

AMENDMENT NO. 3979

(Purpose: To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that non-immigrant visas are not issued to individuals with connections to terrorism or who intend to carry out terrorist activities in the United States)

At the end, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—VISA REQUIREMENTS**SEC. 401. IN PERSON INTERVIEWS OF VISA APPLICANTS.**

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INTERVIEWS.—Section 222 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of State shall require every alien applying for a non-immigrant visa—

“(1) who is at least 12 years of age and not more than 65 years of age to submit to an in person interview with a consular officer unless the requirement for such interview is waived—

“(A) by a consular official and such alien is within that class of nonimmigrants enumerated in section 101(a)(15)(A) or 101(a)(15)(G) or is granted a diplomatic visa on a diplomatic passport or on the equivalent thereof;

“(B) by a consular official and such alien is applying for a visa—

“(i) not more than 12 months after the date on which the alien's prior visa expired;

“(ii) for the classification under section 101(a)(15) for which such prior visa was issued;

“(iii) from the consular post located in the country in which the alien is a national; and

“(iv) the consular officer has no indication that the alien has not complied with the immigration laws and regulations of the United States; or

“(C) by the Secretary of State if the Secretary determines that such waiver is—

“(i) in the national interest of the United States; or

“(ii) necessary as a result of unusual circumstances; and

“(2) notwithstanding paragraph (1), to submit to an in person interview with a consular officer if such alien—

“(A) is not a national of the country in which the alien is applying for a visa;

“(B) was previously refused a visa, unless such refusal was overcome or a waiver of ineligibility has been obtained;

“(C) is listed in the Consular Lookout and Support System (or successor system at the Department of State);

“(D) may not obtain a visa until a security advisory opinion or other Department of State clearance is issued unless such alien is—

“(i) within that class of nonimmigrants enumerated in section 101(a)(15)(A) or 101(a)(15)(G); and

“(ii) not a national of a country that is officially designated by the Secretary of State as a state sponsor of terrorism; or

“(E) is identified as a member of a group or sector that the Secretary of State determines—

“(i) poses a substantial risk of submitting inaccurate information in order to obtain a visa;

“(ii) has historically had visa applications denied at a rate that is higher than the average rate of such denials; or

“(iii) poses a security threat to the United States.”.

SEC. 402. VISA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 222(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(c)) is amended by inserting “The alien shall provide complete and accurate information in response to any request for information contained in the application.” after the second sentence.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding section 341 or any other provision of this Act, this title shall take effect 90 days after date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3980

(Purpose: To require the establishment of pilot projects relating to the coordination of information among emergency first responders, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGIONAL MODEL STRATEGIC PLAN PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) PILOT PROJECTS.—Consistent with sections 302 and 430 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182, 238), not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Executive Director of the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness and the Undersecretary for Science and Technology, shall establish not fewer than 2 pilot projects in high threat urban areas or regions that are likely to implement a national model strategic plan.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot projects required by this section shall be to develop a regional strategic plan to foster interagency communication in the area in which it is established and coordinate the gathering of all Federal, State, and local first responders in that area, consistent with the national strategic plan developed by the Department of Homeland Security.

(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting urban areas for the location of pilot projects under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the level of threat risk to the area, as determined by the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the number of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies located in the area;

(3) the number of potential victims from a large scale terrorist attack in the area; and

(4) such other criteria reflecting a community's risk and vulnerability as the Secretary determines is appropriate.

(d) INTERAGENCY ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide assistance to the Secretary of Homeland Security, as necessary for the development of the pilot projects required by this section, including examining relevant standards, equipment, and protocols in order to improve interagency communication among first responders.

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress—

(1) an interim report regarding the progress of the interagency communications pilot projects required by this section 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) a final report 18 months after that date of enactment.

(f) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank everyone who has worked so hard on this bill, particularly my colleague and partner, Senator LIEBERMAN.

I believe we are ready to move to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

Ms. COLLINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Alexander	Dole	Lugar
Allard	Domenici	McCain
Allen	Dorgan	McConnell
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Miller
Bennett	Enzi	Murkowski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Frist	Nickles
Breaux	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Reed
Bunning	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Gregg	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Harkin	Santorum
Carper	Hatch	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hutchison	Schumer
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Clinton	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Coleman	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kyl	Stevens
Corzine	Landrieu	Sununu
Craig	Lautenberg	Talent
Crapo	Leahy	Thomas
Daschle	Levin	Voinovich
Dayton	Lieberman	Warner
DeWine	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—2

Byrd Hollings

NOT VOTING—2

Edwards Kerry

The bill (S. 2845), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 445, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 445) to eliminate certain restrictions on service of a Senator on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

AMENDMENT NO. 3981

(Purpose: To implement the Congressional oversight recommendations of the 9/11 Commission)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator REID and myself, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 3981.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SEC. 100. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of titles I through V of this resolution to improve the effectiveness of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, especially with regard to its oversight of the Intelligence Community of the United States Government, and to improve the Senate's oversight of homeland security.

TITLE I—HOMELAND SECURITY OVERSIGHT REFORM

SEC. 101. HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Governmental Affairs is renamed as the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

(b) JURISDICTION.—There shall be referred to the committee all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating primarily to the following subjects:

(1) Department of Homeland Security, except matters relating to the Coast Guard, to the Transportation Security Administration, to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the revenue functions of the Customs Service.

(2) Archives of the United States.

(3) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations, except as provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4) Census and collection of statistics, including economic and social statistics.

(5) Congressional organization, except for any part of the matter that amends the rules or orders of the Senate.

(6) Federal Civil Service.

(7) Government information.

(8) Intergovernmental relations.

(9) Municipal affairs of the District of Columbia, except appropriations therefor.

(10) Organization and management of United States nuclear export policy.

(11) Organization and reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

(12) Postal Service.

(13) Status of officers and employees of the United States, including their classification, compensation, and benefits.

(c) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—The committee shall have the duty of—

(1) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to

the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

(2) studying the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government;

(3) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government; and

(4) studying the intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

(d) JURISDICTION OF SENATE COMMITTEES.—The jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs provided in subsection (b) shall supersede the jurisdiction of any other committee of the Senate provided in the rules of the Senate.

TITLE II—INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT REFORM

SEC. 201. INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT.

(a) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES MEMBERSHIP.—Section 2(a)(3) of Senate Resolution 400, agreed to May 19, 1976 (94th Congress) (referred to in this section as “S. Res. 400”) is amended by—

(1) inserting “(A)” after “(3)”; and

(2) inserting at the end the following:

“(B) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services (if not already a member of the select Committee) shall be ex officio members of the select Committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.”

(b) NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—Section 2(a) of S. Res. 400 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “not to exceed” before “fifteen members”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)(E), by inserting “not to exceed” before “seven”; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking the second sentence and inserting “Of any members appointed under paragraph (1)(E), the majority leader shall appoint the majority members and the minority leader shall appoint the minority members, with the majority having a one vote margin.”

(c) ELIMINATION OF TERM LIMITS.—Section 2 of Senate Resolution 400, 94th Congress, agreed to May 19, 1976, is amended by striking subsection (b) and by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(d) APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER.—Section 2(b) of S. Res. 400, as redesignated by subsection (c) of this section, is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “At the beginning of each Congress, the Majority Leader of the Senate shall select a chairman of the select Committee and the Minority Leader shall select a vice chairman for the select Committee.”

(e) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Section 2 of S. Res. 400, as amended by subsections (a) through (d), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The select Committee may be organized into subcommittees. Each subcommittee shall have a chairman and a vice chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the select Committee, respectively.”

(f) REPORTS.—Section 4(a) of S. Res. 400 is amended by inserting “, but not less than quarterly,” after “periodic”.

(g) STAFF.—Section 15 of S. Res. 400 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 15. (a) The select Committee shall hire or appoint one employee for each member of the select Committee to serve as such Member's designated representative on the select Committee. The select Committee shall only hire or appoint an employee cho-

sen by the respective Member of the select Committee for whom the employee will serve as the designated representative on the select Committee.

“(b) The select Committee shall be afforded a supplement to its budget, to be determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration, to allow for the hire of each employee who fills the position of designated representative to the select Committee. The designated representative shall have office space and appropriate office equipment in the select Committee spaces, and shall have full access to select Committee staff, information, records, and databases.

“(c) The designated employee shall meet all the requirements of relevant statutes, Senate rules, and committee clearance requirements for employment by the select Committee.”

(h) NOMINEES.—S. Res. 400 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 17. (a) The select Committee shall have final responsibility for reviewing, holding hearings, and voting on civilian persons nominated by the President to fill a position within the intelligence community that requires the advice and consent of the Senate. “(b) Other committees with jurisdiction over the nominees' executive branch department may hold hearings and interviews with that person.”

TITLE III—COMMITTEE STATUS

SEC. 301. COMMITTEE STATUS.

(a) HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs shall be treated as the Committee on Governmental Affairs listed under paragraph 2 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate for purposes of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) INTELLIGENCE.—The Select Committee on Intelligence shall be treated as a committee listed under paragraph 2 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate for purposes of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

TITLE IV—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUBCOMMITTEES

SEC. 401. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Select Committee on Intelligence a Subcommittee on Oversight which shall be in addition to any other subcommittee established by the select Committee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Subcommittee on Oversight shall be responsible for ongoing oversight of intelligence activities.

SEC. 402. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Committee on Appropriations a Subcommittee on Intelligence. The Subcommittee on Military Construction shall be combined with the Subcommittee on Defense into 1 subcommittee.

(b) JURISDICTION.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Appropriations shall have jurisdiction over funding for intelligence matters.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution shall take effect on the convening of the 109th Congress.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator REID and the majority and Democratic leaders, an amendment to a resolution to reform the Senate's oversight of intelligence and homeland security matters. If enacted, it will mark the most significant changes made in this body since the 1970s relating to the way the Senate operates.

Let me speak for a moment about why we must make significant reforms. The world did not change on September 11, 2001, only our perception of it did. In fact, the world had changed long before that particular clear September day. Frankly, we are nearly a decade late realizing it.

The first clue the world had changed and that a new enemy lurked in the shadows occurred on February 26, 1993, when Islamic terrorists bombed the World Trade Center, killing six and injuring hundreds.

These terrorists had ties to al-Qaida, which was busy then building its army of terrorists in the Sudan.

Four years later, on August 7, 1998, al-Qaida attacked two U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, killing hundreds and injuring thousands.

And on October 12, 2000—nearly 4 years ago today—these same al-Qaida terrorists attacked the USS *Cole* while it was in port in Yemen. These terrorists killed 17 soldiers and injured 40 more.

And yet it took the carnage of September 11 to awaken America, the Congress, our governmental institutions, and our CIA analysts to the magnitude of the threat that Islamic terrorism poses to the American people.

It took September 11 to show us how much the world had changed since the days of the Cold War.

In the wake of those attacks, Congress and the President swung into action—and brought the fight to the enemy.

We in Congress passed the PATRIOT Act, which reformed the FBI and provided our law enforcement agencies with greater tools to combat terrorism. We fast-tracked the procurement of specialized equipment such as the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle for our military forces in Afghanistan.

Congress created the Department of Homeland Security to consolidate and coordinate Government activities that protect America, and to solve some of the problems that contributed to the failure to anticipate September 11.

The administration has issued important executive orders reforming the intelligence community in a way that facilitates coordination of essential information.

Today, the Senate passed the Intelligence Reform Act of 2004, which dramatically reforms our intelligence agencies. These reforms will improve the collection, analysis, and integration of our Nation's most vital intelligence, assuring that red flags are no longer ignored.

What we have not done, however, is reform ourselves.

Congress, as did our intelligence agencies, failed to appreciate the threat prior to September 11. We certainly appreciate it now. And I hope we can reform this institution in a way that allows us to better monitor and influence the executive agencies tasked with keeping America safe.

It is time to put our own house in order.

In August, Senator FRIST and Senator DASCHLE—in response to the 9/11 Commission recommendations—asked the Senate to do just that. They created a working group of 22 senior Members of the Senate, and asked Senator REID and me to chair it.

We worked closely with these Members to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and also to brainstorm new ideas and improvements to our oversight of the intelligence community and Department of Homeland Security.

I want to thank these Members for their many good ideas and for their patience and willingness to work on a bipartisan basis to do something that is very difficult but also very worthwhile.

After convening a number of meetings with our Members, Senator REID and I met frequently to hammer out a list of recommendations that broadly reflects the consensus or majority views of our group.

Not every Senator will be happy with each and every recommendation. But such is the nature of compromise. We have endeavored to be honest brokers, and I hope we have achieved that goal.

Some Members will complain this reform goes too far. Others will complain it does not go far enough.

I hope most Members will agree with me that it is an appropriate balance of reform that improves our ability to conduct oversight of intelligence and homeland security during a very serious time for our country.

Neither Senator REID, nor I, nor the 20 other members of our working group have a monopoly on wisdom. And were our recommendations part of the New Testament, they would not be written in red ink.

The resolution before us today is not a final product. It is a work in progress. And we hope Members who want to improve upon this resolution will come to the floor and offer amendments.

We would like to accept non-controversial amendments, and to allow Members to vote on amendments that may be a bit more contentious. We want the Senate to work its will.

But before ceding control of this resolution to the will of the Senate, let me describe the philosophy behind our recommendations, as well as some of the recommendations themselves.

The most sweeping change we recommend is to consolidate Congressional jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security. If you don't think this is major reform, ask the roughly 25 Senate committee or subcommittee chairmen who currently have jurisdiction over Homeland Security agencies or programs.

Trust me. They have made sure Senator REID and I know how significant this reform is.

The current system of homeland security is broken. These 25 different Senate committees or subcommittees can only have a narrow view of part of the department's activities.

Congressional oversight is like a team of blindfolded scientists, each examining a different part of a horse and trying to describe what kind of animal it is. No committee can step back and look at the horse as a whole.

The Department of Homeland Security deserves its own authorization committee. We wouldn't divide jurisdiction over the Department of Defense by creating an Army committee, a Navy/Marine committee, and an Air Force committee. So why have we done so with Homeland Security?

The status quo also hampers the Department's ability to do its primary job: protecting the homeland.

Currently, the department has to report to 88 House and Senate committees or subcommittees.

This year alone, Secretary Ridge or his subordinates have testified at 164 hearings. They have given over 1300 briefings. And the year isn't over yet.

Mr. President, that's almost 40 briefings a week. In fact, there are probably Homeland Security personnel crawling around Capitol Hill right now, when they should be back in their offices working to keep us safe.

We didn't create the Department of Homeland Security so that it can provide us with a glut of power point presentations but to keep America safe. We should consolidate jurisdiction so that both Congress and the Department can do their job more effectively, and more efficiently.

To do this, we recommend that jurisdiction over the Department be integrated under the Governmental Affairs Committee, which should be renamed the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

There will be exceptions to this jurisdictional consolidation. And we encourage Members who are concerned about jurisdictional issues to file amendments to work with the chairman and ranking member of Governmental Affairs to reach agreements about appropriate jurisdictional arrangements.

We welcome amendments and debate on these issues.

On Intelligence oversight, the working group believed that our oversight of intelligence must be strengthened.

The task force wanted to work with the committee to help structure it so it was comprised of devoted experts who have the time and expertise in the intelligence field. The members now serving on the committee have done so with great distinction. But they need better tools and fewer competing demands on their time in order to conduct focused and comprehensive oversight.

And so we have recommended the status of the committee be raised from B to A. This may seem like a minor and arcane detail, but it means a great deal. On my side of the aisle, Senators can serve on the committee without having to give up any other assignments. Some Members serve on three or four other committees in addition to intelligence.

Quite simply, they cannot devote the time necessary to conduct effective oversight with so many other obligations.

This elevation in status will require Senators interested in intelligence to make a choice to serve on the committee. But once on the committee, they will not be term limited, and each member of the committee will be able to play an integral role in conducting oversight.

The Intelligence Committee is an important committee, and a popular committee, and I am confident that a good number of members will want to serve on it.

As I have said, we also have removed term limits, in order to allow members to develop the expertise needed to conduct effective oversight. No other Committee in the Senate says after you've spent 8 years becoming an expert that you get the boot. Now the Intelligence Committee won't have to say goodbye to its most experienced members.

We have allowed members to hire personal designated staff, to give them a trusted representative on the committee. There was strong support for this recommendation, which will reinstate previous committee policy.

In addition to the 14 suggested improvements to the Select Committee on Intelligence, we also have recommended the Appropriations Committee create a Subcommittee on Intelligence.

Appropriations jurisdiction over oversight is currently dispersed throughout multiple subcommittees. We propose the creation of an Intelligence Subcommittee of Appropriations that would consolidate the roughly 80 percent of the intelligence budget that will come under the jurisdiction of the national intelligence director.

This subcommittee will improve the Appropriations Committee's ability to live up to its responsibility to exercise oversight over the national intelligence budget. For the same reasons that homeland security jurisdiction should be consolidated, so, too, should intelligence appropriations jurisdiction.

Not all of us agree on this recommendation, and I fully expect that Senators will offer an amendment to implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendation to create a combined authorization and appropriations committee.

These recommendations require us to use a different set of muscles in our oversight. And some of these reforms are not easy. But few things worth doing are.

We have a historic opportunity to reform this Chamber for the better, and I believe we should not shirk our responsibility to do so. We must do it now in order to do all we can to protect the American people from the next major terrorist attack.

This is a partisan body, and we have pointed fingers for 3 years about who was to blame for the failures of our in-

telligence and homeland security prior to 9/11. Some blamed the Clinton Administration, others blamed the Bush Administration. Some saw fault in the FBI, others in the CIA, and still other in the military's aversion to covert operations. We are good at pointing fingers at others, but we have not pointed them at ourselves.

Just as our CIA analysts failed to piece together the clues about al-Qaida's intention to attack our cities with hijacked airplanes, so, too, did we fail to question their assessments. We failed to question their focus on old threats. We failed to challenge them to take risks. We failed to question the lack of CIA operatives in Iraq, or why our human intelligence capabilities had become so eroded. Despite the numerous attacks on American targets by Islamic radicals, we failed to put more money in the intelligence budget to hire Arabic linguists.

These are not the faults of the Clinton administration or the Bush administration. They are our fault, too, and we have a chance today to correct them.

I say to my colleagues, I believe we have an opportunity to improve our oversight of the arms of Government that keep America safe. Let us not cause some future generation to look back 50 years from this moment and ask the question: Why did they not act?

Now is our opportunity to do just that, and I encourage my fellow Senators to come to the floor and offer amendments so that we can move this package forward as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, about an hour ago, the Senate marked a historical moment with the passage of S. 2845, the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004. Passage of that act was a major milestone—a major milestone—on the road to the most significant overhaul of our intelligence community in over 50 years.

The Senate bill includes nearly all of the recommendations made by the 9/11 Commission as they centered on intelligence reform within the executive branch—39 recommendations.

It is important to note, however, the Commission said that overhauling the executive branch is not enough and, thus, we are now on the Senate resolution to address the final two recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and that is the overhaul of how we do business in oversight of intelligence functions.

The Democratic leader and I were just talking about how pleased we were

in the fulfillment of the process we set out at the end of July where both arms—one being the one we just completed on the Senate floor in the form of the executive branch intelligence jurisdiction, and the second arm being the overhaul of our Senate oversight—has worked so well to date, but we still have that second arm to address, and that is what we are on today.

The Democratic leader and I have come to the floor to outline to our colleagues, A, the importance of completing that oversight function reform in this body but, B, and equally important, to point out we do not have very much time to address this issue with the range and number of other issues we have to address. We have plenty of time to address these issues, but we need to do so in an expeditious way, in a way that allows people to have their amendments considered, to have them debated, and to have them voted upon, but we need to do so in a timely manner.

We ask our colleagues to bring their amendments to the resolution to the managers so they can be considered.

With that, I turn to the Democratic leader, and then I will have further comments on other legislation we have to address before departing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader. He made note of the fact that this is a historic day. This is a day when the Senate, with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, responded to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and other commissions that have urged our Government to take action to make us safer. We made a major step today in creating the infrastructure to make America safer.

I compliment the majority leader for his efforts and also, of course, the two managers. Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN deserve great credit for the work product we voted on only moments ago. This is historic not only for its substance, but I would like to think it is also historic for the process that brought us here.

As the majority leader has noted, we have an opportunity to replicate the substance and the process with the second piece of our work. I think in an equally bipartisan fashion, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID have worked hand in glove. They deserve great commendation and credit for the work they have done.

They have consulted with every Member of the Senate. They have worked particularly with our chairs and ranking members, and they have now brought us a work product that was amended slightly as a result of that consultative process last night.

After working and laying out the work product, they listened, they responded, and we have the response they put into the RECORD last night. So everybody has had a chance to review their work, and we are now, as the majority leader noted, asking for the

same degree of cooperation and bipartisanship on this legislative work as we have on the bill.

In that context, it will be important for Senators to indicate to us as quickly as possible their intent with regard to amendments. I know both cloakrooms are going to be seeking the response of Senators who may wish to offer amendments.

Based on that response, because of the time of year, we may be required to file cloture just so we can accelerate the consideration of this effort. I will support that effort if it may be required, but, again, as we have done each day during the deliberations of the bill, I hope we could start the day with somewhat of a status report on where we are and what needs to be done and a reiteration of the importance of this work and our efforts in doing it in the same manner.

So I hope we can continue as we have. As I said, this is a historic day, but there is much more history to be made and so much more work to be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, while the Democratic leader and I are both on the floor, because it reflects the discussions we have had over the course of today, there is other business that we will be conducting over the course of the week. There has been huge progress made today on a bill in conference, the FSC/ETI manufacturing jobs bill. We expect to address that hopefully very soon—I believe the House will be addressing it tomorrow—maybe tomorrow night or late tomorrow afternoon. It is a bill we are both committed to addressing before we leave.

As everyone knows, we had planned to leave on Friday, October 8. It is a bill that also has been handled in an admirable way in conference by Chairman GRASSLEY, and Chairman THOMAS from the House, with a very open discussion, open debate, and votes in the conference. We plan on addressing that bill as soon as it is available and the plans will be to complete that as well before we depart.

Homeland Security appropriations is currently in conference and we expect to be able to address that as well.

I mention all of those bills because tonight is Wednesday and we have Thursday and Friday. Although our shared goal is that we leave Friday, if it requires being here Saturday or later, it means that we would have to do just that. It should not. The way these bills have been handled over the last several weeks, it simply should not require going into Saturday, but if necessary, we may just have to do that.

I will comment briefly on the resolution as well because I have not had the opportunity to do so. I know the managers want to be able to proceed directly, but I just wanted to outline that in mid-August Senator DASCHLE and I did assemble a task force of 22

Members to look at the recommendations proposed by the 9/11 Commission that deal with reform of the Congress. We charged this task force to look at the range of issues and possibilities and to present the Democratic and Republican leaders with a proposal and their recommendations.

To reflect the leadership's commitment to the importance of this issue of congressional reform, we asked our respective assistant leaders, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID, who are managing the bill now, to chair this task force. Over the past several weeks, Senators MCCONNELL and REID have held a series of meetings, collectively and individually. As Senator DASCHLE has said and as I have also said, we have had the opportunity to meet as conferences and caucuses to address these issues.

The managers of the bill have also consulted with the 9/11 Commission and others to solicit their ideas and their reflections and recommendations. The product of their efforts is captured in the Senate resolution today and the amendment that has just been introduced.

Right now, as we talk, the amendment may or may not be a perfect product—it is probably not a perfect product—but it is a very good and very solid product. It does reflect the majority view of the task force as they looked at a whole range of options and alternatives, individual items to improve Senate oversight of intelligence, which is the objective, and that is what will be achieved by this resolution.

There are a number of contentious issues that have not been fully addressed, that we expect to be addressed tonight on the Senate floor.

When the Democratic leader said we are reaching out to people to bring those potential amendments forward, that is exactly what we mean. It was Senator MCCONNELL's and Senator REID's recommendation, rightly I believe, to have the Members decide through debate and through the offering of amendments on the floor how we might make that proposal better. That is about as open and transparent a process as one can have, but it does require Members to come forward and participate in that floor debate.

I will close by saying that I personally thank Senators MCCONNELL and REID for their efforts and to the other Members of the leadership task force and to all the Members for their cooperation and their participation in, once again, a nonpartisan manner.

I reiterate that it is the leadership's desire on both sides of the aisle to complete this before we depart.

I close where I began, and that is, without Senate reform of the way we conduct oversight of intelligence and homeland security, our efforts to overhaul the executive branch, which we took a major step forward just an hour ago in this body, will be incomplete, inadequate, and really inconsistent with our obligations to the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I, first, extend my appreciation to Senator MCCONNELL. Senator MCCONNELL and I were given a task and we have done the best we can. I have served in the Congress now for 22 years. This is one of the hardest things I have ever had to do, if not the hardest. It has been a very difficult 3 or 4 weeks that Senator MCCONNELL and I have spent working with Members.

I have known MITCH MCCONNELL for many years, the senior Senator from Kentucky, but as happens when one is thrown into a situation of stress, working closely together, one develops a different relationship, and the bond Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and I have formed over this last month is one that will be with us forever.

I appreciate his willingness to allow me to drop in his office unannounced and call on him all times of the night and day. He has a fine staff and he has worked extremely well with my staff. Without belaboring the point, I appreciate all he has done to get us to this point. Without him, we could not be where we are now.

I have five children. My oldest child is a girl. I have one girl, my daughter Lana. I can remember as if it were yesterday, my little girl was going away to school, to college. I can still remember I cried that day, I felt so sad that my little girl was going to go away. I still feel some emotion when I think about it.

The reason I mention that is my daughter leaving to go to college is only an example of how difficult change is. Why did I feel bad? Because of change. I had been with my little girl for 18 years, and suddenly she was going to leave. Change in our lives is always very difficult. Change in the life of the Senate is difficult. What Senator MCCONNELL and I have brought before the Senate is a change. I repeat, I only give the example of my daughter for illustrative purposes. But change here for 98 Senators with whom we have been working is difficult. It is not the same as sending a daughter to school, but it is still a change. Any time you change, it is difficult. That is what this has been about.

We have been considering ways to reform the executive branch of Government for 2 weeks. It is now done. Now it is time to turn the focus on reform of the Senate. A lot of change is taking place here in the waning days of this Congress, important changes brought about as a result of more than 3,000 Americans being killed through a terrorist act. That is why we are doing this.

A commission was appointed, led by long-time Congressman Lee Hamilton and former Governor of New Jersey Thomas Kean. They had members who worked very hard for a year. They had 80 full-time staff. They came to us with recommendations as to how we had to change the executive branch of Government. We have done the best we can in

that regard. We have changed, as far as the Senate sees it, the executive branch of Government. It has been painful. It has been painful for a lot of Senators. But we did it because we had to do it.

I will elaborate on that a little bit later, but the Commission said doing one without the other is doing nothing. If we walked away from this body now, as some have suggested, and said we have done our job, we have done the executive improvement, we may not have done everything, but we have done all we have time to do—we cannot leave here without having done this.

What we do tonight and tomorrow is nothing the President has to sign. The bill that passed here earlier this evening by a vote of 96 to 2 is something the President has to sign. He does not have to sign this. This is something the Senate is doing on its own. We are doing it because the Commission said you cannot have one without the other.

As I said, some have said, Why do this? Some have said, Maybe the House isn't going to do anything; why does the Senate have to tackle this issue?

We can't maintain the status quo after 9/11. We have to look at every facet of our Government. We did this: The homeland security functions, our intelligence functions, and our congressional oversight.

I extend my appreciation to Senators ROBERTS and ROCKEFELLER. They have, during the most difficult times in the history of the Intelligence Committee, been asked to guide this country through these perilous times, and they did it without having much to do it with. The Intelligence Committee, as indicated by the 9/11 Commission, is weak and toothless. So I appreciate very much the work of these two very wise men. Being able to work together—it wasn't easy. They had a difficult time. The members of the Intelligence Committee also worked well.

But, as the 9/11 Commission indicated, we need to give the Intelligence Committee more authority and power. That is what we are in the process of doing. We, in effect, said, Can we do better? Can we do better for ROCKEFELLER and ROBERTS and others, not only today but in the years to come? We have found, under the leadership of the 9/11 Commission, that oversight of the intelligence community is not strong enough—not enough power, not enough resources, not enough muscle.

As my friend Senator MCCONNELL has indicated, the homeland security oversight is now splintered among 88 committees and subcommittees—not 8 in the Senate, not 8 in the House—Governor Ridge and I came together in 1982, each as a Member of Congress. I don't know the exact number of times he has come here, but I think it was 164 times so far this year. Think about it. We can do better.

We do not need these weak and fractionalized subcommittees and committees, all wanting a piece of the Sec-

retary of Homeland Security. We are not going to make a tweak here and a tweak there. As the 9/11 Commission found:

Tinkering with the existing committee structure is not sufficient. The United States needs a strong, stable and capable committee structure to give America's national intelligence agencies oversight, support and leadership.

We can't make all these changes in the executive branch which we did in this bill we just passed and not put our own house in order. The 9/11 Commission made that point very clear:

The other reforms suggested, such as the National Counterterrorism Center and a National Intelligence Director, will not work if Congressional oversight does not change too.

It has not been easy. We have taken 10 standing committees and taken jurisdiction from each of the 10 and given them to this new committee that will be formed from the Governmental Affairs Committee. It will now be the Homeland Security/Governmental Affairs.

People have had to give things up. Some have given them up graciously. Some have given them up kicking and screaming. There will be amendments offered here to reverse some of the changes we have recommended in the amendment that is now before the Senate. Senator MCCONNELL and I recognize that should be a fair, open process. We are not infallible. Maybe we made some mistakes, but we certainly tried not to.

The Commission made the point clear that it will not work if congressional oversight does not change also. So here we are, with a resolution encompassing some of the most important recommendations of the 9/11 Commission—no doubt the most difficult. Obviously we would not be here without the fine work of the 9/11 Commission that I boasted about more than once, and without the urging of many brave families whose lives were shaken by the tragedy of 9/11.

I served in the House of Representatives with Lee Hamilton. I served under his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives. He is a fine man. He was a mentor to me. He and Governor Kean have made their mark upon the country with their excellent report. We are also here on the verge of landmark reform because of the strong partisan interest of our colleagues in reforming this institution. There may be different opinions about some of the details, but I believe the consensus is very strong about bringing much-needed reform to the intelligence and homeland security functions.

As I started my statement using an example of my dear daughter Lana, I said change is hard. I understand that. I am a member of committees. The committees on which I serve have given up things to make this work.

I also want to extend my grudging appreciation to the two leaders, Senators DASCHLE and FRIST. The next

time they have one of these nice things to pass out, they will think of someone else. This has been very hard for Senator MCCONNELL and me, but they have stood with us. They are fine leaders. And if we get this done—and I am hopeful and confident we will—it all goes directly to their leadership. Both of these men are so busy that they look to their assistants. I am the assistant Democratic leader, the whip. Senator MCCONNELL is the assistant Republican leader, the whip. We have done our best representing our caucuses. We run separate and apart from our two leaders. I run elected on my own, as does Senator MCCONNELL. But we believe this was the time when without any question the two leaders were doing absolutely the right thing. That is why we have spent so much of our time, energy, and effort in carrying out what they have directed us to do.

I jokingly said I grudgingly send my appreciation. I really don't do that. I am happy Senator DASCHLE had enough confidence in me to allow me to go forward on this noble experiment.

I have spoken to members of the 9/11 Commission on quite a few occasions in conference calls and personal meetings, and I appreciate their time. The time is up for this Commission, but they are still devoting large blocks of time to people like me who come to them for direction, guidance, and understanding. They wanted first of all to know what we were doing was nonpartisan. I think Senator MCCONNELL and I proved to them time and time again that it was.

Let us talk about the specifics.

The so-called task force recommended that the Senate implement virtually all of the congressional reform recommendations made by the 9/11 Commission. I will go over what we have done. There are three basic areas we looked at. One is to reform the Intelligence Committee process. The other is to create a different, new committee on homeland security, which I have talked about, and the other is to make sure the appropriations process was part of this.

What we have done to strengthen collection of intelligence is eliminate term limits. We have to ensure that the majority has no more than a one-member advantage. This came directly from the 9/11 Commission. We maintain apportioned slots for these committees. The chairman and ranking member of Armed Services. I will offer an amendment because I heard directly from the Intelligence Committee itself that they also wanted in addition to the Armed Services Committee members of the Foreign Relations Committee doing that. In this instance, it will be Senator LUGAR, chairman of the committee, and Senator BIDEN, ranking member, who will serve as ex officio members. I will offer an amendment at a subsequent time, and elevate the status, as I heard Senator MCCONNELL talk about, from B to A.

We have maintained the majority and minority leaders' ability to appoint all committee members. Members not appointed will serve without term limits.

This is so important. Frankly, this is not anything that the 9/11 Commission recommended, but it came from Senator WARNER in meetings we had with Senator MCCONNELL and me. Senator WARNER has been here a long time. I have served with him from the day after I came here as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. He has been so easy to work with. If there were ever a stereotype of a southern gentleman, it is JOHN WARNER. And JOHN WARNER in his typical gentlemanly fashion suggested to us that for a committee which is important, the chairman and ranking member should serve at the pleasure of the two leaders.

The reason for this is what I refer to as the "Wilbur Mills problem." Wilbur Mills was a long-time Member of Congress and became chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee. This was a man who never had a problem in the world as far as anything dealing with ethics and morality. Suddenly, for whatever reason, Wilbur Mills—this distinguished Member of Congress who served 30 years—started doing a lot of things very publicly that were an embarrassment to this institution. He was there based on seniority and there was no way he could be disposed of. We don't want that. It is something that probably would never happen, but we need that protection. The people who are representing and leading this Intelligence Committee have to be above reproach ethically and morally. The two leaders should have the ability to do that.

That is why Senator MCCONNELL and I, along with Senator WARNER—that is where this came from. We believe that committees around here are too large. One of the things we set out to do was not have more committees. We wanted to do what we could to make the committees smaller. We did this. We reduced the size of the committee from 17 to 15. That may not sound like much, but it was a step forward. We have followed our philosophy and reduced the size of the committee. This is something the 9/11 Commission recommended. The staff positions for each member—maintain nonpartisan professional staff, give the Intelligence Committee a stronger role in reviewing civilian intelligence nominees. This is something else the 9/11 Commission recommended.

That is one of the things they recommended in intelligence. We have done that. But we have gone a step further, and said not only that but the Intelligence Committee should be able to form whatever subcommittee they feel would help that committee perform the functions they have for the country.

Maintain committee subpoena authority; require the committee to make regular reports to the full Senate.

For the purpose of showing how much we did related to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, all we have to do is look right here. We have done what they have recommended, and more.

If you look here, the committee conducts ongoing oversight, checked off; create subcommittee dedicated to oversight, another check; ensure committee has subpoena authority, check that off; ensure majority has not more than one-member advantage, check that off; ensure apportioned members slots for Armed Services, Appropriations, Foreign Relations and Judiciary; one-year term limit; reduce the size of the Intelligence Committee; ensure the Intelligence Committee has a nonpartisan professional staff.

I think we have done that. It is good work. It was not easy, but good.

We have talked about the operations committee, which recommended 14 specific measures to give the committee greater stature and power.

We believe the proposed measures such as elevating the committee from B to A, ending term limits, and creating a subcommittee on oversight will give the committee muscle and that will be oversight of the intelligence agencies.

I have talked about the need for the Appropriations subcommittee to focus on investigations. We have done that.

What I have not talked about is Senator BOB GRAHAM. BOB GRAHAM was chairman of the Intelligence Committee, ranking member, served in a very good way, former Governor of Florida, served in the Senate for 18 years. He is leaving now. He is retiring. When someone suggested to him that you should put the function of the appropriations and authorization all in one committee, he said it would concentrate power in too small a number of people and it would be devastatingly wrong for the intelligence community. So what we came up with, we feel, is something better than that; that is, as one distinguished Senator said, if we can have an Appropriations subcommittee for the District of Columbia, for agriculture, and the legislative branch of Government, we ought to have one for intelligence. It is simply too important, and we agree. Senator MCCONNELL and I agree.

Therefore, we have now merged the Military Construction Subcommittee, which I chaired for a Congress or two, with Defense—again, we don't want to create more subcommittees or more committees—leaving 12 subcommittees for Appropriations. We have created another one on intelligence.

There has been a lot of complaints that the monetary function of the Intelligence Committee was hidden in the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. That won't be the case anymore. It will have chairmen selected based on seniority. I am sure it will be one of the senior members of the Senate. That is about all you have on the Appropriations Committee, and I think

it would do well. This is a significant development.

We will increase the number of members and staff who oversee the intelligence community spending and finally shed light on programs that have been tucked away far too long.

Governor Kean was asked at a recent Select Committee on Intelligence hearing about the creation of an appropriations subcommittee on intelligence. Governor Kean said:

I think [an intelligence appropriations subcommittee] would be very much in my mind, be within the spirit of our recommendations.

I have spoken to Congressman Hamilton and indicated to him what we were going to do. He feels the same as Governor Kean about this.

Now, an appropriations subcommittee on intelligence is exactly the kind of conforming change that is required now that we have passed the Collins-Lieberman bill, where centralization and coordination of the intelligence community is achieved through the establishment of a national intelligence director.

Some Members suggest a joint authorizing and appropriating committee, but there are very strong feelings that creates too much power and too much secrecy for a handful of members, so it actually results in fewer checks and balances and much weaker oversight.

There was a broad consensus to consolidate the oversight of the Department of Homeland Security. Without any question, we should not have to have the director or his assistants appear before 88 committees and subcommittees of the Congress. We ought to have a single homeland security authorizing committee. This would match the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee we created last year.

With this we achieve the much-needed consolidation by replacing homeland security oversight in the Governmental Affairs Committee and renaming the committee Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

What we have now before the Senate is significant and sweeping reform. This resolution with the amendment we placed therein, though it might not be perfect, and Senator MCCONNELL and I would never say it was, is extremely powerful and makes the required structural changes at the same time it sends a clear message to the American people that the Senate understands the problems, and we are ready to make changes that will help keep our country safe.

Let's end what the Commission calls a "dysfunctional" oversight process. It is the right thing to do. This is the right time to do it.

We welcome anyone who wants to offer amendments. We do recognize, however, as the two leaders mentioned earlier, that it is almost 7 o'clock tonight, and we are supposed to leave Friday. We need to finish this legislation. People cannot wait us out. If

Members do not come tonight and tomorrow to offer amendments, we are going to go to third reading. We are not going to wait around while people do other things. This is not January or March or April or May or September. It is just a few days until the leaders have said we are going to go home. At the very best, it will be difficult to get out of here late Friday or even Saturday.

The two leaders are absolutely right in saying we want everyone to have an opportunity to review this resolution. The amendment was filed last night, and everyone has had more than 24 hours to read it, to study it, to prepare their amendments. It is not a 400-page amendment. It is a few pages in length, very simple and direct, and is something we are doing to change this body. It is a significant change, and we recognize that, but a most important change.

Members offering extraneous matters on this—and that is always possible—should understand they are doing it in the face of what the 9/11 Commission said: we have to do this. I hope Members would not come and offer amendments relating to extraneous matters.

If there is something wrong with the amendment Senator MCCONNELL and I sent to the desk, let us know. We have worked with a lot of folks. But we cannot go back to the way things were before. We cannot have a committee called the Department of Homeland Security and not have anything that deals with homeland security. We have to have a committee on homeland security that has the ability to oversee what is going on and have more homeland security for our country.

The time is here. It seems logical that there will not be any votes tonight, but that is up to the leaders to announce. I repeat: This cannot go on forever. There has to come a time when people offer amendments. I hope that would happen before too long. We are here for business, Senator MCCONNELL and I.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for something they have done not just for me or even for the city of Little Rock or the State of Arkansas but for the country. They are trying to help on a project we are working on, Little Rock Central High School.

In 1957, the two biggest stories in the world that year were Sputnik and Little Rock Central High School because Little Rock was the first major southern school district to try to integrate their schools to try to follow the law as laid out in *Brown v. Board of Edu-*

cation, Topeka, KS, and to try with all deliberate speed to integrate their schools.

They took that charge seriously and, as we all know, the situation there got chaotic and very difficult. There has been a lot written about it. It is one of the major milestones in the history of the struggle for civil rights in this country.

In September of 2007, Little Rock Central will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the desegregation crisis at Little Rock Central High. We all know the story of the Little Rock Nine—Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Minnijean Brown Trickey, Terrence Roberts, Jefferson Thomas, Thelma Mothershed Wair, and Melba Pattillo Beals.

We all know the story of these brave children who went into the lion's den, so to speak, to strike a blow against the old system of "separate but equal" that was not working, and was fair. That was not right.

They showed tremendous courage not just for themselves and their personal safety, but they led by example. It is very important we as a Nation honor them and honor Little Rock for making the effort, and honor the school for all the progress they made since 1957.

Little Rock Central High School now is considered one of the best high schools in America. It has been an amazing success story. It shows how things can work when the community pulls together and tries to put difficulties of the past behind them.

I could talk on and on about how proud I am of the Little Rock Nine and the way Little Rock has handled the situation, but today I thank Members of this Senate for their support of S. 420. It is critical to acknowledge what happened at Little Rock 47 years ago.

I thank two Members of this body specifically who really helped get this on track: first, CONRAD BURNS, who is the Interior Subcommittee chairman; and then the ranking member on that subcommittee, BYRON DORGAN. They have both been fantastic. Their staffs have helped. They have made arrangements for us to get \$733,000 in this Interior appropriations bill in order to do the design phase of the new visitor center at Little Rock Central High School.

Our goal is to try to have the visitor center completed and totally constructed and up and running by the September 2007 anniversary. But we could not have done this without Senator BURNS and Senator DORGAN because they have shown a great deal of leadership. Also, I must say, Bruce Evans, Ric Molen, and Peter Kieffhaber, on their staffs, have been great to work with.

Another group that Senator LINCOLN and I both want to thank is the Congressional Black Caucus over on the House side. They have been fantastic. In fact, they have entered a sister resolution to this, and all 38 members of the Black Caucus signed on to the reso-

lution. They have been great. Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS has shown some great leadership on this issue, and it has brought hope to the civil rights community for this hopefully very positive celebration they will have in 2007.

The last person I want to thank, who is always there working behind the scenes trying to get things done for his congressional district, is Congressman VIC SNYDER. VIC SNYDER has shown great leadership in this matter, as he does consistently in everything he does. He has worked behind the scenes and he has worked with all sides. He is doing everything he can to make sure this becomes a reality, again not just for his district or the State but really for the Nation.

So, Mr. President, again, I thank everyone for their help and their support in what we are trying to do at Little Rock Central High School. I happen to have gone there. I am very proud of that school. It is a great landmark in the struggle for civil rights. The people in Arkansas decided to make Little Rock Central not stand for a negative but stand for a positive, stand for progress. It is something that certainly the community but also the State has rallied around. We are very proud of what they have done at Little Rock.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the pending amendment to the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate the pending amendment on S. Res. 445, a resolution to eliminate certain restrictions on service of a Senator on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Bill Frist, Mitch McConnell, Harry Reid, John Cornyn, Craig Thomas, Jim Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Conrad Burns, Norm Coleman, Tom Daschle, Lamar Alexander, Jim Talent, Wayne Allard, Gordon Smith, Larry Craig, Robert F. Bennett, Pete Domenici, Susan Collins.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have hotlined in both cloakrooms all offices asking for an indication of how many amendments might be offered to the underlying resolution. Regretfully, it is roughly 50.

I am authorized to say on behalf of the majority leader, it is our intention to wrap up business this week. We have

no intention of trying to shut out any Senators who want to offer amendments. We had hoped some might come over tonight and offer them. We will certainly have all day tomorrow to deal with any and all amendments that Senators feel strongly about and on which they would like to have votes. But we really must move the process along, and that is the reason the majority leader wished to file a cloture motion tonight.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes, I yield to my friend and colleague from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, around here, we do not often see cloture motions signed by all four leaders. This cloture motion does have four leaders. We are serious about completing this bill at the earliest possible date. It would be a travesty if, having just completed a very significant piece of legislation led by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN, we not do our share of the legislative reform that needs to be done.

The cloture motion was filed with reluctance. No one wanted to do it. But with the 8th of October staring us in the face literally, we have no choice but to do this. I hope people tomorrow will recognize there will be an effort made to offer these amendments. At 1 o'clock tomorrow, all first-degree amendments must be filed. That is the rule.

I hope people will come and discuss with us what problems they see with this amendment. We will be happy to work with them, but I think people should be ready to offer their amendments.

We have taken what we thought needed to be done from the 10 committees to give this committee, the homeland security committee, some strength. We hope people recognize that.

I understand how people are concerned about maintaining the jurisdiction of what they have, but this is a time when people have to give up a little bit for the good of the country and for the good of the Senate.

I totally support the cloture petition that was filed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky on behalf of the two leaders because that is basically what happened.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a second cloture motion to the resolution to the desk as well.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. Res. 445, a resolution to eliminate certain restrictions on service of a Senator on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Bill Frist, Mitch McConnell, Harry Reid, John Cornyn, Craig Thomas, Jim

Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Conrad Burns, Norm Coleman, Tom Daschle, Lamar Alexander, James Talent, Wayne Allard, Gordon Smith, Larry Craig, Robert F. Bennett, Pete Domenici, Susan Collins.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as my good friend from Nevada has indicated, we hope to process all of the amendments that Members of the Senate feel strongly about. We will be open for business on this resolution all day tomorrow, and there should be ample time to deal with all of the amendments that our colleagues feel strongly about and wish to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think everyone within the sound of our voices should understand the majority leader and minority leader were on the Senate floor and they both said we are going to stay here until we finish this, the Homeland Security conference report and the FSC tax bill. Those matters are going to be finished. If we can finish on Friday, we will be out of here. If we are finished on Saturday, we will be out of here. But the two leaders have said we are going to work to finish this legislation.

We are dealing with Senators who know all the rules just as we do, but I will indicate that this is a little different time. We are trying to bring Congress to a close, at least this part of it. Everyone should understand the determination of the two leaders to move this matter forward and the other things that are going to come before the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the assistant Democratic leader has clearly outlined what the goal of the two leaders, both Republican and Democrat, are for the balance of this session before we adjourn for the election. We are hoping to complete all of those items no later than Friday.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HEALTH CARE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I appreciate those comments. I actually would not be here asking to do this if it were not for the earlier comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania, speak-

ing as in morning business, as it relates to Senator KERRY's health care plan. I felt in fairness, as someone who works extensively on health care, that it was important to come down and speak to the errors that were presented earlier as my colleague spoke on the other side of the aisle.

First, it is important to know that it does not matter who we talk to today, it does not matter who comes into my office or what conversation I have with people throughout the great State of Michigan, the issue of health care always comes up.

Right now the big three automakers, struggling to compete internationally with their business competitors around the world, are talking about the need to address the high cost of health care. They have indicated to me on more than one occasion that this needs to be one of our top priorities of the Congress and the President of the United States: to tackle the explosion in health care costs.

We also know that half of those costs is the explosion in prescription drug prices, and that specifically needs to be addressed. We have proposals we have been consistently bringing to this body and bringing to the President of the United States that will bring prices down. So when we talk to our manufacturers in Michigan, this is a huge issue. If I talk to the workers who work for our manufacturers, it is a huge issue for them. They are being asked to pay more copays, more premiums, to take pay cuts, in some cases layoffs, as a result of the high cost of health care and the fact that there has been no action to address this while premiums and costs continue to go up faster and faster.

I could talk to a group of seniors in Michigan and certainly talk about medicine and the fact that the bill that passed this last year for Medicare is more about helping the prescription drug industry than it is about helping our seniors in this country. They know what we need to be doing. They want to see the pharmacists be able to do business with pharmacists in Canada, be able to bring prices down, cut them in half or, in some cases, 70 percent.

Seniors understand we have a crisis as it relates to the cost of medicine and health care in this country, and they certainly know when we look at the fact that this administration has announced the largest Medicare premium increase—17½ percent—in the history of the program since 1965 when it was instituted even though it is estimated that Social Security will go up possibly only as much as 3 percent. I have a bill that has been introduced with colleagues of mine to cap that Medicare increase at the cost of Social Security increases, and up to now we have not been able to get a vote on this. Yet this will be taking effect in January and taking more out of the pockets of our seniors.

We know that one of the major reasons for the increase—it is not just