expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 853. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to establish a program to bolster the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUGAR, Mr. President. I rise to introduce the North American Cooperative Security Act, NACSA. The purpose of this bill is to enhance the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The security of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUGAR, Mr. President. I rise to introduce the North American Cooperative Security Act, NACSA. The purpose of this bill is to enhance the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Secretary of State to establish a program to bolster the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The provision of this Act, the Secretary of State shall enhance the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
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(4) BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE.—Efforts to pursue joint investments in and protection of border infrastructure, including—

(A) priority ports of entry;
(B) dedicated lanes and approaches and improve border infrastructure in order to meet the objectives of FAST;
(C) the development of a strategic plan for expanding the number of dedicated FAST lanes at major crossings at the international border between Mexico and the United States; and
(D) inventory of border transportation infrastructure in major transportation corridors.

(5) SECURITY CLEARANCES AND DOCUMENT INTEGRITY.—The development of more common authentication, validation, and biometric standards for the issuance, authentication, validation, and republication of secure documents, including—

(A) technical and biometric standards based on best practices and consistent with international standards for the issuance, authentication, validation, and republication of travel documents, including—

(i) passports;
(ii) visas; and
(iii) permanent resident cards;

(B) working with the Governments of Canada and Mexico to encourage foreign governments to adopt international standards for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with visa and travel documents; and

(C) applying the necessary pressures and support to ensure that other countries meet proper travel document standards and are equally committed to travel document verification before transit to other countries, including the United States; and

(D) providing technical assistance for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with visa and travel documents.

(6) IMMIGRATION AND VISA MANAGEMENT.—The progress on efforts to share information on high-risk individuals that might attempt to travel to Canada, Mexico, or the United States, including—

(A) immigration lookout data on high risk individuals by implementing the Statement of Mutual Understanding on Information Sharing regarding named aliens considered by Canada and the United States in February 2003; and

(B) immigration fraud and trend analysis, including document fraud.

(7) VISA POLICY CoORDINATION AND IMMIGRATION SECURITY.—The progress made by the Governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States to enhance North American security by cooperating on visa policy and identifying best practices regarding immigration security, including—

(A) information sharing and visa security consultations among visa issuing officials at consulates or embassies of Canada, Mexico, and the United States throughout the world to share information, trends, and best practices;

(B) comparing the procedures and policies of Canada and the United States related to visitor visa processing, including—

(i) application process;
(ii) interview policy;
(iii) general screening procedures;
(iv) visa validity;
(v) quality control measures; and
(vi) access to appeal or review;

(C) converging the list of “visa waiver” countries;

(D) providing technical assistance for the development and maintenance of a national database built upon identified best practices for biometrics associated with immigration violations;

(E) developing and implementing a North American immigration security strategy that works toward the development of a common security perimeter by enhancing technical assistance for programs and systems to support advance automated reporting and risk targeting of international passengers;

(F) the progress made toward sharing information on lost and stolen passports on a real-time basis with law enforcement officials of the Governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States; and

(G) the progress made by the Department of State in collecting 10 fingerprints from all visa applicants.

(8) NORTH AMERICAN VISITOR OVERSTAY PROGRAM.—The implementation parallel entry-exit tracking systems between Canada and the United States—

(A) to share information on third country nationals who have overstayed in either country; and

(B) that respect the privacy laws of each country.

(9) TERRORIST WATCH LISTS.—The progress made to enhance capacity of the United States to combat terrorism through the coordination of counterterrorism efforts, including—

(A) bilateral agreements between Canada and the United States and between Mexico and the United States to govern the sharing of the terrorist watch list data and to comprehensively enumerate the uses of such data by the governments of each country;

(B) establishing appropriate linkages between Canada, Mexico, and the United States Terrorist Screening Center; and

(C) working to explore with foreign governments the establishment of a multilateral watch list mechanism that would facilitate direct coordination between the country that identifies an individual as an individual included in its country that owns such list, including procedures that satisfy the security concerns and are consistent with the privacy and other laws of each participating country.

(10) MONEY LAUNDERING, INCOME TAX EVASION, CURRENCY SMUGGLING, AND ALIEN SMUGGLING.—The progress made to improve information sharing and law enforcement cooperation in organized crime, including—

(A) information sharing and law enforcement cooperation, especially in areas of current and emerging trends involving alien smuggling and trafficking in alcohol, firearms, and explosives;

(B) implementation of the Canada-United States Firearms Trafficking Action Plan;

(C) the feasibility of formulating a firearms trafficking action plan between Mexico and the United States;

(D) developing a joint threat assessment on organized crime between Canada and the United States;

(E) the feasibility of formulating a joint threat assessment on organized crime between Mexico and the United States; and

(F) developing and implementing a plan to combat the transnational threat of illegal drug trafficking.

(11) COUNTERTERRORISM PROGRAMS.—Enhancements to counterterrorism coordination, including—

(A) reviewing existing counterterrorism efforts and coordination to maximize effectiveness; and

(B) identifying best practices regarding the sharing of information and intelligence.

(12) LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION.—The enhancement of law enforcement cooperation to enhance the information sharing between the United States and Mexico, and appropriate procedures from such efforts; and

(13) PROTECTION AGAINST NUCLEAR AND RADIODIOLOGICAL THREATS.—The progress made to increase cooperation to prevent nuclear and radiological smuggling, including—

(A) identifying opportunities to increase cooperation to prevent smuggling of nuclear or radioactive materials, including improving expert controls for materials identified on the high-risk access list maintained by the International Atomic Energy Agency;

(B) working collectively with other countries to install radiation detection equipment at foreign land crossings to examine cargo destined for North America;

(C) enhancing border controls through effective technical cooperation and other forms of cooperation to—

(i) prevent the smuggling of radiological materials; and

(ii) examine related next-generation equipment.

(D) enhancing physical protection of nuclear facilities in North America through effective technical and other forms of cooperation; and

(E) developing a program on physical protection for Mexican nuclear installations that includes the development and transport of nuclear materials.

(14) EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COOPERATION.—The progress made regarding the appropriate coordination of our systems and planning and operational standards for emergency management, including the development of an interoperable communications system or the appropriate coordination of existing systems for Canada, Mexico, and the United States for cross-border incident management.

(15) COOPERATIVE ENERGY POLICY.—The progress of efforts to—

(A) increase the use of clean energy supplies for the region’s needs and development;

(B) streamline and update regulations concerning energy; and

(C) promote energy efficiency, conservation, and technologies;

(D) work with the Governments of Canada and Mexico to develop a North American energy policy that includes reliance on nuclear energy sources; and
(E) work with the Government of Mexico to—
(i) increase Mexico’s crude oil and natural gas production by obtaining the technology and domestic refining capacity needed by Mexico for energy sector development; and
(ii) attract sufficient private direct investment in the upstream sector, within its domestic legal framework, to foster the development of additional crude oil and natural gas production; and
(iii) attract the private direct investment in the downstream sector, within its domestic legal framework, to foster the development of additional domestic refining capacity to reduce costs for consumers and to move Mexico toward self-sufficiency in meeting its domestic energy needs.

(17) FEASIBILITY OF COMMON EXTERNAL TARIFF AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE ECONOMY OF MEXICO.—The progress of efforts to determine the feasibility of—
(A) harmonizing external tariffs on a sector-by-sector basis to the lowest prevailing rate consistent with multilateral obligations, with the goal of creating a long-term common external tariff;
(B) accelerating and expanding the implementation of “smart border” actions plans to facilitate intra-Northern American travel and commerce;
(C) working with Mexican authorities to devise comprehensive policies designed to stimulate the Mexican economy that—
(i) attracts investment;
(ii) stimulates growth; and
(iii) commands broad public support and provides for Mexicans to find jobs in Mexico; and
(D) working to support the development of Mexican industries, job growth, and appropriate improvements to social services.

SEC. 4. INFORMATION SHARING AGREEMENTS.

The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Departments of Homeland Security and the Government of Mexico, is authorized to negotiate an agreement with Mexico to—

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and the Government of Mexico, is authorized to establish a program to—
(1) cooperate in impeding the ability of third country nationals from using Mexico as a transit corridor for unauthorized entry into the United States; and
(2) provide technical assistance to support stronger immigration control at the border with Mexico.

(b) INFORMATION SHARING AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, and the Government of Mexico, shall examine the feasibility of entering into an agreement with Panama and the other countries of Central America regarding the exchange of information, to the extent practicable, to improve security at the borders of the United States; and
(1) strengthen institutions for consultation on defense issues among the United States, Mexico, and Canada, specifically through—
(A) the Joint Intergency Task Force South; (B) the Permanent Joint Board on Defense; (C) joint-staff talks; and
(D) senior Army border talks;
(2) propose an agreement to reach agreements with the Government of Canada or Mexico regarding contingency plans for responding to threats along the international borders of the United States; and
(3) in consultation with the Governments of Canada and Mexico, and with input from the United States Northern Command—
(A) develop a joint trilateral capability to address common threats along shared borders; and
(B) work together to clearly define the term “threats” to only encompass military or defense-related threats, rather than other threats to homeland security;
(4) offer technical support to willing regional parties to maintain air space security, including consultation mechanisms with the Joint Intergency Task Force and the North American Aerospace Defense Command, to improve security in the North American and Central American space; and
(5) proposing mechanisms to strengthen coordination and intelligence sharing on defense issues among the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

SEC. 5. IMPROVING THE SECURITY OF MEXICO’S SOUTHERN BORDER.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, and the Government of Mexico, shall—
(1) assess the specific needs of Guatemala and Belize in maintaining the security of the borders of such countries;
(2) use the assessment made under paragraph (1) to determine the financial and technical support needed by Guatemala and Belize from Canada, Mexico, and the United States to meet such needs; and
(3) provide technical assistance to Guatemala and Belize to secure issuance of passports and travel documents by such countries; and
(b) BORDER SECURITY BETWEEN MEXICO AND GUATEMALA OR BELIZE.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Government of Mexico, and appropriate officials of the Governments of Guatemala, Belize, and other Central American countries, shall—
(i) assess the direct and indirect impact on the United States and Central America on deporting violent criminal aliens;
(ii) establish a program and database to track Central American gang activities, focusing on the identification of returning criminal deportees;
(iii) devise an agreed-upon mechanism for notification applied prior to deportation and for support for reintegration of these deportees; and
(iv) devise an agreement to share all relevant information with the appropriate agencies of Mexico and other Central American countries.

(c) BORDER SECURITY BETWEEN MEXICO AND CANADA.—

(i) AERIAL INTERDICTION OF NARCOTRAFFICKING THROUGH CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—The Secretary of State shall examine the feasibility of entering into an agreement with Panama and the other countries of Central America regarding the exchange of information, to the extent practicable, to improve security of cross-border narcotics interdiction, commonly known as “Airbridge Denial.”

(ii) AERIAL INTERDICTION OF NARCOTRAFFICKING THROUGH CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—The Secretary of State shall examine the feasibility of entering into an agreement with Panama and the other countries of Central America regarding the exchange of information, to the extent practicable, to improve security of cross-border narcotics interdiction, commonly known as “Airbridge Denial.”

(iii) REGISTERED DOCUMENTS.—The Secretary of State shall—
(1) assess the direct and indirect impact on the United States and Central America on deporting violent criminal aliens;
(2) provide the proper support and international pressure necessary to facilitate the removal of inadmissible aliens from the United States and their repatriation in, or reinstatement by, a responsible country, with a focus on criminal aliens that are particularly dangerous or potential terrorists.

By Mr. FEINGOLD.
S. 854: A bill to require labeling of raw agricultural forms of ginseng, including the country of harvest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to discuss legislation I am introducing that would protect ginseng farmers and consumers by ensuring that ginseng is labeled accurately with where the root was harvested. The “Ginseng Harvest Labeling Act of 2005” is similar to bills I introduced in previous Congresses and developed after hearing suggestions from ginseng growers and the Ginseng Board of Wisconsin.

I would like to take the opportunity to discuss American ginseng and the problems facing Wisconsin’s ginseng growers so that my colleagues understand the need for this legislation. Chinese and Native American cultures have used ginseng for thousands of years for herbal and medicinal purposes. As a dietary supplement, American ginseng is widely touted for its ability to improve energy and vitality, particularly in fighting fatigue or stress.

In the U.S., ginseng is experiencing increasing popularity as a dietary supplement, and I am proud to say that my home State of Wisconsin is playing a central role in ginseng’s resurgence. Wisconsin produces 97 percent of the ginseng grown in the United States, and ginseng is grown in just one Wisconsin county, Marathon County. Ginseng is also grown in a number of other States such as Maine, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

For Wisconsin, ginseng has been an economic boon. Wisconsin ginseng commands a premium price in world markets because it is of the highest quality and because it has a low pesticide and chemical content. In 2002, U.S. exports of ginseng totaled nearly $45 million, much of which was grown in Wisconsin. With a huge market for this high-quality ginseng overseas, and growing popularity for the ancient root here at home, Wisconsin’s ginseng industry should have a prosperous future ahead.

Unfortunately, the outlook for ginseng farmers is marred by a serious
problem—smuggled and mislabeled ginseng. Wisconsin ginseng is considered so superior to ginseng grown abroad that consumers know which ginseng is Wisconsin-grown product. There is good reason consumers should want to know that the ginseng they buy is American-grown considering that the only accurate way of testing ginseng to determine where it was grown is to test for pesticides that are banned in the United States. The Ginseng Board of Wisconsin has been testing some ginseng found on store shelves, and in many of the products, residues of chemicals such as DDT, lead, arsenic, and quinotine (PCNB) have been found. Since the majority of ginseng sold in the U.S. originates from countries with less stringent pesticide standards, it is vitally important that consumers know which ginseng is really grown in the U.S.

To give ginseng growers the support they deserve and help consumers make informed choices about the ginseng that they consume. We must ensure that when ginseng consumers reach for a high-quality ginseng product—such as Wisconsin-grown ginseng—they are getting the real thing, not a knock-off. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 854
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 “Ginseng Har-vesting Act of 2005.”

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE OF COUNTRY OF HARVEST.
The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subtitle E—Ginseng" "SEC. 291. DISCLOSURE OF COUNTRY OF HARVEST.
(a) Definition of Ginseng.—In this section, the term "ginseng" means an herb or herbal ingredient that—

(1) is derived from a plant classified within the genus Panax; and

(2) is offered for sale as a raw agricultural commodity shall be made in transactions at wholesale or retail (including transactions by mail, telephone, or Internet or in retail stores)."

(b) Disclosure.—
(1) In General.—A person that offers ginseng for sale as a raw agricultural commodity shall disclose to potential purchasers by means of a label, stamp, mark, placard, or other clear and visible sign on the package, display, or in the holding unit, or bin containing the ginseng.

(2) Retailers.—A retailer of ginseng shall—
(A) retain disclosure provided under subsection (b); and
(B) provide disclosure to a retail pur-chaser of the raw agricultural commodity.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall by regulation prescribe with specific manner and disclosure how the country of harvest of the ginseng at the point of entry into the United States, in accordance with section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304).

(c) Manner of Disclosure.—The disclosure required by subsection (b) shall be provided to potential purchasers by means of a label, stamp, mark, placard, or other clear and visible sign on the package, display, or in the holding unit, or bin containing the ginseng.

(d) Failure to Disclose.—The Secretary of Agriculture may impose on a person that fails to comply with subsection (b) a civil penalty of not more than—

(1) $1,000 for the first day on which the failure to disclose occurs; and

(2) $250 for each day during which the failure to disclose continues.”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.
This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS:
S. 855. A bill to improve the security of the Nation’s ports by providing Federal grants to support Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and to address vulnerabilities in port areas identified in approved vulnerability assessments or by the Secretary of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Port Security Grants Act of 2005. This legislation would establish a dedicated grant program within the Department of Homeland Security to enhance terrorism prevention and response efforts at our ports. It would provide the resources needed to better protect the American people from attack through these vital yet still extremely vulnerable centers of our economy and points of entry. I am very pleased that my partner in this effort, Representative JANE HARMAN, today is introducing the same legislation in the House of Representatives. Congresswoman HARMAN knows well the vulnerability of our Nation’s ports. Indeed, earlier this year, I accompanied her to the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. We observed firsthand the incredible volume of activity that occurs at these thriving economic centers—and the incredible security challenges that they pose. Congresswoman HARMAN’s dedication to the security of our ports as a whole makes her one of Congress’ acknowledged leaders on homeland security matters. I am pleased that we have been able to join forces on this important initiative.

To address security needs at our ports has been woefully inadequate. The Coast Guard estimates that implementing the provisions of the Maritime Transportation Security Act and similar requirements for international port security will cost $7.3 billion over the next decade. Yet, since MTSA was enacted, only the fiscal year 2006 budget request contained a line item for this crucial need, and that at a mere $46 million. Although the Administra-tion’s fiscal year 2006 budget request includes $600 million for infrastruc-ture protection, it does not contain a dedicated line item for port security grant funding.

As a point of comparison, the Transportation Security Administration’s fiscal year 2006 budget dedicates $4.9 billion for aviation security. As Dr. Stephen Flynn of the Council on Foreign Relations testified at a Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee hearing in January, port security needs to pass beyond the hand-to-mouth cycle that ports have faced for years. It does the following: First, it creates a competitive grant program administered by the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness at the Department of Homeland Security. This is the same office that administers the State Grant and Urban Area Security Initiative programs.

Second, under our bill, grant funds will be used to address port security...."
vulnerabilities identified through Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans, currently required by Federal statute, or through other DDS-sanctioned vulnerability assessments. In other words, grant dollars must be spent consistent with an established plan, and the costs divvied from efforts already underway.

Authorized uses of these grant funds include: acquiring, operating, and maintaining equipment that contributes to the overall security of the port area; conducting port-wide exercises to strengthen emergency preparedness; developing joint harbor operations centers to focus resources on port area security; implementing Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans; and covering the costs of additional security personnel during times of heightened alert levels.

Third, we require DHS to prioritize efforts to promote coordination among port stakeholders and integration of port security with transportation and intelligence sharing among first responders and federal, state, and local officials.

Fourth, we authorize funding for port security grants at $400 million per year for fiscal years 2007 through 2012. This steady, dedicated stream of funding would represent a substantial down payment on the billions of dollars of port security needs identified by the Coast Guard. It is also the amount the American Association of Port Authorities believes needs to be dedicated annually to port security in order to begin addressing serious vulnerabilities.

Under our bill, port security dollars will originate from duties collected by Customs and Border Protection, and—with exceptions made for small or extraordinary projects—recipients will be required to contribute 25 percent of the cost. This cost-sharing requirement has proven to be a key ingredient in the development of true partnerships between the federal government and grant recipients.

Fifth, our legislation includes strong accountability measures—including audits and reporting requirements—to ensure the grant funds awarded under the bill are properly accounted for and spent as intended.

This legislation does call for a major commitment of resources. I am confident, however, that my colleagues recognize, as I do, that this commitment is fully proportional to what is at stake.

Approximately 95 percent of our Nation’s trade, worth nearly $1 trillion, enters through one of our 361 seaports. Cargo is on board some 8,555 foreign vessels, which make more than 55,000 port calls per year. Clearly, an attack on the U.S. maritime transportation system could devastate our economy.

The wide extent of this devastation was amply demonstrated by the 2002 West Coast dock labor dispute, which cost our economy an estimated $1 billion per day, affected operations in 29 West Coast ports, and harmed businesses throughout the country. An anticipated and violent act against a cargo port could result in economic costs that are incalculable, not to mention a potential loss of life that would be horrifying.

Much of the discussion regarding port security revolves around the security of inbound containers. At his confirmation hearing, Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff stated that his major concern is the introduction into the United States of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive threats via a shipping container. Secretary Chertoff is absolutely correct in identifying this as a major vulnerability.

But there are many other threats against ports. Just last month, the State Department issued a warning concerning information that terrorists may attempt to mount a maritime attack using a hijacked vessel or a small West Coast vessel, possibly in East Africa. This isn’t the first instance of this type of attack—the USS Cole in 2000 and the French tanker Limberg in 2002 were both attacked by this method. The repeated threats of suicide bombers and truck bombs around the world also raise great concern about our ports, and the critical infrastructure and population centers located around them.

Coming from a State with a strong maritime tradition and vital maritime industry, I am keenly aware of what is at stake. Maine has three international cargo ports. Each is a vital and multifaceted part of our economy: State, regional, and even national.

The Port of Portland, for example, is the largest port by tonnage in New England and the largest oil port on the East Coast. Ninety percent of its foreign cargo was crude oil. In addition, Portland has a booming cruise-ship industry, a vibrant fishing fleet, and an international ferry terminal. This wide range of activity provides economic opportunity and also provides terrorism vulnerability.

It is not my intention to suggest that our security agencies and ports are at a standstill. Indeed, much has been done to improve port security. The Coast Guard’s Sea Marshals program places armed units on ships at sea to ensure their safe arrival and departure. The Customs and Border Protection’s Maritime Security Initiative Bureau of Customs and Border Protection works with foreign governments to target high-risk cargo and to prevent terrorists from exploiting cargo containers. Detailed information is now required on each ship and its passengers, crew, and cargo. To upgrade security at international ports, the United States worked with the International Maritime Organization for the adoption of the International Ship and Port Security Code, the first multilateral port security standard ever created.

It is, however, my intention to assert that we must do more to improve port security on the front lines—the ports that line the harbor of cities and towns along our vast coastlines, the Great Lakes, our immense inland river network and in Alaska and Hawaii.

We observed this week two anniversaries that bear on this issue. Monday was Patriot’s Day, the 230th anniversary of the ride of Paul Revere. While I am not suggesting “one if by land, two if by sea” be adopted as a funding formula for homeland security, that famous phrase does remind us of the bond between security and transportation that has existed since our nation’s very first days.

On a far more somber note, Tuesday was the 10th anniversary of Oklahoma City. As we paused to reflect on that horrific attack, we once again were confronted with the harsh reality that terrorists—whether foreign or domestic—will strike wherever they see vulnerability.

Our seaports are vulnerable. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation that will help deny terrorists an opportunity to strike at a vulnerable target.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 858. A bill to reauthorize Nuclear Regulatory Commission user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
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S. 858. A bill to reauthorize Nuclear Regulatory Commission user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
for implementation of section 3116 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2135(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(9) Applicability.—This subsection does not apply to a reactor….”

SEC. 104. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

SEC. 205. MEDICAL ISOTOPE PRODUCTION. Section 134 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(3) Uses of radioactive material.—The term ‘uses of radioactive material’ means a radioactive material used in nuclear medicine or in radioactive therapy.”

SEC. 206. THIRD LICENSE. Section 103 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133(c)) is amended by striking “forty years” and inserting “40 years from the authorization to commence operations”.

SEC. 207. ELIMINATION OF NRC ANTITRUST REVIEW.

Section 106 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2136(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(9) Applicability.—This subsection does not apply to a reactor….”

SEC. 208. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. 

SEC. 209. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. 

SEC. 210. TREATMENT OF NUCLEAR REACTOR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS. 

Section 523 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “(1) TREATMENT OF NUCLEAR REACTOR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title— “(A) any funds or other assets held by a licensee or former licensee of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or by any other person, to satisfy the responsibility of the licensee, former licensee, or any other person to comply with the order of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission governing the decontamination and decommissioning of a nuclear reactor that is licensed under section 103 or 104 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133, 2134(b)) shall not be used to satisfy the claim of any creditor in any proceeding under this title, other than a claim resulting from an activity undertaken to satisfy that responsibility, until the decontamination and decommissioning of the nuclear power reactor is completed to the satisfaction of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; “(2) obligations of licensees, former licensees, or other persons to use funds or other assets to satisfy a responsibility described in paragraph (1) may not be rejected, avoided, or discharged in any proceeding under this title or in any liquidation, reorganization, receivership, or other insolvency proceeding under Federal or State law; and “(3) private insurance premiums and standard deferred premium held and maintained in accordance with section 170 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(b)) shall not be used to satisfy the claim of any creditor in any proceeding under this title, until the indemnification agreement executed in accordance with section 170 c. of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2210(c)) is terminated.”

SEC. 211. FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS. 

The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study to determine— “(1) the potential cost for producing low enriched uranium for medical isotopes from commercial sources that do not use highly enriched uranium; “(ii) the current and projected demand and availability of medical isotopes in regular current domestic use; “(iii) the progress that is being made by the Department of Energy and others to use all of highly enriched uranium in reactor fuel, reactor targets, and medical isotope production facilities; and “(iv) the potential cost differential in medical isotope production costs and target processing facilities if the products were derived from production systems that do not involve fuels and targets with highly enriched uranium.”

SEC. 212. FEASIBILITY. 

For the purpose of this subsection, the use of low enriched uranium to produce medical isotopes shall be deemed feasible if— “(i) low enriched uranium targets have been developed and demonstrated for use in the reactors and target processing facilities that produce significant quantities of medical isotopes to serve United States needs for such isotopes;
“(ii) sufficient quantities of medical isotopes are available from low enriched uranium targets and fuel to meet United States domestic needs; and

“(iii) the average anticipated total cost increase from production of medical isotopes in such facilities without use of highly enriched uranium is less than 10 percent.

“(C) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Fees Reauthorization Act of 2006, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that—

“(i) contains the findings of the National Academy of Sciences made in the study under paragraph (3); and

“(ii) discloses the existence of any commitments from commercial producers to provide domestic requirements for medical isotopes without use of highly enriched uranium consistent with the feasibility criteria described in subparagraph (B) not later than the date that is 4 years after the date of submission of the report.

“(5) SECOND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If the study of the National Academy of Sciences determines under paragraph (4)(A)(i) that the procurement of supplies of medical isotopes from commercial sources that do not use highly enriched uranium is feasible, but the Secretary is unable to report the existence of commitments under paragraph (4)(C)(i), not later than the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Fees Reauthorization Act of 2006, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes options for developing domestic supplies of medical isotopes in quantities that are adequate to meet domestic demand without the use of highly enriched uranium consistent with the cost increase described in paragraph (4)(B)(ii).

“(6) CERTIFICATION.—At such time as commercial facilities that do not use highly enriched uranium are capable of meeting domestic requirements for medical isotopes, within the cost increase described in paragraph (4)(B)(ii) and without impairing the reliable supply of medical isotopes for domestic utilization, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a certification to that effect.

“(7) SUNSET PROVISION.—After the Secretary submits a certification under paragraph (6), the Commission shall, by rule, terminate the review of the Commission's application under this subsection.”.

SEC. 206. COST RECOVERY FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

Section 161 w. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2201(w)) is amended—

“(1) by striking “for or is issued” and all that follows through “2002” and inserting “to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for, or is issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, a license or certificate”; and

“(2) by striking “as” and inserting “as”; and

“(3) by striking “of, for, or holders of, such licenses or certificates.”.

SEC. 207. CONTRACTS OF INTEREST RELATING TO CONTRACTS AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS.

Section 178 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2218(a)) is amended—

“(1) by redesigning paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (A):—

“(2) by striking “The Commission” and inserting the following:

“b. EVALUATION.—

“(1) by striking “Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Commission”;

“(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.—

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission may enter into a contract, agreement, or arrangement with the Department of Energy or the operator of a Department of Energy facility, if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission determines that—

“(A) the conflict of interest cannot be mitigated; and

“(B) adequate justification exists to proceed without mitigation of the conflict of interest.”.

SEC. 208. HEARING PROCEDURES.

Section 189 a. (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2238(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) HEARING.—Hearing under this section shall be conducted using informal adjudicatory procedures unless the informal adjudicatory procedures determine that formal adjudicatory procedures are necessary—

“(i) to develop a sufficient record; or

“(ii) to achieve fairness.”.

SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2006 and each subsequent fiscal year.

TITLE III—NRC HUMAN CAPITAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. PROVISION OF SUPPORT TO UNIVERSITY NUCLEAR SAFETY, SECURITY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROGRAMS.

Section 31 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2201(b)) is amended—

“(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“b. GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission is further authorized to make;” and

“(2) in paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (4)(C)(iv)), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(i) to provide grants, loans, cooperative agreements, contracts, and equipment to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 302) to support courses, studies, training, curricula, and disciplines pertaining to nuclear safety, security, or environmental protection, or any other field that the Commission determines is in a critical skill area related to its regulatory mission, in a graduate or professional degree program offered by an institution of higher education in the United States, the Commission may carry out a program to—

“(1) award scholarships to undergraduate students who—

“(A) are United States citizens; and

“(B) enter into an agreement under subsection (c) to be employed by the Commission in the area of study for which the scholarship was awarded; and

“(2) provide grants, loans, cooperative agreements, contracts, and equipment to—

“(A) institutions of higher education (as defined in section 302) to support courses, studies, training, curricula, and disciplines pertaining to nuclear safety, security, or environmental protection, or any other field that the Commission determines is in a critical skill area related to its regulatory mission, in a graduate or professional degree program offered by an institution of higher education in the United States, the Commission may carry out a program to—

“(1) award fellowships to graduate students who—

“(A) are United States citizens; and

“(B) enter into an agreement under subsection (c) to be employed by the Commission in the area of study for which the fellowship was awarded; and

“(2) provide grants, loans, cooperative agreements, contracts, and equipment to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 302 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) to support courses, studies, training, curricula, and disciplines pertaining to nuclear safety, security, or environmental protection, or any other field that the Commission determines to be critical to the regulatory mission of the Commission.”.

SEC. 302. PROMOTIONAL ITEMS.

Chapter 14 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2210 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 170C. PROMOTIONAL ITEMS.

“The Commission may purchase promotional items of nominal value for use in the recruitment of individuals for employment.”.

SEC. 303. EXPENSES AUTHORIZED TO BE PAID BY THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.

Chapter 14 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1942 (42 U.S.C. 2210 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 170D. EXPENSES AUTHORIZED TO BE PAID BY THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.

“The Commission may—

“(1) pay transportation, lodging, and subsistence expenses of employees who—

“(A) assist the Commission in the recruitment of individuals for employment; adminis- trative, or technical employees of the Commission; and

“(B) are students in good standing at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) pursing courses related to the field in which the students are employed by the Commission; or

“(2) pay the costs of health and medical services furnished, pursuant to an agreement between the Commission and the Department of State, to employees of the Commission and dependents of the employees serving in foreign countries.”.

SEC. 304. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after section 242 (42 U.S.C. 2051a) the following:

“SEC. 243. SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

“(a) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—To enable students to study, for at least 1 academic semester or equivalent term, science, engineering, or another field of study that the Commission determines is in a critical skill area related to the regulatory mission of the Commission, the Commission may carry out a program to—

“(1) award scholarships to undergraduate students who—

“(A) are United States citizens; and

“(B) enter into an agreement under subsection (c) to be employed by the Commission in the area of study for which the scholarship was awarded; and

“(2) provide grants, loans, cooperative agreements, contracts, and equipment to—

“(A) institutions of higher education (as defined in section 302) to support courses, studies, training, curricula, and disciplines pertaining to nuclear safety, security, or environmental protection, or any other field that the Commission determines to be critical to the regulatory mission of the Commission.”.

“(b) FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—To enable students to pursue education in science, engineering, or another field of study that the Commission determines is in a critical skill area related to its regulatory mission, in a graduate or professional degree program offered by an institution of higher education in the United States, the Commission may carry out a program to—

“(1) award fellowships to graduate students who—

“(A) are United States citizens; and

“(B) enter into an agreement under subsection (c) to be employed by the Commission in the area of study for which the fellowship was awarded; and

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL. As a condition of receiving a scholarship or fellowship under subsection (a) or (b), a recipient of the scholarship or fellowship shall enter into an agreement with the Commission under which, in return for the assistance, the recipient shall—

“(A) maintain satisfactory academic progress; and

“(B) agree that failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress shall result in loss of the scholarship or fellowship.

“(2) ON COMPLETION. On completion of the academic course of study in connection with which the assistance was provided, and in accordance with criteria established by the Commission, engage in employment by the Commission for a period specified by the Commission; that shall be not less than 1 time and not more than 3 times the period for which the assistance was provided; and

“(3) WAIVER OR SUSPENSION. The Commission may establish criteria for the partial or total waiver or suspension of service or payment incurred by a recipient of a scholarship or fellowship under this section.

“(4) COMPETITIVE PROCESS. Recipients of scholarships or fellowships under this section shall be selected through a competitive process based primarily on the basis of academic merit and such other criteria as the Commission may establish, with consideration given
to financial need and the goal of promoting the participation of individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a, 1885b).

"(e) DIRECT APPOINTMENT.—The Commission may appoint directly, with no further competition, public notice, or consideration of any other potential candidate, an individual who has completed the academic program for which a scholarship or fellowship was awarded by the Commission under this section.

SEC. 205. PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Chapter 3 of the Higher Education Act of 1954 (2 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) (as amended by section 304) is amended by inserting after section 323 the following:

"SEC. 304. PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Hispanic-serving institution' has the meaning given the term in section 302(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011a(a)).

"(2) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.—The term 'historically Black college or university' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011).

"(3) TRIBAL COLLEGE.—The term 'tribal college' has the meaning given the term 'tribally controlled college or university' in section 262 of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)).

"(b) PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—The Commission shall establish and participate in activities relating to research, mentoring, instruction, and training with institutions of higher education, including Hispanic-serving institutions, historically Black colleges or universities, and tribal colleges, to strengthen the capacity of the institutions—

"(1) to educate and train students (including present or potential employees of the Commission); and

"(2) to conduct research in the field of science, engineering, or law, or any other field that the Commission determines is important to the work of the Commission.

SEC. 306. ELIMINATION OF PENSION OFFSET FOR CERTAIN REHired FEDERAL RETIREES.

Chapter 14 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (2 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) (as amended by sections 302 and 303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 170E. ELIMINATION OF PENSION OFFSET FOR CERTAIN REHired FEDERAL RETIREES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may waive the application of section 3344 or 4608 of title 5, United States Code, on a case-by-case basis for employment of an annuitant—

"(1) in a position of the Commission for which there is exceptional difficulty in recruiting or retaining a qualified employee; or

"(2) when a temporary emergency hiring need exists.

"(b) PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall prescribe procedures for the exercise of authority under this section, including—

"(1) criteria for any exercise of authority; and

"(2) procedures for a delegation of authority.

"(c) EFFECT OF WAIVER.—An employee as to whom a waiver under this section is in effect shall not be considered an employee for purposes of subsection (b) of chapter 53, or chapter 64, of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 308. APPROPRIATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title and amendments made by this title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an income tax credit for the provision of homeownership and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. President. I rise today to introduce the Community Development Homeownership Tax Credit Act. I am very pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators KERRY, SMITH, STABENOW, ALLARD, and SARBANES, who are original cosponsors of this legislation.

Homeownership is a key component of the American Dream. Many people around this country dream of and plan for the day they can buy a home of their own and raise their children, to settle down in a community, and to build equity and wealth. They see the importance of homeownership and the stability it can bring to families and neighborhoods. It is often home ownership in which financially anchor American families and civically anchors our communities. But I believe our focus on homeownership also returns our attention to the basic ideals of the American Dream. Ensuring access to homeownership among the most significant ways we can empower our citizens to achieve the happy, productive and stable lifestyle everyone desires.

Having a home of one’s own that provides security and comfort to one’s family and that gives families an active, vested interest in the quality of life their community provides is central to our collective ideas about freedom and self-determination. As a nation, where homeownership helps the emotional and intellectual growth and development of children. We know that homeownership show greater interest and more frequent participation in civic organizations and neighborhood issues. We know that when people own homes, they are more likely to accumulate wealth and assets and to prepare themselves financially for such things as their children’s education and retirement.

In America today, homeownership is at a record high. Unfortunately, there remains a significant homeownership gap between minority and non-minority populations, leaving homeownership an elusive financial prospect for many. According to the Census Bureau, in 2004 the homeownership rate for non-Hispanic whites reached 76 percent, compared to 49.1 percent for African-Americans and 48.1 percent for Hispanics or Latinos.

The bill I introduce today enjoys strong bipartisan support in the Senate and will encourage increased homeownership rates, more stable neighborhoods and strong communities. This legislation would give developers and investors an incentive to participate in the rehabilitation and construction of homes for low- and moderate-income buyers. It will also spur economic development in low- and moderate-income communities across our country by providing the stimulus for the development of our nation’s economy.

This proposal is modeled after the very successful low-income rental tax credit. It will allow states to allocate tax credits to developers and investors to construct or substantially rehabilitate homes in economically disadvantaged communities, including rural areas, for sale to low- or moderate-income buyers. These tax credits will help bridge the gap between the cost of developing affordable housing and the price at which these homes can be sold to eligible buyers in low-income neighborhoods where housing is scarce. It provides investors with a tax credit of 50 percent up to 40 percent of home construction or rehabilitation. It is estimated that this legislation will encourage the construction and substantial rehabilitation of up to 500,000 homes for low- and moderate-income families in economically distressed areas over the next ten years.

President Bush has long supported the creation of a tax credit as have the majority of both the House and Senate in the last Congress. This proposal also has the backing of a large coalition of housing-related groups, including the National Association of Home Builders, the National Council of State Housing Agencies, and the National Association of Realtors. In addition, this initiative has the backing of major non-profit groups, including Habitat for Humanity, as well as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation and the Enterprise Foundation.

This important legislation addresses a critically important issue: many Americans today, housing affordability. It also addresses the community development needs of many neighborhoods. It continues to have strong bipartisan support, and I am hopeful that it will be enacted this year. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting homeownership by cosponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 860. A bill to amend the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act to require State academic assessments of student achievement in United States history and civics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am introducing the American History Achievement Act and am pleased to be joined in this effort by the senator from Massachusetts. This is part of my effort to put the teaching of American history and civics back in its rightful place in our
schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

The “American History Achievement Act” gives the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) the authority to conduct a state pilot study for the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) test in U.S. history in 2006. They already have that authority for reading, math, science, and writing. The bill also includes a new provision that would permit a 10-state pilot study for the Civics NAEP test if funding is available.

This modest bill provides for improved testing of American history so that we can determine where history is being taught well—and where it is being taught poorly—so that improvements can be made. We also know that when testing is focused on a specific subject, states and school districts are more likely to step up to the challenge and improve performance.

We could certainly use improvement in the teaching of American history. According to the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), commonly referred to as the “National Report Card,” fewer students have just a basic understanding of American history than have a basic understanding of any other subject which we test—including math, science, and reading. When you look at the national report card, American history is our children’s worst subject.

Yet, according to recent poll results, the exact opposite outcome is desired by the American people. Hart-Teeter conducted a poll last year of 1300 adults for the Educational Testing Service (ETS), where they asked what the principal goal of education should be. The top response was “producing literate, educated citizens who can participate in our democracy.” Twenty-six percent of respondents felt that should be our principal goal. “Teach basics: math, science, reading, writing” was selected by only 15 percent as the principal goal of education. You can’t be an educated participant in our democracy if you don’t know our history.

Our children don’t know American history because they are not being taught it. For example, the state of Florida recently passed a bill permitting high school students to graduate without taking a course in U.S. history.

And when our children are being taught our history, they’re not learning what’s most important. According to Harvard scholar Samuel Huntington, “A 1987 study of high school students found that more knew who Harriet Tubman was than knew that Washington commanded the American army in the Revolution or that Abraham Lincoln wrote the Emancipation Proclamation.” Now I’m all for teaching about the history of the Underground Railroad or the Reverend John Rankin, like Harriet Tubman, was a conductor on the Underground Railroad—but surely children ought to learn first about the most critical leaders and events in the Revolution and the Civil War.

Let me give a few examples of just how bad things have gotten:

The 4th grade NAEP test asks students the following question: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, do ordain and establish the following Declaration of Independence.” The answer to this question has four choices: (a) Constitution, (b) Mayflower Compact, (c) Declaration of Independence, and (d) Article of the Confederation.

Only 46 percent of students answered correctly that it came from the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration is the fundamental document for the founding of our Nation, but less than half the students could identify that famous passage from it.

The 8th grade NAEP test asks students to “Imagine you could use a time machine to visit the past. You have landed in Philadelphia in the summer of 1776. Describe an important event that is happening.” Nearly half the students could not write the correct answer to this question.

We could certainly use improvement in the teaching of American history.
chronology, appropriate political and historical context, or sufficient information about real events and people. As many as 9 States still have no standards at all for American history.

Good standards matter. They’re the foundation of teaching and learning in every school. With the right historical information, time, and attention, it’s possible to develop creative and effective history standards in every State. Massachusetts began to work on this effort in 2000, through a joint review of history standards that involved teachers, administrators, curriculum coordinators, and university professors. After monthly meetings and three years of development and revision, the state released a new framework for teaching history in 2003. Today, our standards in American history and World history receive the highest marks.

School budget problems at the local level are also a serious threat to these goals. Other accounts report that schools are narrowing their curriculums away from the social sciences, arts, and humanities, in favor of a more concentrated approach to the teaching of reading and math in order to meet the strict standards of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Meeting high standards in reading and math is important, but it should not come at the expense of scaling back teaching in other core subjects such as history and civics. Integrating reading and math with other subjects often gives children a better way to master literacy and number skills, even while learning in a history, geography, or government lesson. That type of innovation deserves special attention in our schools. Making it happen requires added investments in teacher preparation and teacher mentoring, so that teachers are well prepared to use interdisciplinary methods in their lessons.

Our bill today takes several important steps to strengthen the teaching of American history and civics, and raise the standing of these subjects in school curriculums. Through changes to the National Assessment for Educational Progress, schools will be better able to achieve success on this important issue.

First, we propose a more frequent national assessment of children in American history and civics. The NAEP has served as the gold standard for measuring the progress of students and reporting on that progress. Students last participated in the U.S. history NAEP in 2001, and that assessment generated encouraging results. But the NAEP is an important assessment with which we can compare data—was administered in 1994—too long before to be of real assistance.

It makes sense to measure the knowledge and skills of children more frequently. We propose that the U.S. history NAEP assessment, to generate a more timely picture of student progress. We should have an idea of children’s knowledge and skills in American history more often than every 6 or 7 years, in order to address gaps in learning.

The bill also proposes a leap forward to strengthen State standards in American history and civics through a new State-level pilot assessment of these subjects under NAEP. The assessment would be conducted on an experimental basis in 10 States, in grades 8 and 12. The National Assessment Governing Board will develop new model standards, as well as those that are still under development, participate in this assessment.

Moving NAEP to the State level does not carry any high stakes for schools. But it will provide an additional benchmark for States to develop and improve their standards. It’s our hope that states will also be encouraged to undertake improvements in their history curricula and in their teaching of civics, and ensure that both subjects are a beneficiary and not a victim of school reform.

America’s past encompasses great leaders and great ideas that contributed to our heritage and to the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and opportunity for all. Today’s students will be better citizens in the future if they learn more about that history and about the skills needed to participate in our democracy. The American History Achievement Act is an important step toward that goal, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER): S. 861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide transition funding rules for certain plans electing to cease future benefit accruals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I join with Senator ROCKEFELLER to introduce the Employee Pension Preservation Act of 2005. This bill seeks to eliminate the threat that airline employees are facing to their earned pensions as a result of funding laws that make pension funding schedule volatile and unpredictable. The Employee Pension Preservation Act of 2005 would allow their employers to make the required pension payments in a more predictable and manageable way. This common sense, industry specific approach is supported by airline employees and their employers.

We are giving airlines the ability to fund their pension obligations to their employees on a more manageable and stabilized 25-year schedule using stable long-term assumptions. It is analogous to refinancing a short-term adjustable rate mortgage to a more predictable long-term fixed rate mortgage. It protects the interests of the American employee, and keeps the Employee Benefit Guarantee Corporation’s liabilities at current levels, and ensures that a uniform evenhanded policy is taken with respect to the entire industry. Finally, this must be a joint decision made by the airline and its employees.

We are establishing a payment schedule for unfunded liabilities that is both affordable and practical, while properly protecting the interests of all employees. Airlines and the American taxpayer. I commend Senator ROCKEFELLER for joining me in introducing this important legislation, and look forward to its passage so that we can provide stability to airline employees with regards to the funding of their earned pensions.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the U.S. airline industry continues to teeter on the brink of financial collapse. The industry lost over $10 billion in 2004 and the airlines are expected to lose another $1.9 billion in 2005. Our Nation cannot afford to let this vital part of our economy collapse. Our economic prosperity is tied to a healthy and growing aviation industry. As we saw after the events of September 11, 2001, the shutdown of our aviation systems caused a massive disruption to the flow of people and goods throughout the world. Without a healthy airline industry, our economy would not grow. I do not think the significance of aviation to our economy can be overstated. I do not think many in Congress and across the country realize that over 10 million people are employed directly in the aviation industry, 15 related jobs are produced. In my State of West Virginia, aviation represents $3.4 billion of the State’s gross domestic product and directly and indirectly employs 51,000 people.

The airline industry has been hard hit in recent years by high oil prices, weak revenue, and low fare competition. Since 2001, the airline industry has lost more than $30 billion collectively, and while aviation analysts expect 2005 will be a significant improvement over recent years, most estimates assume oil prices drop significantly from current levels—a matter that increasingly remains in doubt.

Many airlines have aggressively cut costs through a number of means, most notably by reducing labor expenditures and through decreasing capacity by cutting flight frequencies, using smaller aircraft, or eliminating service to some communities.

As a result of the airlines’ efforts, they have not been able to return to financial stability. The Federal Government is faced with serious and difficult choices in how to ensure both the short-term and long-term viability of the Nation’s aviation industry. The one choice we do not have is the choice not to act. Although Congress cannot restore profitability to the airline industry with a law, we can create the atmosphere for the industry to succeed, grow, and bring people back to work. If we fail to pass this bill, tens of thousands of employees will lose their jobs on top of the 200,000 that have already lost their jobs, small communities will lose their
air service, and the United States will lose its global leadership in aviation.

One of the greatest threats to the future financial viability of the airlines is pension funding. Congress needs to reform the pension rules to provide the tools to maintain or restructure pension plans. As a step in the right direction, I am pleased to introduce legislation today with Senator ISAKSON that protects the retirement plans airline employees depend on.

The Employee Pension Preservation Act of 2005 provides critical pension funding relief to the commercial airline industry by allowing the airlines to fund their pension obligations over a 25-year time horizon. Last year, recognizing that the airlines were facing extraordinary circumstances, Congress provided airlines a temporary reprieve from deficit reduction contributions.

However, when that temporary relief expires at the end of the year, airlines will face immediate and crushing penalties. If we do not provide any permanent, appropriate remedies that enable airlines to maintain their pension plans, Congress needs to provide airlines a temporary reprieve to fund their pension obligations over a 25-year time horizon. Last year, recognizing that the airlines were facing extraordinary circumstances, Congress provided airlines a temporary reprieve from deficit reduction contributions.

Some people may worry that by granting extended payment periods we are increasing the risks to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which insures the airlines' defined benefit plans. However, I am hopeful that by making the funding rules more flexible this bill will actually decrease the likelihood that pension plans will be terminated and the PBGC saddled with unfunded obligations. Let me be clear, this legislation requires airlines to fully fund all of their past and future pension promises. It merely provides a more reasonable schedule for recovering from the recent downturn that hurt many pension plans.

Moreover, the bill includes provisions to limit the liability potentially faced by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. In contrast to the status quo, any pension plans that take advantage of the funding relief offered by our legislation would accrue no additional PBGC obligations. To the extent that any additional liabilities are earned by employees, the benefits would have to be immediately and fully funded by the employer.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have been working for years to improve our defined benefit pension system. I recognize that there are few easy answers or quick fixes. And I do not suggest that the legislation we are introducing today is a silver bullet for the airlines' defined benefit plans. Still, I am pleased to support legislation that is a responsible compromise agreed to by both the labor and management representatives in the airline industry. That is very important to me, because this legislation will require some difficult sacrifices especially on the part of workers who may no longer accrue guaranteed benefits. While I have reservations about any agreement to limit the PBGC protection of pensions, I have been assured that in this particular case employees support this compromise and see it as the best opportunity to save their hard earned retirement benefits.

I hope that my colleagues will carefully examine this proposal and join Senator ISAKSON and me in a debate about how we can better secure the pensions of airline employees. I appreciate that our legislation is not likely to pass this year, but I urge Senators to limit the liability potentially faced by the Government insurance agency. To the extent that any additional liabilities are earned by employees, the benefits would have to be immediately and fully funded by the employer.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr.浜卡尔, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JEFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LUTZENBERG, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. PHYOR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. WARNER): S. 863. A bill to require without negotiation and compromise. Indeed, I welcome opportunities to improve this legislation. But I do not believe that we can ignore the plight that the airlines face, and I will work to enact prudent reforms as soon as possible.
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The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after section 161 (42 U.S.C. 2201) the following:

"SEC. 161A. USE OF FIREARMS BY SECURITY PERSONNEL.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term "ammunition," the terms "short-barreled shotgun," and "short-barreled rifle" shall have the meanings given in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code.

"(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a)(4), (a)(5), (b)(2), (b)(4), and (o) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, section 923(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, section 5844 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and any law (including regulations) of a State or a political subdivision of a State, any licensee or applicant submitting such fingerprints shall be permitted access to a utilization facility, possession, transportation, importation, or use of a handgun, a rifle, a shotgun, a short-barreled rifle, a machinegun, a semiautomatic assault weapon, ammunition for any such gun or weapon, or a large capacity ammunition feeding device, in carrying out the duties of the Commission or in support of the Commission by storing the security personnel of any licensee or certificate holder of the Commission (including an employee of a contractor of such a licensee or certificate holder) to transfer, receive, possess, transport, import, and use or control, ammunition for any such gun or weapon, or to store, transfer, receive, possess, transport, import, and use or control, ammunition for any such gun or weapon.

"(c) REGULATIONS.—The Commission may promulgate regulations prescribing, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, requirements for the use of any alternative biometric method for identification that has been approved by the Attorney General, including requiring that, on or before the date on which an individual is permitted access under subsection (b), the individual is fingerprinted any individual who—

"(i) is unescorted access to a utilization facility licensed or operated by such a licensee or certificate holder; or

"(ii) is unescorted access to the facility of a licensee or applicant required to conduct the fingerprinting under paragraph (1); and

"(iii) is unescorted access to a utilization facility licensed or operated by such a licensee or certificate holder; and

"(d) NOTWITHSTANDING any other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

"(A) in subparagraph (B) of section 702 of title 18, United States Code, by striking the words "protection of the public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; or"

"(B) in the previous sentence, by striking "and all other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Commission; and

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under paragraph (2) to the Attorney General, based on fingerprints obtained as part of a background check conducted pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to a background check by the Attorney General, based on fingerprints obtained as part of a background check conducted pursuant to subsection (b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103–159; 18 U.S.C. 922 note) to determine whether the person is prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or State law.

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date on which regulations are promulgated by the Commission, with the approval of the Attorney General, to carry out this section.

SEC. 5. FINGERPRINTING AND CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS.

Section 140 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2169d) is amended—

"(1) in subsection a.—

"(A) by striking "a. The Nuclear" and all that follows through "147." and inserting "(a) the Attorney General; and "(b) the Commission, by regulation; ."

"(2) in subsection c.—

"(A) by striking "subject to public notice and comment, regulations— and inserting "and regulations—"; and

"(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking "unescorted access to the facility of a licensee or applicant" and inserting "unescorted access to a utilization facility, radioactive material, or other property described in subsection a.(1)(B)";

"(3) in redesignating subsection d. as subsection e.; and

"(4) by inserting after subsection c. the following:

"d. The Commission may require a person or individual to conduct fingerprinting under subsection a.(1) by authorizing or requiring the use of any alternative biometric method for identification that has been approved by the Attorney General.

"(1)(A) A person that is permitted access under this section, the term "person" means an individual that the Commission determines to be of significance to the common defense and security or public health and safety or the common defense and security as to warrant fingerprinting and background checks; and

"(2) by inserting after section 147—

"(i) a facility owned or operated by a licensee or certificate holder of the Commission; or

"(ii) a utilization facility licensed or operated by such a licensee or certificate holder; and

"(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "or in the custody of" and inserting "in the custody of";

"(iv) in subsection a., by striking "a. The Nuclear" and all that follows through "147."

"(C) in paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A))—

"(2) Every other provision of law, the Attorney General may provide any result of an identification or records check under this Act or any other Act before the period.

SEC. 7. SABOTAGE OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES, FUEL, OR DESIGNATED MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 236a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2284(a)) is amended—

"(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "storage facility" and inserting "treatment, storage, or disposal facility";

"(2) in paragraph (3)—

"(A) by striking "such a utilization facility licensed under this Act"; and

"(B) by striking "or" at the end;

"(3) in paragraph (4)—

"(A) by striking "facility licensed" and inserting "and the activation of a utilization facility licensed under this Act;" and

"(B) by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

"(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(B) in paragraph (2) by striking "any production, utilization, waste storage, waste treatment, waste disposal, uranium enrichment, uranium conversion, or nuclear fuel fabrication facility subject to license under this Act during the construction of the facility, if the destruction or damage caused or attempted to
be caused could adversely affect public health and safety during the operation of the facility;
(6) any primary facility or backup facility from which a radioactive material in excess of 100 curies is released to the environment;
(7) any radioactive material or other property regulated by the Commission that, before the date of the offense, the Commission, by order or regulation published in the Federal Register, is of significance to the public health and safety or to common defense and security;"
(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 236 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2284) is amended by striking "the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to reauthorize the Price-Anderson provisions; to the Commission that, before the date of the offense, the Commission determined, by order or regulation published in the Federal Register, is of significance to the public health and safety or to common defense and security;"
(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "Nuclear Regulatory Commission LICENSEES" and inserting "INSURERS";
(2) by striking "December 1, 1983" and inserting "December 1, 2005"; and
(3) by striking "December 31, 2005" each place it appears and inserting "December 31, 2025".
SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.
The amendments made by this Act take effect on December 1, 2005.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:
S. 865. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to reauthorize the Price-Anderson provisions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.
There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
S. 865
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 "Price-Anderson Amendments Act of 2005".
SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF INDEMNIFICATION AUTHORITY.
(a) INDEMNIFICATION OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION LICENSEES.—Section 170c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(c)) is amended by striking "licensure" and inserting "licensing".
(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 236 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2284) is amended by striking "the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to reauthorize the Price-Anderson provisions; to the Commission that, before the date of the offense, the Commission determined, by order or regulation published in the Federal Register, is of significance to the public health and safety or to common defense and security;"
(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "Nuclear Regulatory Commission LICENSEES" and inserting "INSURERS";
(2) by striking "December 1, 1983" and inserting "December 1, 2005"; and
(3) by striking "December 31, 2005" each place it appears and inserting "December 31, 2025".
SEC. 3. REPORTS.
Section 170p. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(p)) is amended by striking "August 1, 1998" and inserting "August 1, 2005".
SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.
The amendments made by this Act take effect on December 1, 2005.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 114—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN THORACIC SOCIETY, CELEBRATING ITS ACHIEVEMENTS, AND ENCOURAGING THE SOCIETY TO CONTINUE OFFERING ITS GUIDANCE ON LUNG-RELATED HEALTH ISSUES TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO THE WORLD

Mr. CRAPO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:
S. Res. 114
Whereas in 1905, Mrs. Osler, Trudeau, Janeway, and Knopf, leaders in the fight in the United States against tuberculosis, created the American Sanitorium Association, an organization dedicated to the improvement of tuberculosis care and treatment at tuberculosis sanatoriums in the United States;
Whereas in 1939, the name of the American Sanitorium Association was changed to the American Thoracic Society, with the financial support of Dr. Edward Livingston Trudeau and recognizing the growing scientific interest in the study of lung diseases beyond tuberculosis, and in 1960 the American Thoracic Society became the American Thoracic Society in keeping with the evolution of the medical specialty area from phthisiology to pulmonology, that is, from tuberculosis to the whole range of respiratory disorders;
Whereas in 1917, to fulfill its mission as a scientific society, the American Sanitorium Association began the publication of an academic journal, the American Review of Tuberculosis, a text that carried articles on the classification of tuberculosis, diagnostic standards, and related topics on the diagnosis, treatment, cure and prevention of tuberculosis, and in the following years, the journal was named the American Review of Tuberculosis and renamed subsequently, finally, the American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine;
Whereas in 1989, the American Thoracic Society began the American Journal of Respiratory Cell and Molecular Biology to recognize the contribution of basic research to the field of respiratory medicine;
Whereas the American Thoracic Society hosts the largest global scientific meeting dedicated to highlighting and disseminating the latest research and clinical advances in the prevention, detection, treatment, and cure of respiratory diseases;
Whereas the American Thoracic Society continues to meet its clinical and scientific mission through its publication of academic journals and clinical statements on the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and the cure of respiratory disorders, and through providing continued medical education in respiratory medicine; and
Whereas the American Thoracic Society has a long tradition of working in collaboration with the Federal Government to improve the respiratory health of all Americans; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes the scientific, clinical, and public health achievements of the American Thoracic Society as its members and staff commemorate and celebrate the milestone of its 100th anniversary;
(2) recognizes the great impact that the American Thoracic Society has had on improving the lung-related health problems of people in the United States and around the world; and
(3) congratulates the American Thoracic Society for its achievements and trusts that the organization will continue to offer scientific guidance on lung-related health issues to improve the public health of future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 115—DESIGNATING MAY 2005 AS "NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise to submit a resolution deeming May 2005 as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month." I wish more than anything that this resolution were not necessary, and that we had already cured this terrible disease. But CF continues to haunt thousands of families, and this innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due in part to the establishment of the extramural clinical trials network by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans and their families suffer from and unknowing carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene and individuals must have 2 copies to have the disease;
Whereas 1 of every 3,500 babies born in the United States is born with cystic fibrosis;
Whereas newborn screening for cystic fibrosis has been implemented by 12 States and facilitates early diagnosis and treatment which improves health and longevity;
Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation recommend that all States consider newborn screening for cystic fibrosis;
Whereas approximately 30,000 people in the United States have cystic fibrosis, many of them children;
Whereas the average life expectancy of an individual with cystic fibrosis is in the mid-thirties, an improvement from a life expectancy of 10 years in the 1960s, but still unacceptably short;
Whereas prompt, aggressive treatment of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis can extend the lives of people who have the disease;
Whereas recent advances in cystic fibrosis research have produced promising leads in gene, protein, and drug therapies beneficial to people who have the disease;
Whereas this innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due in part to the establishment of the extramural clinical trials network by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation;
Whereas the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation marks its 50th year in 2005, continues to fund a research pipeline for more than 2 dozen potential therapies, and funds a nationwide network of care centers that extend the length and the quality of life for people with cystic fibrosis, but lives continue to be lost to this disease every day; and
Whereas education of the public on cystic fibrosis, including the symptoms of the disease, increases knowledge and understanding of cystic fibrosis and promotes early diagnosis; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates May 2005 as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month;"
(2) calls on the people of the United States to promote awareness of cystic fibrosis and actively participate in support of research to control or cure cystic fibrosis, by observing the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and
(3) supports the goals of—
(A) increasing the quality of life for individuals with cystic fibrosis by promoting public knowledge and understanding in a manner that will result in earlier diagnoses;
(B) encouraging increased resources for research; and
(C) increasing levels of support for people who have cystic fibrosis and their families.
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