

KENNEDY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3599 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4939, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3600

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3600 proposed to H.R. 4939, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BOND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. GREGG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. BURR):

S. 2653. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to make efforts to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Call Home Act of 2006 would require the Federal Communications Commission to take such actions as may be necessary to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas, including the waiver of government fees, assessments, or other costs.

In seeking to reduce phone rates, the legislation would require the FCC to evaluate and analyze the costs of calls to and from official duty stations including vessels whether in port or under way; evaluate methods of reducing rates including deployment of new technology such as Voice over Internet protocol, VOIP, or other Internet protocol technology; encourage phone companies to adopt flexible billing procedures and policies call to and from Armed Forces personnel; and seek agreements with foreign governments to reduce international surcharges on phone calls.

The legislation would, however, prohibit the FCC from regulating rates in

order to carry out the Call Home Act's requirements.

The Call Home Act of 2006 would replace similar legislation from 1992 that limited the FCC's efforts to reduce rates to specific countries. The Call Home Act would expand the FCC's efforts to benefit troops wherever they are deployed in support of the global war on terrorism.

We have received a letter of support from the Military Coalition, which represents 36 military and veterans groups. We have also received letters of support from individual members of that coalition and others urging Congress to enact this legislation: Veterans of Foreign Wars; Association of the United States Army; Enlisted Association of the National Guard; Military Officers Association of America; American Legion; Naval Reserve Association; Naval Enlisted Reserve Association; Gold Star Wives of America; and Air Force Sergeants Association.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars' letter of support says that calls home are "lifeline" for the brave men and women stationed abroad.

I urge you to vote for this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent letters in support of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MILITARY COALITION,
Alexandria, VA, April 10, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: The Military Coalition (TMC), a consortium of uniformed services and veterans associations representing more than 5.5 million current and former servicemembers and their families and survivors, is writing to express our strong support of your bill, "Call Home Act of 2006," that directs the Federal Communications Commission to seek ways to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas.

Everyday, military members deployed or assigned unaccompanied overseas are faced with the burdens of being separated from families and loved ones. Your bill recognizes the burden these members and families encounter and takes an important step forward to reduce the costs of high phone rates.

The Military Coalition thanks you for introducing this legislation and recommends that the bill be expanded to include all members of the uniformed services. We also appreciate your leadership on issues affecting all servicemembers and their families and pledge our strong support in seeking enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Signed by 36 representatives of member organizations of the Military Coalition.

ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Arlington, VA, April 6, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: On behalf of over 100,000 members of the Association of the United States Army (AUSA), I write to express our strong support of your bill. "Call Home Act of 2006," that directs the Federal

Communications Commission to seek ways to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas.

Everyday, military members deployed or assigned unaccompanied overseas are faced with the burdens of being separated from families and loved ones. Your bill recognizes the burden these members and families encounter and takes an important step forward to reduce the costs of high phone rates.

AUSA thanks you for introducing this legislation and for your leadership on issues affecting all servicemembers and their families. We pledge our strong support in seeking enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

GORDON R. SULLIVAN,
General, USA Retired.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: On behalf of the 4 million members of The American Legion Family, I would like to take this opportunity to offer our support for your draft legislation entitled, The Call Home Act of 2006.

Your legislation would direct the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to make every effort possible to reduce telephone rates for those deployed and fighting overseas in the war on terror. The bill also directs the FCC to develop new technologies, encourage foreign governments to reduce international surcharges, and help provide flexible billing for troops and their families. All of these things would help make positive improvements in the lives of our servicemembers who just want to phone home and talk to a loved one.

We support efforts to reduce telephone rates for our servicemembers stationed overseas who depend on an affordable and timely means of communication with their family and loved ones. Over a decade ago, American Legion National Commanders discovered in their visits to troops in the Balkans that our servicemembers were being charged exorbitant telephone rates to call home. The American Legion is strongly supportive of military quality of life, and frequent and timely calling home is a huge morale factor which could only pay dividends to our troops going into harm's way.

Thank you for introducing this legislation and for your continuous support of those on the battlefield today. We look forward to working with you and your staff on the enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE HILL,
Chairman,
National Security Commission.

ENLISTED ASSOCIATION OF THE
NATIONAL GUARD,
Alexandria, VA, April 6, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS, Chairman,
Hon. DANIEL INOUE, Ranking Member,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce, Science
and Transportation, Washington, DC.

The Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States (EANGUS) is pleased to express our strongest support, on behalf of the Enlisted men and women of the Army and Air National Guard, for the "Call Home Act of 2006" which would authorize the FCC to take actions necessary to reduce telephone bills for all deployed service members, active duty, Guard and Reserve.

Members of the Guard and Reserve comprise over 45 percent of all U.S. personnel in Afghanistan and Iraq. Since September 11, 2001, our nation has deployed over 525,000 Guard and Reserve members for operational missions for the Global War on Terrorism,

all over the world. Unfortunately, many of these members, predominately in the junior enlisted ranks, are not be able to afford expensive calls from overseas to families or to address personal issues that increase stress on the member. All servicemembers need contact with their home areas and families for a multitude of reasons; however most Guard and Reserve member's home towns are not in the vicinity of a traditional base; therefore contact with their families is critical when deployed.

Today's guardsmen and reservists are professionals. They are the best that we have had and they are answering the call on a routine basis not envisioned during the Cold War. We need to take care of those that answer the call from our nation. If passed this benefit for members of the Guard and Reserve will provide an important tool to bolster recruitment, retention, family morale and overall readiness.

Thank you for recognizing one of the many needs of the military community. You have the support of EANGUS and our membership.

Working for America's Best!

MICHAEL P. CLINE,
Executive Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: On behalf of the 2.4 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and our Auxiliaries, I would like to take this opportunity to offer our support for your draft legislation entitled, The Call Home Act of 2006.

Your legislation would direct the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to make every effort possible to reduce telephone rates for those deployed and fighting overseas in the war on terror. The bill also directs FCC to evaluate the role of new technologies, encourage foreign governments to reduce international surcharges, and help provide flexible billing for troops and their families. All of these things would help make positive improvements in the lives of our servicemembers who just want to phone home and talk to a loved one.

We believe that telephone calls and service are a lifeline for our servicemembers stationed abroad who depend on an affordable means of communication with their friends and family. To help decrease these costs in any way is the least we can do for those fighting for our freedoms and for their families who are making their own sacrifices on the home front.

Thank you for introducing this legislation and for your continuous support of those on the battlefield today. We look forward to working with you and your staff on the enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director.

NAVAL RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, April 5, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STEVENS: I am writing you on behalf of the members of the Naval Reserve Association, members of the Navy Reserve, their families and survivors. I'm writing to express our strongest support for The "Call Home Act of 2006" which would authorize the FCC to take actions necessary to reduce telephone bills for all deployed service members, active duty, Guard and Reserve.

Members of the Guard and Reserve comprise over 45 percent of all U.S. personnel in

Afghanistan and Iraq. Since September 11, 2001, our nation has deployed over 525,000 Guard and Reserve members for operational missions for the Global War on Terrorism, all over the world. Additionally, during any month, approximately 25 percent of the Navy Reserve force is doing some type of operational support to the fleet for operational mission requirements.

Unfortunately, many of these members, predominately in the junior enlisted ranks, are not able to afford expensive calls from overseas to families or to address personal issues that increase stress on the member. All servicemembers need contact with their home areas and families for a multitude of reasons. Most Guard and Reserve member's home towns are not in the vicinity of a traditional base; therefore, contact with their families is critical when deployed.

Today's guardsmen and reservists are professionals. They are the best that we have had and they are answering the call on a routine basis not envisioned during the Cold War. We need to take care of those that answer the call from our nation. If passed, this benefit for members of the Guard and Reserve will provide an important tool to bolster recruitment, retention, family morale and overall readiness. I look forward to working together in support of a strong and viable Navy Reserve, and all reserve components. Thank you for all your hard work on their behalf with the Call Home Act of 2006.

Sincerely,

CASEY W. COANE,
RADM, USN (Ret.),
Executive Director.

THE NAVAL ENLISTED
RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Falls Church, Va.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Chair, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation, Russell Senate Office
Building, Washington, DC.

I am writing you on behalf of the members of the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association, members of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard Reserve, their families and survivors. I'm writing to express our strongest support for The "Call Home Act of 2006" which would authorize the FCC to take actions necessary to reduce telephone bills for all deployed service members, active duty, Guard and Reserve.

Members of the Guard and Reserve comprise over 45 percent of all U.S. personnel in Afghanistan and Iraq. Since September 11, 2001, our nation has deployed over 525,000 Guard and Reserve members for operational missions for the Global War on Terrorism, all over the world. Additionally, during any month, approximately 25 percent of our Reserve Forces are doing some type of operational support to meet the country's mission requirements.

Unfortunately, many of these members, predominately in the junior enlisted ranks, are not able to afford expensive calls from overseas to families or to address personal issues that increase stress on the member. All servicemembers need contact with their home areas and families for a multitude of reasons. Most Guard and Reserve members' home towns are not in the vicinity of a traditional base; therefore contact with their families is critical when deployed. Due to time and operation differences, it is not practicable for the families to call them and if they are able, the cost is still prohibitive.

Today's guardsmen and reservists are professionals. They are the best that we have had and they are answering the call on a routine basis not envisioned during the Cold War. We need to take care of those that answer the call from our nation. If passed this benefit for members of the Guard and Reserve will provide an important tool to bolster recruitment, retention, family morale

and overall readiness. I look forward to working together in support of a strong and viable Reserve and Guard Force. Thank you for all your hard work on their behalf with the "Call Home Act of 2006."

DAVE DAVIDSON,
CAPT, USN (Ret.),
Executive Director.

GOLD STAR WIVES OF AMERICA, INC.,
Arlington, VA, April 5, 2006.

Mr. HARRY WINGO,
Counsel, Committee on Commerce, Science, and
Transportation, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WINGO: On behalf of Gold Star Wives of America, I'm writing to support the "Call Home Act of 2006" which directs the FCC to seek to reduce telephone rates for Armed Forces personnel deployed overseas.

Gold Star Wives has a chatroom for new widows of the Iraq and Afghanistan Conflict. Our survivors of the Global War on Terrorism know first hand how important it is to have frequent contact with their loved ones deployed overseas. With reduced phone rates for those serving overseas, it would certainly help permit more frequent phone calls to keep in touch with loved ones. It would be a great morale booster.

Thank you for this bill, and if we can help in any way, please don't hesitate to contact me. Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. is a member of The Military Coalition.

Sincerely,

ROSE LEE,
Chair, Legislative Committee.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2654. A bill to protect consumers, and especially young consumers, from skyrocketing consumer debt and the barrage of credit card solicitations, to establish a financial literacy and education program in elementary and secondary schools to help prepare young people to be financially responsible consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2655. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act, to prohibit universal default practices by credit card issuers, to limit fees that may be imposed on credit card accounts, and to require credit card issuers to verify a prospective consumer's ability to pay before extending credit to the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today, families across this country face a growing problem of rising credit card debt. In 2004, the average American household had \$9,300 in credit card debt, up from \$3,200 just 12 years earlier. More and more Americans are using credit card debt to manage daily living expenses such as basic living costs, medical bills, and house or automotive repairs. And for college students, the problem cannot be overstated. According to university administrators, colleges lose more students to credit card debt than to academic failure.

To fuel that growth, credit card issuers have increased the number of

solicitations sent to consumers 500 percent since 1990 to a record 5.23 billion in 2004. And they start sending them to children at younger and younger ages. Last year, AJ, the son of my State director received his very first solicitation at the age of 2 years old. If you have a pulse and a social security number, you can get a credit card.

Credit card companies are increasingly targeting people who are likely to default. They have focused their attention on teenagers and college students, people who live beyond their means, and those who have declared bankruptcy. Clearly, credit card companies are not paying attention to whom they are giving a credit card, much less if the applicant can afford to pay the balance.

There is no question that we must demand personal responsibility from consumers, but at the same time credit card companies should not be allowed to take advantage of consumers with excessive fees and unreasonable interest rates. One study found that people in this Nation pay \$90 billion each year in penalty fees and interest payments. Just think about that for a second—\$90 billion annually. It is money that could be used to send our children to college, to pay the health care bills of both our children in the dawn of their lives and our parents in the sunset of theirs, while still saving for our own retirements.

One of the most egregious practices is known as “universal default.” It involves credit card companies raising interest rates, up to 30 percent APR, on customers who have a perfect record with the credit card but miss a payment with any other creditor. So a person can make their credit card payment on time every month but see their interest rate skyrocket because they paid their gas bill late. Further, this penalty interest rate is often applied not only to future purchases but retroactively to current balances as well. This is a completely arbitrary rate-hike intended solely to hike the company's bottom line.

That is why I am introducing the Credit Card Bill of Rights—two pieces of legislation that, taken together, will stop some of the most egregious practices of credit card issuers while also ensuring that future generations have the information to make financial decisions.

Many American adolescents are inadequately prepared for the complex financial world that awaits them. In 2004, almost two-thirds of the students who took a personal finance survey failed the test.

The causes for this failure are largely due to the lack of high school finance courses available to teenagers combined with insufficient parental mentoring. Statistics show that while a large majority of both college and high school students rely on their parents for financial guidance, only 26 percent of 13- to 21-year-olds reported their parents actively taught them how to man-

age money. Public education has not filled this void as only about one in five students between the ages of 16 and 22 say they have taken a personal finance course in school.

Credit card companies are exploiting this financial inexperience of young Americans with an aggressive marketing strategy designed to maximize enrollment and profit, with little regard for a potential customer's ability to pay. As a result, over 20 percent of children between the ages of 12 to 19 have access to a credit card.

This credit card marketing blitz further intensifies once an individual enters college. During the first week college freshmen arrive on campus, they are barraged by an average of eight credit card offers. Students actually double their average credit card debt, and triple the number of credit cards in their wallets, from the time they arrive on campus until graduation. This large number of new credit card owners combined with the lack of financial literacy of high school graduates leads to high levels of debt amongst undergrads.

Credit card companies have actually encouraged this rise in credit card debt through increasing the median balance for undergraduates. As a result, 21 percent of undergraduates that have credit cards, have high-level balances between \$3,000 and \$7,000.

The Protection of Young Consumers Act will protect people, especially college students and other young people, against skyrocketing consumer debt and the barrage of credit card solicitations that lead to it. The bill will do so by building on the current opt-out program for pre-approved credit card solicitations by requiring young consumers under age 21 to proactively opt-in to receive solicitations from credit card companies. This proposal will also establish a financial literacy and education program in elementary and secondary schools to help prepare young people to be financially responsible consumers.

In addition to targeting high school and college students, credit card companies have become very adept at increasing their profits through hidden fees and deceptive advertising, taking advantage of Americans of all ages.

The Credit Card Reform Act will protect consumers against hidden fees and excessive interest rates. It does so by: 1) prohibiting “universal defaults” that I mentioned earlier, 2) banning unilateral changes in credit card agreements without written consent, and 3) requiring that the fees charged by creditors are “reasonably related” to the cost incurred by the issuer.

The bill will also establish standards that would prohibit unfair or deceptive acts or practices, while tightening regulations on credit card companies to ensure that they are not offering credit to high-risk cardholders without verifying their ability to pay.

I would like to be clear that I am not trying to remove the obligation for

consumers to behave responsibly. Every individual must take responsibility for their own actions, but at the same time it is the obligation of the companies who are earning billions in profits from credit cards to behave ethically as well.

This Credit Card Bill of Rights will help ensure that New Jersey consumers and consumers across the country are given a fair chance at being responsible consumers who will enjoy economic security as well as economic opportunity in their futures.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2658. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, today I join my friend and fellow cochair of the Senate National Guard caucus, Senator PAT LEAHY, in introducing bipartisan legislation to strengthen one of our Nation's most important military and civilian resources—the National Guard.

The Guard has a long and proud history of contributing to America's military away game, while providing vital support and security to civil authorities in the home game. Since September 11, 2001, our citizen-soldiers have taken on greater responsibilities and risks from fighting the war on terror to disaster assistance.

Today, the Guard supports the Nation's military strategy overseas, functions as a primary line of defense here at home, and helps local responders deal with overwhelming natural disasters.

We have seen the tremendous value of Guard forces as they confront terrorists in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other hotspots, and as they provide water, food, and health supplies to victims of Hurricane Katrina and other natural disasters.

More than 1,300 guardsmen from my home State of Missouri were deployed in less than 72 hours following Hurricane Katrina, providing medical, transportation, airlift, military police, engineering, and communications capabilities. For example, the 139th Airlift Wing evacuated 23 critically ill young patients from Children's Hospital in New Orleans and brought them to Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City for the high-level care they needed.

Stories such as this were repeated all over the country in most if not all our States.

Why was the Guard successful when other elements of the Katrina response were not? Quite simply, the Guard is the entity best organized and trained to initiate and coordinate a civil response to any disaster on the scale of Katrina.

In addition, more than 200,000 Guard troops have left their homes, their

jobs, and their families to participate in another critical mission: the global war on terror. The National Guard has provided as much as half the combat force and 40 percent of the total force in Iraq.

I point out that the Guard is a tremendous value for the capabilities it provides. It gives 40 percent of the total military force for around 4.5 percent of the budget. Whether at home or abroad, the men and women of the Guard are performing their duties with honor and valor, often at great sacrifice to their families and their own lives. As they willingly make these sacrifices to preserve American lives and freedoms, we have a responsibility to support them as they carry out their unique dual mission.

While serving abroad, National Guard troops serve under Air Force and Army commands under title 10 status. But when the Guard operates at home, they serve under the command and control of the Nation's Governors in title 32 status.

There is a lot more we can do to make this work more smoothly.

Despite their importance on the street, as it were, the Guard is often given short shrift back at Pentagon headquarters, which has proposed repeatedly to cut Guard personnel and equipment budgets.

The Guard will play a critical role in response to another terrorist attack or natural disaster, but the Pentagon has allowed its equipment levels to sink to dangerously low levels. Currently, the National Guard has only about 35 percent of the equipment it needs. In Missouri, only one of two engineering battalions that were requested to assist with Katrina could respond because the other one did not have the equipment they needed.

With the support of 75 of my colleagues, Senator LEAHY and I led an effort to increase equipment funding for the Guard by almost \$1 billion. We are going to continue that fight this year to ensure the Guard has equipment it needs to carry out both missions.

Just a few months ago, the Army proposed significant cuts to Guard troop strength. Three-quarters of the Senate again joined us in a letter opposing this, and I thank all of our colleagues who joined us.

We need to do more to empower the Guard. We need to give the Guard more bureaucratic muscle. Time and again, the Guard has had to rely on Congress, not its total force partners in the active duty, to provide and equip fully the resources it needs to fulfill its missions.

That the Guard is left out of the Pentagon decisionmaking process is beyond dispute. In the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review, during the BRAC review process of 2004 and 2005, when the Army and Air Force reduced National Guard force structure in 2005, and when equipment levels of the Army and National Guard reached the dangerously low levels of 35 percent, Congress has had to step in.

To remedy this, the legislation we introduce today to strengthen the Guard consists of three central planks.

One, we will allow the National Guard Bureau to establish more formal relationships with the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs.

We will give the Guard more muscle in existing relationships, elevating the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to a four-star position and providing a seat for him on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It goes without saying that to be a part of a big decision, you have to be at the table. Having a four-star Guard general providing advice to the SECDEF instead of a two-star major general will give our governors and 450,000 citizen-soldiers and airmen access to the highest level of the DOD and ensure key policy decisions are heard and taken into account.

To put things in perspective, the Active-Duty Army has 12 four-star generals and 46 lieutenant generals. The Air Force has 13 four-star generals and 35 lieutenant generals. The National Guard, which represents over 40 percent of the entire force structure, is represented by three lieutenant generals and zero four-star generals.

Can anyone tell me with a straight face how the Guard one four-star general and an additional three-star will endanger our national security? The only element endangered would be the Pentagon status quo which is outdated.

Facts are stubborn things. Clearly, the facts demonstrate a glaring, disproportionate number of three- and four-star generals in the Army and the Air Force when compared with the Guard.

Second, we will ensure that the Deputy Commander of the Northern Command is a member of the Guard, a new command with the mission of coordinating responses to emergencies within the United States.

The Guard is the entity best suited to respond to major incidents, and they need that capability. With both the Guard and NorthCom's missions being defense of the homeland, it only makes sense to have substantive input through a lieutenant general as deputy commander.

Finally, we must ensure the Guard plays a role in identifying and filling any gaps between civilian emergency response capabilities and those of the military. Current DOD policy prohibits procurement of supplies or equipment for providing military support to civilian authorities during emergencies except with the permission of SECDEF. That policy is outdated. It will give the National Guard Bureau, in consultation with the State adjutant generals, the budgetary power to research, validate, and make those equipment purchases.

Neither the homeland support nor the military support missions of the Guard are likely to diminish. They are needed more now than ever. But we must strengthen the decisionmaking

capability of Guard leaders within the Department of Defense.

As we heard today from General Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee when he was asked questions by Senator INOUE, he responded with a football analogy. When we asked him if he was in the huddle, he said he was "not in the huddle" during the QDR.

This legislation would empower the Guard to respond in the affirmative the next time it is asked, "are you in the huddle" on this major decision.

I thank my colleagues for their past support. I ask for their support of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that congressional findings regarding National Guard Forces be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL GUARD FORCES

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

1. The Constitution of the United States recognizes a well-regulated militia is a necessity to the security of a free state.

2. The United States continues to face a wide spectrum of threats at home and abroad, including terrorism, natural disasters, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and other emerging perils. In meeting these threats, the United States relies heavily on the men and women of the National Guard.

3. At no time in America's history has the National Guard played so critical a role in the security of our homeland and in our Nation's military objectives abroad.

4. The National Guard is a vital part of this Nation's security, and this country relies on the exemplary service provided this Nation by the members of the Guard, their families, their employers and their communities.

5. The National Guard is a critical component of the Department of Defense's contribution to the security of our Nation and has been key to the Department's accomplishments at home and abroad. Much of the success DOD has had would not have been possible without the participation of National Guard forces.

6. The National Guard's response to our Nation's emergencies in the post 9/11 world has been unparalleled.

7. Within hours of the attacks on the World Trade Center, 1,500 New York National Guard troops reported for duty. Within 24 hours of the attacks, over 8,000 New York National Guard Soldiers and Air men and women were on active duty supporting New York State's security needs. These troops provided not just a calming presence on the streets of New York during unsettling times; they provided New York's first responders with critical perimeter security support, refueling for civilian emergency vehicles, emergency lighting, power generation, communications, emergency transportation, engineering assets and other logistical support.

8. At the request of the President, State Governors supplemented the security of the Nation's airports with National Guard personnel. Their missions encompassed over 400 airports in 52 States and territories. National Guard troops along the northern and southern borders were used to support the U.S. Custom Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Border Patrol in the heightened post 9/11 security posture.

9. In contrast to Hurricane Andrew (1992) in which National Guard forces constituted 24 percent of the military response, National Guard forces represented more than 70 percent of the military force for Hurricane Katrina.

10. The response to Hurricane Katrina proved that the National Guard is the Nation's first military responder and that the overwhelming majority of forces that respond to disasters in the United States will be National Guard who will be on the scene before the Department of Defense is requested to respond.

11. More than 9,700 National Guard soldiers and airmen were in New Orleans by August 30. National Guard deployed over 30,000 additional troops within 96 hours of the storms passing. In wake of the Hurricane Katrina devastation, the National Guard mobilized over 50,000 personnel in support of hurricane relief in the largest and fastest domestic deployment since World War II, saving over 17,000 lives. The Air National Guard flew nearly 3,500 flights and over 12,000 tons of cargo in support of all Hurricane relief in the last year.

12. The National Guard Bureau will be a part of any large-scale emergency response. As demonstrated during the Hurricane Katrina response, the National Guard Bureau is a significant joint force provider for homeland security missions.

13. The National Guard is continuously on active duty supporting State security missions, Federal security missions under Operation Noble Eagle and overseas military operations as part of Operation Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom and more are engaged in regularly scheduled training and operational requirements around the Nation and the world. Under Title 32, counter-drug activities are a daily operational mission of the National Guard, fortifying a longstanding successful relationship with civil authorities.

14. The Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force could not fulfill current Title 10 responsibilities without the Army and Air National Guard. In 2005, National Guard units at one time made up 50 percent of the combat forces in Iraq.

15. The National Guard has mobilized over 300,000 soldiers and 36,000 airmen supporting the Global War on Terror since September 11, 2001. (Need NGB confirmation)

16. Since September 11, 2001, 85 percent of the Army National Guard has been mobilized. Since September 11, 2001, the Air National Guard has flown over 206,000 sorties accumulating over 620,000 flying hours. These deployments abroad have created a battle hardened and seasoned force of experienced veterans ready for the challenges of the 21st century.

17. National Guard forces have provided: 55 percent of the Army's combat capability; 55 percent of the Air Force's airlift capability; 50 percent of the Army strategic and tactical manpower; 45 percent of all in-flight refueling missions; 33 percent of all aircraft in Operation Iraqi Freedom; 100 percent of Operation Enduring Freedom A-10 missions; 66 percent of Operation Iraqi Freedom A-10 missions; 45 percent of all F-16 fighter missions; 86 percent of Operation Iraqi Freedom tanker sorties; 94 percent of Strategic Air Defense Alert; and 75 percent of all domestic combat air patrols in the Global War on Terror.

18. The National Guard offers unique efficiencies between State and Federal, and domestic and overseas missions, operating under three different command relationships: Federal funding and Federal control; Federal funding and State control; and State funding and State control.

19. National Guardsmen and women are their State's primary emergency response

force, providing support in their communities and to civil authorities and first responders throughout their States.

20. The National Guard is invaluable to civil support mission, homeland defense and emergency preparedness. The National Guard has an undeniable record of military assistance to civilian authorities since the birth of this Nation, responding heroically and meeting every mission asked of them, particularly in times of crisis—terrorism, natural disasters, plane crashes, blizzards, wildfires, floods.

21. There must be strong agreement between State and Federal leadership as to the operational objectives during emergencies. State concerns about maintaining sovereignty must be respected. Governors, who are most intimately familiar with and better understand the National Guard's unique capabilities, must retain the ability and authority to deploy their National Guard troops in times of crisis.

22. Governors using State-to-State emergency mutual assistance compacts are an integral part of the use of National Guard resources in responding to emergencies at home.

23. The National Guard and State Adjutants General are invaluable nexus of coordination between Federal and State planning, exercising and response to emergencies and disasters. Over 50 percent of State Adjutants General are also State Emergency Managers offering unparalleled integration of planning, preparation and response capabilities in emergencies.

24. National Guard forces are also uniquely positioned to engage within the U.S. and its territories by virtue of their geographic dispersal and relationships to State and local governments.

25. The National Guard is familiar with the local area and local culture. The National Guard has close ties with first responders such as local and State law enforcement, fire departments, and other emergency service providers. The local community relies upon the National Guard because they are part of the community. National Guard personnel are more likely to have more experience working with local responders than the active component.

26. WMD Civil Support Teams are a specialized homeland security capability based entirely in the National Guard.

27. As America prepares for an influenza pandemic, the National Guard has more domestic response training and decentralized capabilities than any other military organization and ready to respond in a moment's notice.

28. The National Guard Bureau has proved its ability to plan for and respond to natural and man-made events with the establishment of Joint Force Headquarters-State, Joint Task Force State, CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Packages, CERFP, National Guard Reaction Force, NGRF, and the current development of Joint CONUS Communications Support Environment, JCCSE.

Congress finds that despite the contributions of the National Guard to the United States—

1. The Department of Defense has not adapted to the significant role of the National Guard in this nation's security.

2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force have not sufficiently integrated the National Guard into planning, procuring or decision-making processes.

3. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force do not have a long-term strategy to equip the National Guard at a high level of readiness for overseas or domestic missions.

4. The Department of Defense does not adequately resource or equip the National Guard for its current operational missions. Currently the National Guard receives only 4.5 percent of the Department of Defense's budget.

5. The Army National Guard has been equipped at less than war-time readiness levels and is forced to transfer equipment to deploying units. Army National Guard units that have returned from overseas deployments have also left behind many equipment items for use by follow on units. Army officials do not track and develop plans to replace Guard equipment.

6. Army and Air National Guard forces are generally expected to perform homeland defense and civil support missions only with equipment supplied for their war-fighting mission or equipment supplied by the States.

7. In the current budget, the Department of the Air Force does not fund the Air Sovereignty Alert mission of the Air National Guard at full capacity.

8. During the BRAC process, the Air Force failed to adequately solicit input of Air Guard leadership and State Adjutants General.

9. When developing Future Total Force Strategy, the Air Force failed to adequately consult Air Guard leaders and State Adjutants General.

10. The Department of Defense does not have adequate knowledge of the role of the National Guard at home or incorporated the National Guard's significant capabilities into plans for homeland defense or security.

11. Left unchecked, the Department of Defense will continue to ignore the Federal requirements of the National Guard to perform homeland defense and civil support missions.

12. The Department of Defense has not recognized the value of including State Adjutants General in all homeland defense and military support to civilian authority planning.

13. The Department of Defense has not recognized that governors will rely on National Guard manpower and equipment before relying on Federal forces.

14. Although DOD has a Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support, which recognizes the National Guard's critical role in Federal and State missions, the strategy does not detail what the Army or Air National Guard's role or requirements will be in implementing the strategy.

15. The Department of Defense and Northern Command have not articulated specific requirements or capabilities that National Guard forces need during major homeland disasters. Without formal requirements, equipment deemed necessary for the National Guard to assist civilian authorities in Katrina had not been purchased by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force.

16. The readiness of the National Guard to perform homeland missions that may be needed in the future is unknown because the National Guard's roles in these missions has not been defined and requirements for manpower, equipment and training have not been established; and preparedness standards and measures have not been developed by the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense does not require the purchase of equipment specifically for military assistance to civilian authorities for the National Guard.

17. WMD Civil Support Teams' face challenges in personnel, equipment acquisition and facilities under current Department of Defense and service budgets.

18. The lack of coordination of National Guard and active duty forces hampered the military response to Katrina. Advance planning between active-duty personnel and the Guard is vital during emergencies. The Department of Defense and the National Guard

must plan and exercise together to prepare for events in the homeland.

19. The National Guard leadership and State Adjutants General are not adequately involved in Department of Defense planning guidance developed at Northern Command, including concept of operations plans and functional plans for military support to civilian authorities.

20. There was a lack of coordination of Joint Task Force Katrina and the National Guard headquarters in supporting States.

21. The Department of Defense has not adequately incorporated or funded the National Guard to participate in joint exercises in military assistance to civil authorities, which would have allowed for a more effective response to Hurricane Katrina and other homeland emergencies.

22. Northern Command does not have adequate insight into State response capabilities or adequate interface with governors, which contributed to a lack of mutual understanding and trust during the Katrina response.

23. There is an unresolved tension between the Department of Defense and the States regarding the role of the military in emergency response that could be resolved if the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security adopted and made NIMS a priority for emergency management.

24. The National Guard lacked communications equipment during Hurricane Katrina, suggesting that the Pentagon does not assign homeland defense and military assistance to civilian authorities a sufficiently high priority.

25. The Department of the Army decided to reduce end-strength without substantive consultation with Guard leaders and the Air Force has decided to reduce end-strength without substantive consultation with National Guard leaders.

26. The Department of the Army currently plans to scale back the Army National Guard to 324,000 soldiers from 350,000. The Department of the Air Force plans to scale back the Air National Guard by 14,000 airmen and women. To cut Guard manpower in this time of increased homeland need, and the fluxation of current Department of Defense transformation policies affecting the Army and Air National Guard, sets up an undeniable risk to this country.

27. National Guard force structure cuts could result in the closure of over 200 National Guard community-based facilities throughout the U.S.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

1. The National Guard is a force essential to the Nation's security and safety.

2. The National Guard brings to bear significant capabilities for contingencies at home or abroad.

3. The National Guard is no longer a strategic reserve, but an operational reserve.

4. States and governors are not adequately represented at the Department of Defense.

5. The role of the National Guard Bureau as chief communicator between the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security and the States needs to be enhanced.

6. The men and women of the National Guard have earned the right to be represented at the highest levels of the Department of Defense.

7. The National Guard leadership needs to be integrated into the highest offices in the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force.

8. The National Guard Bureau plays a critical role in planning for and responding to future terrorist attacks in the U.S.

9. The National Guard Bureau is in a unique position to understand and create re-

quirements for the National Guard for missions in support of states and other civilian authorities.

10. The National Guard Bureau plays a critical role in the development of requirements for military assistance to civilian authorities.

11. NORTHCOM lacks knowledge of its theater of operations, specifically State emergency plans and resources, and knowledge of National Guard resources. NORTHCOM needs to be reformed to include increased National Guard leadership and participation in all levels of its operations.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr President, I am pleased today to join my friend and co-chair of the Senate National Guard Caucus, the Senator from Missouri, Senator BOND, in introducing far-reaching legislation that will strengthen our Nation's defense and the National Guard, which is an inextricable part of the bedrock of our security. The National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006 would empower the National Guard.

It offers the Guard new authorities and a greater and more fitting voice in policy and budgetary discussions that is more in line with the reliance that we place on this force of proud men and women.

The Nation asks the Guard to provide a large part of the ground forces in Iraq, but then we give the force no say in strategic planning and budget discussions. In fact, there have been recent efforts within the armed services to cut the force precipitously.

Anyone who has watched recent events knows that the role of the Guard is dramatically changed as we come into this century.

We ask the Guard to carry out missions at home in response to disasters and possible domestic attacks, but then give the force no real ability to develop new equipment for this unique mission. And, in a crunch, our senior defense leaders—including the President—turn to the Chief of the National Guard for guidance in addressing and responding to emergencies within the domestic United States, yet those same senior Guard leaders receive only mediated and filtered advice at other points. This gap between the Guard's real world missions and its institutional position is simply unacceptable. It is not efficient, and it is not smart. It violates basic notions of logic, and it hinders our ability to get the full potential out of the National Guard.

Our legislation will take them from the 19th and 20th century structure into the 21st century's reality.

Our legislation directly addresses this troubling missions-to-authorities gap in three very specific ways. First, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006 would elevate the Chief of the National Guard to the rank of General with four-stars, also installing this senior officer on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs is the highest military advisory body to the President and the Secretary of Defense. Without a Guard representative at the

four-star level, the Secretary and the President receive only filtered advice from the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Air Force about National Guard matters.

The Army and the Air Force chiefs can provide keen insights about the Guard's role as a prime military reserve to the active components. However, they are not responsible for, and therefore are not experts on, disaster relief and homeland security functions that the Guard carries out at the State level, often under the command-and-control of the Nation's governors. Placing a National Guard General on the Joint Chiefs offers the fullest and most sensible guidance to our leaders on all aspects of the Guard, and this arrangement would give the Nation's governors a straight line to the Joint Chiefs and the President on military matters.

Creating a Guard senior advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the President streamlines and formalizes an arrangement that already arises in real emergencies. During the darkest early days of Katrina, for example, the current National Guard Bureau Chief General Steven Blum was by the side of the Secretary of Defense and the President. A permanent Guard presence on the Joint Chiefs ensures that this advisory relationship is in no way last-minute and ad-hoc.

The second way that this legislation puts the National Guard's authorities more in line with its real-world missions is by giving the force more budgetary authority. The Act gives the National Guard the ability to research, develop and procure equipment that is peculiar to its unique mission in the realm of homeland security.

This authority would be similar to the authority of the Special Operations Command, given under the Nunn-Cohen legislation of the mid-1980s, to develop unique equipment for the special forces.

Last year, Congress appropriated almost \$1 billion for the National Guard to procure equipment that has application for homeland security. This legislation establishes more formal structure for the Guard to refine such equipment requirements and work in close coordination with the states to ensure an adequate force structure—fully adequate in domestic emergencies—is in place.

The final way that this legislation brings realistic authorities to the Guard is by ensuring that the Deputy Commander of Northern Command is a three-star general from the National Guard. This Command is charged with planning for the active military's response to federal emergencies, as well as coordinating the response with other federal agencies and civilian authorities. Any military response in the domestic United States will surely include the National Guard, in many cases with the State governor overseeing the effort.

Currently, there are few if any senior Guard officers at the highest reaches of

the Command, and the legislation would ensure expertise on the force exists there.

There has been a lot of discussion already about this legislation after Senator BOND and I last month expressed our intention to pursue it. To clear up any confusion, let me say what this legislation does not do. This legislation does not affect the National Guard's role as one of the primary military reserves to the Air Force and the Army, which we believe is beneficial for the country.

It also does not inflate the size of National Guard headquarters here in Washington. We put a firm cap on the size of the Guard Bureau in this legislation. The legislation further does not create any new general office positions beyond the four-star Joint Chiefs position. It only ensures that the adequate seats of representation is in place in key positions; in fact, the legislation actually removes a less influential Major General officer slot on the Joint Staff.

What this bill does do—and with great intensity—is to give the National Guard the institutional muscle commensurate with the Guard's missions. With this bill, we can ask the Guard to do all that it does, but then say that, yes, it can have a seat at the table during key discussions involving the Guard's missions and readiness. With this bill, we can tap into the Guard for situations like the war in Iraq and the response to Hurricane Katrina and tell these proud men and women that we take are committed to taking real steps to keep the size of this force steady and improve its stock of available equipment.

With this bill, we can ensure that our senior leaders—the Secretary of Defense and the President—are making decisions about the National Guard based on the best available information.

With this bill, we strengthen the National Guard, the military chain-of-command, and the Guard's ability to effectively serve each of the States and the entire Nation.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUE):

S. 2659. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility of Indian tribal organizations for grants for the establishment of veterans cemeteries on trust lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation for our Native American veterans. The Native American Veterans Cemetery Act of 2006 would provide tribal organizations eligibility for Department of Veterans Affairs grants to establish veterans cemeteries on trust lands. Currently, VA does not have the authority to make such grants.

Native American veterans have a long and proud history of military service on behalf of this Nation. Per

capita, Native Americans have the highest percentage of people serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Native Americans have honorably served in every war fought by the United States. After completion of their service, many Native American veterans return to their communities on trust lands. Passage of this legislation would provide them the option of veterans cemetery burial in a location convenient for their families and loved ones.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have always fought for the rights of our indigenous peoples. The Native American Veterans Cemetery Act of 2006 is another step forward in helping native peoples. The Department of Veterans Affairs supports enactment of this legislation and estimates it to be budget neutral. It is my hope that the Senate will expeditiously proceed to the consideration of this important bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2659

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 "Native American Veterans Cemetery Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS CEMETERIES ON TRUST LANDS.

Section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) The Secretary may make grants under this subsection to any tribal organization to assist the tribal organization in establishing, expanding, or improving veterans' cemeteries on trust land owned by, or held in trust for, the tribal organization.

"(2) Grants under this subsection shall be made in the same manner, and under the same conditions, as grants to States are made under the preceding provisions of this section.

"(3) In this subsection:

"(A) The term 'tribal organization' has the meaning given that term in section 3764(4) of this title.

"(B) The term 'trust land' has the meaning given that term in section 3764(1) of this title."

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2660. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to require notice to Congress of certain declassifications of intelligence information, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I introduce today legislation to require the White House to notify Congress when it declassifies information. This bill will both enhance Congress's oversight abilities and ensure that intelligence is not used for political gain.

This legislation recognizes that as the head of the executive branch, the President has the authority to declassify any information he so chooses. It

does not place any conditions or procedures on that declassification process, it only requires that the Congress be provided with notice so that it can meet its own constitutional responsibilities.

Information is usually declassified because the public's need to know outweighs the security risks to intelligence sources and methods. In such cases, it is important for the Congress to be informed so that Senators and Representatives can discuss the issues with the American people.

And if the President declassifies information so that his subordinates can discuss intelligence with reporters, Congress should be alerted so that the intelligence committees can ensure that national secrets are not being used for political purposes.

According to court filings and media reports, the Vice President's chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby, acting on the direction and authorization of the President and Vice President, disclosed information in the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction to select journalists. This was not done to provide the American people with a fuller understanding of the pre-Iraq war intelligence; the Estimate was fully and publicly declassified shortly afterwards in a more appropriate manner. Rather, the selective declassification and leak was intended to stem a tide of bad press and discredit an administration critic through a subtle campaign of media manipulation.

According to the prosecutor in Mr. Libby's case, Libby provided information on Iraq's purchase of uranium from Niger to New York Times reporter Judith Miller. The Niger claim was not a "key judgment" of the NIE, meaning that it was not deemed by the intelligence community to be a priority. It was included in the body of the report "for completeness," according to the primary author. At the time, the Department of State's intelligence office found the Niger uranium claim to be "highly dubious," and the intelligence community downplayed the Niger connection afterwards:

The CIA had deleted a reference to Niger from the President's October 7, 2002 speech in Cincinnati;

Two senior intelligence officials had downplayed the assessment in testimony to the Senate Intelligence Committee;

The International Atomic Energy Agency had denounced the claim as being based on forged documents; and

The intelligence community had retracted the intelligence.

Let me say that again: the intelligence community had retracted this piece of intelligence. None of this additional information, apparently, was provided by Mr. Libby.

Had the Senate and House intelligence committees been informed of this declassification, as would be required by this legislation, Members could have corrected the public record.

I would hope that with this reporting requirement, administrations of both political parties will be deterred from improper use of intelligence.

In addition to stemming the politicization of intelligence, the bill I introduce today also notes the importance of keeping the full intelligence community informed of declassifications. If the President chooses, for whatever reason, to declassify information, the intelligence agency that had been responsible for those secrets has to take steps to protect intelligence sources and methods.

Similarly, the National Archives are to be informed upon a Presidential declassification so the Nation's records can be appropriately maintained. As has been highlighted again today with the release of the Archives audit over the reclassification of intelligence, the Archives play an important role in providing declassified intelligence to the public. To do so, it must be informed when information enters the public domain.

It should be made clear that there are more traditional procedures by which individual intelligence agencies declassify information on a regular basis, when the release of that information is seen as no longer damaging the national security. This is done thousands of times a week throughout the intelligence community.

It is important that the public have access to as much information on its government's activities as possible. To that end, I look forward, through this legislation and otherwise, to working with my colleagues and the executive branch to ensure that declassification is done as extensively and as quickly as possible without risking our national security.

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

S. 2660

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

SECTION 1. NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF CERTAIN DECLASSIFICATIONS OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION.

(a) NOTICE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN DECLASSIFICATIONS OF INTELLIGENCE

“SEC. 508. (a) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the declassification of any intelligence by the President, or Vice President if authorized by Executive Order or other delegation of authority from the President, the President shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees notice on the declassification of such intelligence.

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADDITIONAL NOTICE.—It is the sense of Congress that, in furtherance of the protection of intelligence sources and methods and to ensure appropriate handling and dissemination of intelligence, any notice submitted to the congressional intelligence committees under subsection (a) should also be submitted to—

“(1) the Director of National Intelligence;

“(2) the Archivist of the United States; and

“(3) the heads of applicable elements of the intelligence community.

“(c) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to the declassification of intelligence done as part of the mandatory or systematic declassification of information as described by section 3 of Executive Order No. 13292, of March 25, 2003, or any successor Executive Order.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for that Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 507 the following new item:

“Sec. 508. Notice to Congress on certain declassifications of intelligence.”.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN OFFICIALS AUTHORIZED TO DECLASSIFY INFORMATION.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report setting forth a current list of each official of the Executive Office of the President, other than the President, who is authorized to declassify information other than information originally classified by such official.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 15 days after adding or removing an official from the list required by paragraph (1), the President shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees an update of the list and a notice of the addition or removal of such official from the list.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 446—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROP SCIENCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 446

Whereas the Crop Science Society of America was founded in 1955, with Gerald O. Mott as its first President;

Whereas the Crop Science Society of America is one of the premier scientific societies in the world, as shown by its world-class journals, international and regional meetings, and development of a broad range of educational opportunities;

Whereas the science and scholarship of the Crop Science Society of America are mission-directed, with the goal of addressing agricultural challenges facing humanity;

Whereas the Crop Science Society of America significantly contributes to the scientific and technical knowledge necessary to protect and sustain natural resources on all land in the United States;

Whereas the Crop Science Society plays a key role internationally in developing sustainable agricultural management and biodiversity conservation for the protection and sound management of the crop resources of the world;

Whereas the mission of the Crop Science Society of America continues to expand, from the development of sustainable produc-

tion of food and forage, to the production of renewable energy and novel industrial products;

Whereas, in industry, extension, and basic research, the Crop Science Society of America has fostered a dedicated professional and scientific community that, in 2005, included more than 3,000 members; and

Whereas the American Society of Agronomy was the parent society that led to the formation of both the Crop Science Society of America and the Soil Science Society of America and fostered the development and the common overall management of the 3 sister societies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary year of the Crop Science Society of America;

(2) commends the Crop Science Society of America for 50 years of dedicated service to advancing the science and practice of crop science;

(3) acknowledges the promise of the Crop Science Society of America to continue enriching the lives of all citizens of the United States by improving stewardship of the environment, combating world hunger, and enhancing the quality of life for another 50 years and beyond; and

(4) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the Crop Science Society of America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 447—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN BADGERS MEN'S HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2006 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 447

Whereas, on April 8, 2006, the University of Wisconsin men's hockey team won the Frozen Four in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, by defeating—

(1) the University of Maine Black Bears by a score of 5-2 in the semifinals; and

(2) the Boston College Eagles by a score of 2-1 in the championship game;

Whereas Robbie Earl and Tom Gilbert each scored a goal and Brian Elliott had 22 saves in the championship game;

Whereas Adam Burish, Robbie Earl, Brian Elliott, and Tom Gilbert were named to the All-Tournament Team, and Robbie Earl was named the Most Outstanding Player of the tournament;

Whereas the success of the season depended on the hard work, dedication, and performance of every player on the University of Wisconsin men's hockey team, including—

(1) Andy Brandt;

(2) Adam Burish;

(3) Ross Carlson;

(4) Shane Connelly;

(5) A.J. Degenhardt;

(6) Jake Dowell;

(7) Davis Drewiske;

(8) Robbie Earl;

(9) Brian Elliott;

(10) Josh Engel;

(11) Matthew Ford;

(12) Tom Gilbert;

(13) Tom Gorowsky;

(14) Jeff Henderson;

(15) Ryan Jeffery;

(16) Andrew Joudrey;

(17) Kyle Klubertanz;