES INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—H. CON. RES. 172 AND H.R. 1154

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Nos. 241 and 409 be indefinitely postponed, en bloc.

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

NATIONAL VETERANS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 357) designating the week of November 11 through November 17, 2007 as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the week that includes Veterans Day, corresponding this year to November 11–17, 2007, be designated as ''National Veterans Awareness Week''. This marks the eighth year in a row that I have introduced such a resolution, which has been adopted unanimously by the Senate on all previous occasions.

The purpose of National Veterans Awareness Week is to serve as a focus for educational programs designed to make students in elementary and secondary schools aware of the contributions of veterans and their importance in preserving American peace and prosperity. This goal takes on particular importance and immediacy this year as we find ourselves again with uniformed men and women in harm's way in foreign lands.

Why do we need such an educational effort? In a sense, this action has become necessary because we are victims of our own success with regard to the superior performance of our Armed Forces. The plain fact is that there are just fewer people around now who have had any connection with military service. For example, as a result of tremendous advances in military technology and the resultant productivity increases, our current armed forces now operate effectively with a personnel roster that is one-third less in size than just 15 years ago. In addition, the success of the all-volunteer career-oriented force has led to much lower turnover of personnel in today's military than in previous eras when conscription was in place. Finally, the number of veterans who served during previous conflicts, such as World War II, when our military was many times larger than today, is inevitably declining.

The net result of these changes is that the percentage of the entire population that has served in the Armed Forces is dropping rapidly, a change that can be seen in all segments of society. Whereas during World War II it was extremely uncommon to find a family in America that did not have one of its members on active duty, now there are numerous families that include no military veterans at all. Even though the Iraqi war has been prominently discussed on television and in the newspapers, many of our children are much more preoccupied with the usual concerns of young people than with keeping up with the events of the day. They just don't ''feel'' the war like many earlier generations did through both World Wars and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts. As a consequence, many of our youth still have little or no connection with or knowledge about the important historical and ongoing role of men and women who have served in the military. This omission seems to have persisted despite ongoing educational efforts by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the veterans service organizations.

This lack of understanding about military veterans' important role in our society can have potentially serious repercussions. In our country, civilian control of the armed forces is the key tenet of military governance. A citizenry that is oblivious to the capabilities and limitations of the armed forces, and to its critical role throughout our history, can make decisions regarding our military involvement that may have unexpected and unwanted consequences. Even more important, general recognition of the importance of those individual character traits that are essential for military success, such as patriotism, selflessness, sacrifice, and heroism, is vital to maintaining these key aspects of citizenship in the Armed Forces and even throughout the population at large.

The failure of our children to understand why a military is important, why our society continues to depend on it for ultimate survival, and why a successful military requires integrity and sacrifice, will have predictable consequences as these youngsters become of voting age. Even though military service is a responsibility that is no longer shared by a large segment of the population, as it has been in the past, knowledge of the contributions of those who have served in the Armed Forces is as important as it has ever been. To the extent that many of us will not have the opportunity to serve our country in uniform, we must still remain cognizant of our responsibility as citizens to fulfill the obligations we owe, both tangible and intangible, to those who do serve and who do sacrifice on our behalf.

The importance of this issue was brought home to me several years ago by Samuel I. Cashdollar, who was then a 13-year-old seventh grader at Lewes Middle School in Lewes, DE. Samuel won the Delaware VFW's Youth Essay Contest that year with a powerful presentation titled ''How Should We Honor America's Veterans''? Samuel's essay pointed out that we have Nurses' Week, Secretaries' Week, and Teachers' Week, to rightly emphasize the importance of these occupations, but the contributions of those in uniform tend to be overlooked. We don't want our children growing up to think that Veterans Day has simply become a synonym for a department store sale, and we don't want to become a nation where more high school seniors recognize the name Britney Spears than the name Dwight Eisenhower.

National Veterans Awareness Week complements Veterans Day by focusing on education as well as commemoration, on the contributions of the many in addition to the heroism and service of the individual. National Veterans Awareness Week also presents an opportunity to remind ourselves of the contributions and sacrifices of those who have served in peacetime as well as in conflict; both groups work unending hours and spend long periods away from their families under conditions of great discomfort so that we all can live in a land of freedom and plenty. It can also remind us of the importance of our country keeping its promises to our veterans and providing them with the proper support services.

Last year, my resolution designating National Veterans Awareness Week was approved in the Senate by unanimous consent. Responding to that resolution, President Bush issued a proclamation urging our citizenry to observe National Veterans Awareness Week. I ask my colleagues to continue this trend of support for our veterans by endorsing this resolution again this year. Our children and our children's children will need to be well informed about what veterans have accomplished in order to make appropriate decisions as they confront the numerous worldwide challenges that they are sure to face in the future.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, en bloc, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 357) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 357

Whereas tens of millions of Americans have served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the past century;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Americans have given their lives while serving in the Armed Forces during the past century;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of the men and women who served in the Armed Forces have been vital in maintaining the freedoms and way of life enjoyed by the people of the United States;

Whereas the advent of the all-volunteer Armed Forces has resulted in a sharp decline in the number of individuals and families who have had any personal connection with the Armed Forces;

Whereas this reduction in familiarity with the Armed Forces has resulted in a marked decrease in the awareness by young people of the nature and importance of the accomplishments of those who have served in the Armed Forces, despite the current educational efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the veterans service organizations;

Whereas the system of civilian control of the Armed Forces makes it essential that the future leaders of the Nation understand the history of military action and the contributions and sacrifices of those who conduct such actions; and

Whereas in each of the years 2000 through 2006 the Senate has recognized the need to increase the understanding of the contributions of veterans among school-aged children by approving a resolution rcognizing the week containing Veterans Day as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of November 11 through November 17, 2007, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' for the purpose of emphasizing educational efforts directed at elementary and secondary school students concerning the contributions and sacrifices of veterans; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Veterans Awareness Week with appropriate educational activities.

NATIONAL BE BEAR AWARE AND WILDLIFE STEWARDSHIP MONTH

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR THE VICTIMS OF THUNDERSTORMS IN ILLINOIS, IOWA, MINNESOTA, OHIO AND WISCONSIN

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to the consideration of the following Calendar items: No. 444 and No. 445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolutions by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 347) designating May 2008 as ''National Be Bear Aware and Wildlife Stewardship Month''.

A resolution (S. Res. 346) expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the resolution, where applicable, be agreed to; that the resolutions, as amended, if amended, be agreed to en bloc; the amendment to the preamble, where applicable, be agreed to; the preambles, as amended, if amended, be agreed to, en bloc; that the title amendment to S. Res. 346 be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, en bloc, the consideration of these items appear separately in the RECORD, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 347) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 347

Whereas wildlife and wildlife viewing enrich the shared outdoor heritage of the people of the United States;

Whereas it is possible to enjoy wildlife in a way that is prudent, safe, and educational and that has minimal adverse effects on wildlife;

Whereas the people of the United States should be aware of the potential for conflict between humans and wildlife;

Whereas the people of the United States should learn the safety and stewardship techniques that can prevent such conflicts;

Whereas some groups, such as the Center for Wildlife Information and State and Federal wildlife associations, in cooperation with State and Federal wildlife and land management agencies, have taken important proactive steps to create educations toolkits and design programs to educate outdoor enthusiasts; and

Whereas educational efforts can raise awareness of the potential for such conflict, help minimize such conflict, and promote the responsible enjoyment of wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates May 2008 as ''National Be Bear Aware and Wildlife Stewardship Month''.

S. RES. 346

The Senate proceed to consider the resolution (S. Res. 346) expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble.

[Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic]

S. RES. 346

[Whereas, during August 2007, severe thunderstorms were responsible for bringing as much as 18 inches of torrential rain to parts of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, resulting in devastating floods;

[Whereas these storms tragically took the lives of 14 people;

[Whereas these storms injured countless other people, damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, and devastated businesses and institutions;

[Whereas, on August 21, 2007, the Governor of Minnesota declared Fillmore, Houston, Steele, Olmsted, Wabasha, and Winona Counties, Minnesota, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms, and subsequently Dodge and Jackson Counties, Minnesota, received a Federal major disaster declaration as well;

[Whereas, on August 20 and 21, 2007, the Governor of Wisconsin declared Crawford, La Crosse, Richland, Sauk, and Vernon Counties, Wisconsin, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

[Whereas, on August 22, 2007, and in the days following, the Governor of Iowa declared Allamakee, Appanoose, Boone, Calhoun, Cherokee, Davis, Humboldt, Mahaska, Montgomery, Palo Alto, Pocahontas, Union, Van Buren, Wapello, Wayne, Webster, and Winneshiek Counties, Iowa, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

[Whereas, on August 22, 2007, the Governor of Ohio declared Allen, Crawford, Hancock, Hardin, Putnam, Richland, Seneca, Van Wert, and Wyandot Counties, Ohio, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

[Whereas, on August 24, 2007, and in the days following, the Governor of Illinois declared Cook, DeKalb, DuPage, Grundy, Lake, LaSalle, Kane, Knox, McHenry, Warren, and Will Counties, Illinois, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

[Whereas President Bush declared 8 counties in Minnesota, 8 counties in Ohio, 14 counties in Wisconsin, 6 counties in Illinois, and 14 counties in Iowa to be major disaster areas as a result of these storms, and individuals and families, State and local Governments, and certain private nonprofit organizations in these areas became eligible for individual or public Federal disaster assistance or both;

[Whereas numerous individuals and entities have selflessly and heroically given of themselves and their resources to aid in the disaster relief efforts; and

[Whereas the catastrophic injury, death, and damage in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin would have been even worse in the absence of local relief efforts: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas, during August 2007, severe thunderstorms were responsible for bringing as much as 18 inches of torrential rain to parts of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, resulting in devastating floods;

Whereas these storms tragically took the lives of at least 20 people;

Whereas these storms injured countless other people, damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, and devastated businesses and institutions;

Whereas, on August 20, 2007, the Governor of Oklahoma declared Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Grady, Jefferson, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, McClain, Muskogee, Okfuskee, Oklahoma, Okmulgee, Pontotoc, Pottawatomie, Seminole, Stephens, and Washita Counties, Oklahoma, to be in a state of emergency as a result of these storms;

Whereas, on August 21, 2007, the Governor of Minnesota declared Fillmore, Houston, Steele, Olmsted, Wabasha, and Winona Counties, Minnesota, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms, and subsequently Dodge and Jackson Counties, Minnesota, received a Federal major disaster declaration as well;

Whereas, on August 20 and 21, 2007, the Governor of Wisconsin declared Crawford, La Crosse, Richland, Sauk, and Vernon Counties, Wisconsin, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

Whereas, on August 22, 2007, and in the days following, the Governor of Iowa declared Allamakee, Appanoose, Boone, Calhoun, Cherokee, Davis, Humboldt, Mahaska, Montgomery, Palo Alto, Pocahontas, Union, Van Buren, Wapello, Wayne, Webster, and Winneshiek Counties, Iowa, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

Whereas, on August 22, 2007, the Governor of Ohio declared Allen, Crawford, Hancock, Hardin, Putnam, Richland, Seneca, Van Wert, and Wyandot Counties, Ohio, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

Whereas, on August 24, 2007, and in the days following, the Governor of Illinois declared Cook, DeKalb, DuPage, Grundy, Lake, LaSalle, Kane, Knox, McHenry, Warren, and Will Counties, Illinois, to be in a state of disaster as a result of these storms;

Whereas President Bush declared 8 counties in Minnesota, 8 counties in Ohio, 22 counties in Oklahoma, 14 counties in Wisconsin, 6 counties in Illinois, and 14 counties in Iowa to be major disaster areas as a result of these storms, and individuals and families, State and local Governments, and certain private nonprofit organizations in these areas became eligible for individual or public Federal disaster assistance or both;

Whereas numerous individuals and entities have selflessly and heroically given of themselves and their resources to aid in the disaster relief efforts; and

Whereas the catastrophic injury, death, and damage in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin would have been even worse in the absence of local relief efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, [*Oklahoma*,] and Wisconsin;

(2) conveys gratitude to the local, State, and Federal officials and emergency personnel who responded swiftly to the crisis, including emergency management teams in each of the affected States, Michael Chertoff, Secretary of Homeland Security, and David Paulison, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(3) recognizes the generous and selfless support of citizens, local businesses, the American Red Cross, the United Way, Catholic Charities, and the Salvation Army; and

(4) reaffirms support for helping the victims of the flooding rebuild their homes and lives.

The amendment (No. 3471) was agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3471

(Purpose: To amend the title of the resolution)

Amend the title to read as follows: ''Expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, and for other purposes.''

The resolution (S. Res. 346), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

(The resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2247

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the depreciation classification of motor sports entertainment complexes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2007

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m., Monday; that on Monday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period of morning business for 90 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; with Senator BOXER in control of the first 60 minutes, and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of the Republicans; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 158, S. 294, Amtrak authorization.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as a reminder to Members, the cloture motion has been filed on Amtrak. Germane first-degree amendments need to be filed by 3:30 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2007, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:47 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 29, 2007, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN H. GIBSON, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE MICHAEL MONTELONGO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

STEVEN R. CHEALANDER, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2012. (REAPPOINTMENT)

MARK V. ROSENKER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, October 26, 2007:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GEORGE E. PATAKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KELLY G. KNIGHT, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

RODGER D. YOUNG, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

WILLIAM H. FRIST, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS.

KENNETH FRANCIS HACKETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID T. JOHNSON, OF GEORGIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AFFAIRS).

ROBIN RENEE SANDERS, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

BARRY LEON WELLS, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

MARK M. BOULWARE, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF MAURITANIA.

JAMES D. MCGEE, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZIMBABWE.

RONALD K. MCMULLEN, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF ERITREA.

P. ROBERT FANNIN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

CHRISTOPHER EGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

LOUIS JOHN NIGRO, JR., OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHAD.

PAUL E. SIMONS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE.

GAIL DENNISE MATHIEU, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA.

DAN MOZENA, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ANGOLA.

EUNICE S. REDDICK, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE GABONESE REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE.

DANIEL V. SPECKHARD, OF WISCONSIN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

THOMAS F. STEPHENSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PORTUGUESE REPUBLIC.

VINCENT OBSITNIK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S13465–S13495

Measures Introduced: Six bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2246–2251, and S. Res. 357. **Pages S13489–90**

Measures Reported:

S. 635, to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories. (S. Rept. No. 110–207)

S. 1347, to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to modify the date as of which certain tribal land of the Lytton Rancheria of California is deemed to be held in trust and to provide for the conduct of certain activities on the land. (S. Rept. No. 110–208)

S. 2248, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act. (S. Rept. No. 110–209) **Page S13489**

Measures Passed:

National Veterans Awareness Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 357, designating the week of November 11 through November 17, 2007, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country. **Pages S13493–94**

National Be Bear Aware and Wildlife Stewardship Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 347, designating May 2008 as ''National Be Bear Aware and Wildlife Stewardship Month''. **Pages S13494–95**

Victims of August 2007 Flooding: Senate agreed to S. Res. 346, expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the devastating thunderstorms that caused severe flooding during August 2007 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, after agreeing to the committee amendment, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S13494–95**

Reid (for Coleman) Amendment No. 3471, to amend the title of the resolution. **Page S13495**

Measures Indefinitely Postponed:

Charleston Fallen Firefighters: Senate indefinitely postponed H. Con. Res. 172, honoring the life of each of the 9 fallen City of Charleston firefighters who lost their lives in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 18, 2007. **Page S13493**

Congressional Gold Medal: Senate indefinitely postponed H.R. 1154, to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D. **Page S13493**

Measures Considered:

Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 294, to reauthorize Amtrak, agreeing to the committee amendments, which will be considered as original text for purpose of further amendment, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S13466–69**

Pending:

Lautenberg (for Carper) Amendment No. 3454 (to Amendment No. 3452), of a perfecting nature. **Page S13466**

Allard Amendment No. 3455, to strike the provisions repealing Amtrak's self-sufficiency requirements. **Page S13466**

Bond (for DeMint) Amendment No. 3467, to require Amtrak to disclose the Federal subsidy of every ticket sold for transportation on Amtrak. **Pages S13466–67**

Bond (for DeMint) Amendment No. 3468, to increase competition in the American rail system by allowing any qualified rail operator or transportation company to compete for passenger rail service. **Pages S13466–67**

Bond (for DeMint) Amendment No. 3469, to clarify the level of detail to be included in the modern financial accounting and reporting system required under section 203. **Pages S13466–67**

Bond (for DeMint) Amendment No. 3470, to require the Performance Improvement Plan to address reaching financial solvency by eliminating routes and services that do not make a profit. **Pages S13466–67**

Bond Amendment No. 3464, to amend section 24101 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify Amtrak's mission. **Pages S13467–69**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday, October 26, 2007, a vote on cloture will occur at to be determined by the Majority Leader on Tuesday, October 30, 2007. **Page S13466**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all first-degree germane amendments be filed at the desk by 3:30 p.m., on Monday, October 29, 2007. **Page S13466**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 4:30 p.m., on Monday, October 29, 2007. **Page S13495**

State Children's Health Insurance Program: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3963, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program. **Page S13492**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, October 29, 2007. **Page S13492**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S13492**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

P. Robert Fannin, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic.

Gail Dennise Mathieu, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia.

Eunice S. Reddick, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

Ronald K. McMullen, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the State of Eritrea.

Christopher Egan, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

Robin Renee Sanders, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

David T. Johnson, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs).

James D. McGee, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Barry Leon Wells, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of The Gambia.

Mark M. Boulware, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

Paul E. Simons, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile.

Dan Mozena, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola.

Louis John Nigro, Jr., of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad.

Vincent Obsitnik, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic.

Thomas F. Stephenson, of California, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic.

Daniel V. Speckhard, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to Greece.

George E. Pataki, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kelly G. Knight, of Kentucky, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Rodger D. Young, of Michigan, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

William H. Frist, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of two years. **Pages S13492–93, S13495**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

John H. Gibson, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Steven R. Chealander, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2012.

Mark V. Rosenker, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years. **Page S13495**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S13489**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S13489**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S13490**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S13490–91**

Additional Statements: **Page S13489**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S13492**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 1:47 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, October 29, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S13495.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, October 29, 2007.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 29 through November 3, 2007

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at 4:30 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 294, Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: October 31, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine climate disclosure, focusing on measuring financial risks and opportunities, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: October 31, to hold hearings to examine S. 2063, to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the economic security of the United States, and to expand future prosperity and growth for all Americans, 9 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: October 30, business meeting to consider S. 2096, to amend the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act to eliminate the automatic removal of telephone numbers registered on the Federal ''do-not-call'' registry, S. 1580, to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, S. 2045, to reform the Consumer Product Safety Commission to provide greater protection for children's products, to improve the screening of noncompliant consumer products, to improve the effectiveness of consumer product recall programs, S. 1853, to promote competition, to preserve the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services, S. 1675, to implement the recommendations of the Federal Communications Commission report to the Congress regarding low-power FM service, H. Con. Res. 225, honoring the 50th anniversary of the dawn of the Space Age, and the ensuing 50 years of productive and peaceful space activities, and the nominations of Todd J. Zinser, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Commerce, Robert Clarke Brown, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, and promotions lists in the United States Coast Guard, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: October 31, to hold hearings to examine the licensing process for the Yucca Mountain Repository, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: November 1, to hold hearings to examine pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: October 30, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sean R. Mulvaney, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Daniel D. Heath, of New Hampshire, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

October 31, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. Res. 334, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the degradation of the Jordan River and the Dead Sea and welcoming cooperation between the peoples of Israel, Jordan, and Palestine, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, with Annexes, done at Montego Bay, December 10, 1982 (the ''Convention''), and the Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, with Annex, adopted at New York, July 28, 1994 (the Agreement''), and signed by the United States, subject to ratification, on July 29, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 103–39), Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and accompanying Protocol, signed on November 27, 2006, at Brussels (the ''proposed Treaty'') (Treaty Doc. 110–03), Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income signed at Copenhagen May 2, 2006

(the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 109–19), Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Finland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Helsinki May 31, 2006 (the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 109–18), and Protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, Signed on August 29, 1989, signed at Berlin June 1, 2006 (the ''Protocol''), along with a related Joint Declaration (Treaty Doc. 109–20), 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: October 30, to hold hearings to examine ways to protect the United States from drug-resistant tuberculosis, focusing on reinvesting in control and new tools research, 10 a.m., SD–430.

November 1, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory F. Jacob, of New Jersey, to be Solicitor, and Howard Radzely, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, both of the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: October 30, to hold hearings to examine the role of local law enforcement in countering violent Islamist extremism, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

October 31, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery, to hold hearings to examine post-catastrophe crisis, focusing on addressing the dramatic need and scant availability of mental health care in the Gulf Coast, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

November 1, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine the Small Business Administration, focusing on the efficacy of the 7(a) loan program, 2 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: November 1, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the impact of the Flood Control Act of 1944 on Indian Tribes along the Missouri river, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: October 31, to hold hearings to examine Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) amendments, focusing on ways to protect Americans' security and privacy while preserving the rule of law and government accountability, 10 a.m., SD–226.

November 1, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 1946, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, S. 2168, to amend title 18, United States Code, to enable increased federal prosecution of identity theft crimes and to allow for restitution to victims of identity theft, S. 352, to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings, and the nominations of John Daniel Tinder, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, and Julie L. Myers, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: October 31, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

Select Committee on Intelligence: October 30, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

November 1, Full Committee, meeting of conferees on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2008 for the intelligence community, 10 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

November 1, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, October 30, hearing to review technologies in the meat industry, 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, October 30, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies, hearing on Assessing an Effective Diplomatic and Development Program in Iraq: an Examination of the Diplomatic Surge, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

October 31, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on CVC Oversight, 10 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, October 30, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations: Learning from Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) Experience, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, November 1, hearing on Counting the Change: Accounting for the Fiscal Impacts of Controlling Carbon Emissions, 11:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, October 31, to mark up Supplemental Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

November 1, full Committee, hearing on Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunities: Addressing the Rising Costs of a College Education, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, October 30, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1534, Mercury Export Ban Act of 2007; H.R. 2830, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2007; H.R. 3461, Safeguarding America's Families by Enhancing and Reorganizing New and Efficient Technologies Act of 2007; H.R. 2601, To extending the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees to administer and enforce the provisions relating to the ''Do-not-call'' registry of the Telemarketing Sales Rule; H.R. 3541, Do-Not-Call Improvement Act of 2007; H.R. 3526, To include all banking agencies within the existing regulatory authority under the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to depository institutions; H.R. 3403, 911 Modernization and Safety Act of 2007; and H.R. 3919, Broadband Census of America Act of 2007; 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, to mark up H.R. 1747, Safe Drinking Water for Healthy Communities Act of 2007, 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

October 31, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and The Internet, to continue hearings entitled ''Status of the DTV Transition—Part 3,'' 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

November 1, Subcommittee Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''FDA Foreign Drug Inspection Program: A System at Risk,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, October 30, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled ''Additional Perspectives on the Need for Insurance Regulatory Reform,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled '' Preserving and Expanding Minority Banks,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

November 2, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Progress in Administration and Other Efforts to Coordinate and Enhance Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 30, hearing on Russia on the Eve of National Elections, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, hearing on Renewable Energy and the Global Environment, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 31, full Committee, hearing on The Mexico City Policy/Global Gag Rule: Its Impact on Family Planning and Reproductive Health, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 31, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on the Activities of the Department of State's Office of the Inspector General, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, October 30, Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled ''The SAFE Port Act: Status of Implementation One Year Later,'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

October 31, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Homeland Security: TWIC Failures: TWIC Examined,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

October 31, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, joint hearing entitled ''Enhancing and Implementing the Cybersecurity Elements of the Sector Specific Plans,'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

November 1, Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, hearing entitled ''Aviation Security Part II: A Frontline Perspective on the Need for Enhanced Human Resources and Equipment,'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, October 31, oversight hearing on the Use of Robocalls' in Federal Campaigns, 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, October 30, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, to continue hearings on Straightening Out the Mortgage Mess: How Can We Protect Home Ownership and Provide Relief to Consumers in Financial Distress?—Part II, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, oversight hearing on the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, hearing on Stifling or Stimulating—Role of Gene Patents in Research and Genetic Testing, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

October 31, full Committee, hearing on Combating Modern Slavery: Reauthorization of Anti-Trafficking Programs, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

November 1, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 3359, Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Fairness and Simplification Act of 2007, 12 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

November 1, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on H.R. 2878, Enhanced Financial Recovery and Equitable Retirement Treatment Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, October 30, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forest and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 415, To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; H.R. 1143, To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Islands National Park; H.R. 1286, Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act; H.R. 1545, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a boundary study to evaluate the significance of Fort San Geronimo and other related resources in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the suitability and feasibility of their inclusion in the National Park System as part of the San Juan National Historic Site; H.R. 1836, Weir Farm National Historic Site Amendment Act; H.R. 3022, Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park Wilderness Act of 2007; H.R. 3120, Stranahan House, Trading Post and Campsite Historic Preservation Act; H.R. 3265, Harry S. Truman Birthplace Study Act; H.R. 3473, Bountiful City Land Consolidation Act; H.R. 3616, Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Extension Study Act of 2007; and H.R. 3821, Battle of Matewan Study Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

October 31, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2801, Izembek and Alaska Peninsula Wildlife Refuges and Wilderness Enhancement and King Cove Safe Access Act, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

November 1, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 3301, Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2007, 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, October 30, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, hearing on Will Increased Postal Rates put Mailers out of Business? 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

October 30, Subcommittee on National Security, and Foreign Affairs, hearing on Iran: Reality, Options, and Consequences—Iranian People and Attitudes, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

October 31, full Committee, hearing on Oil and Gas Development: Exemptions from Health and Environmental Protections, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

November 1, full Committee, hearing on The Administration's Regulatory Actions on Medicaid: The Effects on Patients, Doctors, Hospitals, and States, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

November 1, Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization and Procurement, hearing on Too Many Cooks? Coordinating Federal and State Health IT, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, October 30, to consider the following: H.R. 2262, Trade and Globalization Act of 2007, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, October 30, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Research to Improve Water-Use Efficiency and Conservation: Technologies and Practices, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

October 31, full Committee, hearing on Aviation Safety: Can NASA Do More to Protect the Public? 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

October 31, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on Research on Environmental and Safety Impacts of Nanotechnology: Current Status of Planning and Implementation under the National Nanotechnology Initiative, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, October 31, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing entitled ''Competitive Bidding for Durable Medical Equipment: Will Small Suppliers Be Able To Compete? 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

November 1, full Committee, hearing on Evaluating the Impact of Pending Free Trade Agreements upon U.S. Small Businesses, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, November 1, Subcommittee on Highway and Transit, hearing on Drug and Alcohol Testing of Commercial Motor Vehicle Drivers, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, November 1, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the VA Construction Process, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, October 30, hearing on the Appropriateness of Retirement Plan Fees, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, October 31, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 8:45, and executive, briefing on DNI Personnel, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, November 1, hearing entitled ''Wildfires and the Climate Crisis,'' 9:30 a.m., room to be announced.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: November 1, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, meeting of conferees on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2008 for the intelligence community, 10 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: October 29, to hold hearings to examine the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and simmering tensions with Russia before parliamentary and presidential elections, 4 p.m., 210–CHOB.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, October 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 90 minutes), Senate will resume consideration of S. 294, Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, October 29

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.