place for a reason, and I am sick and tired of it being violated. The Constitution is the foundation of this country, and anyone with common sense will tell you, that when you chip away at the very foundation of something, then the entire structure will crumble. That is what is happing to the USA. Stop letting the environmentalist run and control everything. If it were not for them, and the idiots running this country we would have already drilled in ANWR Alaska. Or better yet our own, gulf instead of China/Cuba/India. By the way, these are two suggestions for you to use.

Let us make this country back into what it was meant to be, a great place to live, and raise your children in. Stop selling out the United States of America.

NICK and KASEY, *Boise*.

I hope you do not mind, but I am an avid Glenn Beck listener, and I heard on his show yesterday that one of Senator Orrin Hatch's secretaries or spokespeople told one of his constituents that he would not support offshore drilling. The constituent was calling because he wanted to tell Senator Hatch that he supported it.

I am glad to see you asking directly for people's opinion and actually using some of the stories on your site.

Let me just say that right now my wife, our baby, and I do not have a car. Well, not one in working condition. See, I have a '94 Geo Metro, but it threw a rod earlier in the year and we just do not have the money to get a new car. I did find an engine for my Geo, though, so everything should work out once we get our economic stimulus check, except for the whole skyrocketing gas prices thing.

Right now we have to borrow my parents' truck if we need a car, which is very frequently. We are trying to get my wife into school to become a paramedic, but without transportation, we cannot do anything. Back when gas prices were cheaper, I had less of a problem borrowing people's vehicles, but these days I cannot stand to borrow somebody's car because a lot of the time I do not have the cash to put gas back into it.

Luckily I live really close to where I work, so I walk every day. My wife mostly just stays home with our baby, and both sets of our parents live close by. The only thing is, just the short distances that our parents have to drive to pick us up or take us to the store or whatever they do is too much. Even having smaller vehicles, like my Geo, does not seem to help that much. Before the thing broke down I was putting $40–50 in to fill the thing, and it only has an 8-gallon tank.

Let me be frank. I like that you have asked people's opinions on this subject. High gas prices affect everything, as you can probably see. Food prices are going up because of the money it takes to transport. Anything that is made with petroleum (which is something that people rarely think about) like paint products and plastics are going up. Everything is going up because everybody uses gas to get from point A to B, so businesses let customers make up the difference by raising prices.

It is a pretty simple economic concept, but something that should be even simpler is supply and demand. I do not know why anybody at this point is against offshore drilling. And, I do not know why anybody is against nuclear energy. Sure, plenty of environmentalists are all bonkers about nuclear meltdowns and all that, but how many times in history has that ever happened? Nuclear waste from reactors is even becoming less of a factor.

The long and short of it is really that I support Senators that listen to the people. I think that you should try to get on the news yourself and let people know that you want their opinion.

PHIL, *Boise*.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

140TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. MARK'S A.M.E. CHURCH

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I wish to honor St. Mark's A.M.E. Church, which has been a part of Milwaukee's faith community for 140 years and serves as a shining example for the entire State of Wisconsin.

In 1869, eight eager Christian men and women envisioned a ''Church of Allen.'' This church would uphold the ideals of Richard Allen, a freed slave who became the first free African to be ordained in the Methodist Church. The church's eight founders were led by Ezekiel Gillespie, a prominent figure involved in the Underground Railroad and the fight for suffrage for African-Americans in Wisconsin. The founding members became an official congregation on April 5, 1869, but the church was still missing a building to call home.

Within 2 months, a plot of land was purchased and the church embraced its new house of worship. Unfortunately, expenses mounted for nearly a decade and the founders were forced to sell a portion of their land in order to cover the debt. After a city condemnation required the razing of St. Mark's original church, both the clergy and laity insisted that a new edifice be erected in its place. In 1887, they began construction of a church which would last into the 20th century.

As the city of Milwaukee continued to grow and thrive, so too did the membership of St. Mark's. The increase in size prompted the creation of new churches in 1914 and again in 1953. After the Milwaukee Redevelopment Program of the 1960s, the construction of a highway ushered in the demolition of their 1953 structure. The congregation grew only stronger and its current church truly represents its lasting success.

Given the moniker, ''The Friendly Church,'' St. Mark's has continually proven both its friendliness and its faith within Milwaukee. St. Mark's A.M.E. Church holds a special place in our State's history as Wisconsin's oldest African-American chartered church. St. Mark's leaders and parishioners have stalwartly defended their home and shared their devotion with our Milwaukee community, and this historic church will continue to thrive in the future. On this occasion of St. Mark's 140th anniversary, I want to offer my heartfelt congratulations.•

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 Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 363. A bill to make determinations by the United States Trade Representative under title III of the Trade Act of 1974 reviewable by the Court of International Trade and to ensure that the United States Trade Representative considers petitions to enforce United States trade rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 132

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to increase and enhance law enforcement resources committed to investigation and prosecution of violent gangs, to deter and punish violent gang crime, to protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, to revise and enhance criminal penalties for violent crimes, to expand and improve gang prevention programs, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes.

S. 333

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 333, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction against individual income tax for interest on indebtedness and for State sales and excise taxes with respect to the purchase of certain motor vehicles.

S. 354

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 354, a bill to provide that 4 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 363. A bill to make determinations by the United States Trade Representative under title III of the Trade Act of 1974 reviewable by the Court of International Trade and to ensure that the United States Trade Representative considers petitions to enforce United States trade rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, the devastating job losses we are currently seeing across our economy have reaffirmed my conviction that Congress must redirect U.S. international trade policy toward preserving American jobs through stringent enforcement of

U.S. trade rights, rather than endlessly pursuing new free trade agreements. Shifting the focus of U.S. trade strategy to job preservation is particularly essential in the manufacturing sector, which since 1994—the year NAFTA came into effect—has lost over 4.2 million jobs. The economic downturn over the past year has further decimated U.S. manufacturers, which have shed over 600,000 jobs in 2008 alone.

It is no coincidence that this withering of our country's once-unparalleled manufacturing base took place during a decade-and-a-half of record trade liberalization and increases in imports from large, often poorly regulated low-cost producers like China and India. In Maine, my constituents have seen this down-side of trade, with over 20,000 manufacturing jobs lost since 2000, mainly in paper and wood-working industries that have suffered from unfair competition from Asian imports.

To stem the outflow of American manufacturing jobs due to trade competition with countries that manipulate their currencies, exploit their workers or wantonly degrade their environment, it is essential that we decisively enforce the trade agreements we already have in place. Yet our Government has often failed to take this basic but crucial step when confronted with egregiously unfair trade practices. While foreign governments engage in market-distorting currency manipulation, refuse to protect intellectual property rights and turn a blind eye to labor exploitation—each a violation of trade obligations to the United States—ours all too frequently demurs with communiqués and consultations, rather than formal enforcement action. What makes this abdication of duty to defend the U.S. economy from unfair foreign practices especially troubling is that the tools to do so already exist in the dispute resolution provisions of various trade agreements.

The distressing reality is that U.S. industry and labor groups are often rebuffed in attempts to petition the United States Trade Representative to initiate a formal investigation or bring a dispute resolution action under the relevant multilateral or bilateral trade agreement, as there seems to be considerable institutional momentum among senior officials at USTR and elsewhere in the bureaucracy against bringing formal enforcement action against key trade partners. Indeed, it is a troubling fact that every single one of the petitions brought by business or labor groups in the last 8 years under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974—the statute setting forth the process by which members of the public can request that the government enforce of U.S. trade rights—has been rejected by USTR, in some instances on the same day they were filed!

It is to prevent further disregard for U.S. businesses and workers seeking a fair and consequential hearing of their concerns with foreign trade practices that Senators ROCKEFELLER and CONRAD and I today introduce the Trade Complaint and Litigation Accountability Improvement Measures Act, or the Trade CLAIM Act.

The Trade CLAIM Act would amend the Section 301 process to require the United States Trade Representative to act upon an interested party's petition to take formal action in cases where a U.S. trade right has been violated, except in instances where: the matter has already been addressed by the relevant trade dispute settlement body; the foreign country is taking imminent steps to end or ameliorate the effects of the practice; taking action would do more harm than good to the U.S. economy; or taking action would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

The bill would also grant the U.S. Court of International Trade jurisdiction to review de novo USTR's denials of Section 301 industry petitions to investigate and take enforcement action against unfair foreign trade laws or practices. Such jurisdiction would include the ability to review USTR determinations that U.S. trade rights have not been violated as alleged in industry petitions, and the sufficiency of formal actions taken by USTR in response to foreign trade laws or practices determined to violate U.S. trade rights.

The Trade CLAIM Act would thus give U.S. businesses and workers a greater say in whether, when and how U.S. trade rights should be enforced. As Ranking Member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I believe this bill would also be particularly beneficial to small businesses, which—like other petitioners in Section 301 cases—currently have no avenue to formally challenge the merits of USTR's decisions, and are often drowned out by large business interests in industry-wide Section 301 actions initiated by USTR.

By providing for judicial review of USTR decisions not to enforce U.S. trade rights, the bill provides for impartial third party oversight by a specialty court not subject to political and diplomatic pressures. In de-linking discreet trade disputes from the mercurial machinations of USTR's trade liberalization agenda, this Act would end the sacrifice of individual industries on the negotiating table, and allow trade enforcement claims to be decided on their merits. We owe no less to the millions of American workers whose jobs depend on the level international playing field that can only be guaranteed by their Government consistently standing up for them against unfair foreign trade practices.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 99. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1, making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 100. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 101. Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 102. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 103. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 104. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 105. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 99. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1, making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows;

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a Joint Select Committee on Economic Recovery (referred to in this section as the ''joint committee'') to be composed of 20 members as follows:

(A) 10 Members of the House of Representatives, including the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations, or their designee, 4 members appointed from the majority party by the Speaker of the House, and 2 members from the minority party to be appointed by the minority leader.

(B) 10 Members of the Senate, including the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations, or their designee, 4 members appointed from the majority party by the majority leader of the Senate, and 2 members from the minority party to be appointed by the minority leader.

(2) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.