

Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2970, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide free credit monitoring and credit reports for veterans and others affected by the theft of veterans' personal data, to ensure that such persons are appropriately notified of such thefts, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 20, a concurrent resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and support for the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

S. CON. RES. 84

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 84, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a free trade agreement between the United States and Taiwan.

S. RES. 182

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 182, a resolution supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 224, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate supporting the establishment of September as Campus Fire Safety Month, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 405

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 405, a resolution designating August 16, 2006, as "National Airborne Day".

S. RES. 462

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 462, a resolution designating June 8, 2006, as the day of a National Vigil for Lost Promise.

S. RES. 485

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 485, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate concerning the value of family planning for American women.

AMENDMENT NO. 4045

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4045 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for

comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4071

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4071 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4083

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4083 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4114

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4114 proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4124

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4124 proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4127

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4127 proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4144

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4144 proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4167

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4167 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4175

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4175 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4178

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4178 intended to be proposed to S. 2611, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2994. A bill to provide for the mandatory revocation, in addition to the mandatory denial, of passports of individuals who have a certain level of child support arrearages; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to offer legislation that helps to prevent children from living in poverty and ensures that noncustodial parents pay child support, instead of fleeing off to hide from their responsibilities. I commend my fellow Kansas colleagues, Congressman JERRY MORAN and Congressman DENNIS MOORE, for introducing similar legislation in the House.

The problem is this: a noncustodial parent could potentially avoid paying their responsible share of child support by leaving the country. State child support enforcement agencies must certify cases to the State Department for passport denial if the child support debt is over \$5,000. The \$5,000 is slated to be reduced in October 2006 to \$2,500 in accordance with Public Law 109-171. The loophole that emerges is for those deadbeat parents who already have a passport. Under current implementation of the law, the next opportunity point of enforcement is at the renewal of the passport, which could be several years down the road. The legislation I offer today closes that loophole, and simply instructs the State Department to revoke, in addition to denying, a noncustodial parent's passport once the individual's child support debt exceeds the amount set in law.

Studies show that the receipt of child support is a key factor that keeps a child and single parent family from living in or near poverty. Beyond that financial security that steady child support provides, there is a greater likelihood that the noncustodial parent is personally involved in their child's life. If a parent shows responsibility financially, there is a bigger chance that he or she is involved emotionally. The impact of a noncustodial parent's involvement in his child's life, in many cases, results in better grades and fewer behavioral problems.

In Kansas alone, there are currently 131,000 child support cases open, including those receiving public assistance, and those above that income bracket. Last year, the Kansas Child Support Enforcement program collected \$156 million in child support. However, that number represents only 54 percent of all payments owed to children. Unfortunately, that missing 46 percent of child support overdue averages out to

just over \$7,000 per child. That is quite a loss for a single-parent's household budget to absorb.

Now, you might ask: What percentage of the population will this help? I would concede that, although this may not impact a high percentage of those children and families receiving child support, the impact on an individual family is very significant. According to my State's limited records on this issue, approximately 50 passport applications and renewals are denied on a yearly basis. That figure does not include those passports that should be revoked. Coupled with the upcoming reduction in allowable debt, the Kansas Child Support Enforcement Program estimates that the number of deadbeat parents affected would increase to 250. The security afforded by the steady stream of child support could be the lone determinant of a family living in poverty or existing on adequate financial ground.

I encourage my colleagues to add their support to this important fix. We must ensure that the tools provided to the States have the teeth necessary to discourage deadbeat parents from running out on their financial responsibilities.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 2999. A bill to improve protections for children and to hold States accountable for the safe and timely placement of children across State lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DEWINE. Today I join with my colleagues Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator DOMENICI to introduce the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006. I am proud to have had the opportunity to again work with my friend, Senator ROCKEFELLER, on the important issues affecting the most vulnerable and at risk children—children in foster care. This is an important bill and I hope we will be able to pass swiftly.

In 1997, I worked on the Adoption and Safe Families Act, an important bill that worked to provide timelier placement of children in foster care. Since that time, it has been successful. Dramatically more children are being adopted. Children are spending less time languishing in foster care and have greater opportunities to find a permanent home or family. However, there are barriers that remain for children in foster care—particularly for children who are placed across state lines for various reasons—including trying to place them with family members or if a family in another state is looking to adopt that child. These children are shown to continue to remain in foster care for much longer periods of time. Through no fault of their own—they wait for placement and wait for a permanency in their lives that children long for and deserve.

I also want to thank the work that the States have done to alleviate the

problems we currently find in interstate placement. This has been a problem for many years, but recently States have been active in creating and promulgating guidelines for dealing with complications that can arise related to interstate placement. I hope that we can see these guidelines soon implemented. The primary power to move these children to homes rests with the States, and we want to encourage their quick action.

This bill will require and support States in the expeditious study of homes for children in foster care who may be placed or adopted across State lines. This bill would allow a 60-day period for such study to occur—while 2 months is a long time in the life of a child, we feel that it is an appropriate balance between the needs of the State and child welfare agencies to conduct thorough assessments and the needs of the child to be in a more permanent home.

This bill also expresses the sense of the Congress that States should accept the home study evaluations done by another State. This would go a long way to reduce time waiting for placement and redundancy of effort in the child welfare system.

Importantly, this bill is not just another mandate on States. This bill would provide resources to enhance and speed up their systems for interstate placement—but States do have to earn it. If passed, it would provide \$1,500 per child who was placed within a 30-day period. States can use this money to improve their systems for placement, hire more staff to conduct placement, or otherwise use it for improvement of services for foster children in their State.

This bill will also improve the rights of children and their foster, pre-adoptive parents, or family caregivers to be heard in court proceedings concerning their case within the child welfare system. It is important that a child's needs are appropriately represented and this bill will work to ensure that the parties most involved in the child's life are present when important matters are being considered. Courts will also be required to work more closely with their counterparts in other States when the situation warrants. The judges who work with the child welfare system hold so much power in so many children's lives. We must continue to encourage their cooperation with outside stakeholders, including child welfare systems and court systems in other States, to quickly move these children to permanent homes. There is no excuse for a child to languish in a system for months and sometimes years of their lives due to court inaction or delay.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for their work and support of these efforts. I am confident that we can work together to quickly pass this legislation and put it to work for our Nation's children.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Today, I rise to join my colleagues Senators DEWINE

and DOMENICI to introduce the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006. This is a bipartisan initiative that I have been working on for several years.

This legislation could help to deliver on the promises made in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 which stated that geographic barriers should not delay or deny adoptions. Unfortunately, data continues to suggest that it can take twice as long for a child to leave foster care to an out-of-state placement. When a child leaves foster care and goes out of state, half of the time the child is being adopted and gaining a permanent home. In about twenty percent of the cases, a child is being placed with a parent or caretaker. These are good, permanent options for children, and it should not take twice as long to achieve such a placement.

This new legislation could provide incentives for States to process these out-of-state claims more quickly. In my view, this complements and builds upon actions by many States to update the 1960 Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children. The purpose of this legislation is to add specific timeframes and to provide federal incentives to achieve the goal set in 1997 of reducing and eliminating geographic barriers.

As technology has vastly improved, and more families seek to open their hearts and homes to children in foster care, we need improved regulations and policies to serve such families. This legislation is part of the DeWine-Rockefeller bill, called the "We Care Kids Act". Thanks to the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY, the major provisions of We Care Kids Act were included in the reconciliation package to invest in court training and data to help judges have insight and the information needed to care for the vulnerable children in foster care. But action could not be taken to improve interstate case planning within the reconciliation bill. In 2004, similar legislation passed the House of Representatives. Today, we are re-introducing the legislation for timely placements of children across state lines. Hopefully the Senate will act, and we can help children in foster care get a permanent home in a timely manner.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3000. A bill to grant rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over certain Native allotments in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which will resolve an ongoing dispute in our State concerning rights of way in the Copper River Valley region.

In 1906, Congress passed the Alaska Native Allotment Act, which allowed Alaska Natives to each claim up to 160 acres of land. Between 1906 and 1970, Alaska Natives filed allotment applications. The majority of these were filed

in the late 1960s. In 1971, Congress repealed the Alaska Native Allotment Act as part of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Congress then resolved all outstanding land claims by approving pending applications in the 1980 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. This approval was subject to valid existing rights.

When it settled the outstanding land claims in our State, Congress unintentionally created an issue which is now the subject of several lawsuits. In the 1950s and 1960s, the Federal Government and the State of Alaska granted rights of way to the Copper Valley Electric Association to run power lines across areas in our State which were later claimed by Alaska Natives. These rights were conveyed before Alaska Native allotment claims had been filed and processed.

Since outstanding land claims were approved through ANILCA in 1980, several Native allottees have come forward and claimed the Copper Valley Electric Association is trespassing on their lands. In 1987, the Interior Board of Land Appeals affirmed this position, finding Native allottees have priority over other competing uses of land—in this case, those of the utility company—regardless of the fact that the rights of way were granted prior to the conveyance of the property in question to the allottees. This situation is still unresolved and has resulted in years of litigation.

We have been unable to settle these disputes through existing remedies. These conflicts now jeopardize existing transportation and utility corridors. This issue threatens future infrastructure development in the region.

At my request, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, reviewed this situation. The GAO issued its report and recommended solutions. This bill incorporates the GAO's recommendation. It compensates the owners of the Native allotments, while ensuring that the utility companies are able to provide residents with the infrastructure and services they need. I believe this is the most equitable solution available, and I urge the Senate to pass this bill.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3001. A bill to ensure that all electronic surveillance of United States persons for foreign intelligence purposes is conducted pursuant to individualized court-issued orders, to streamline the procedures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to introduce the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Improvement and Enhancement Act of 2006.

First, I would like to thank Senator FEINSTEIN and her staff for their work on what I believe is an excellent and much needed proposal.

No one disputes that preserving our homeland must be our first priority.

Without that, every other goal falls away. And no one can dispute that the enemy we face today is an enemy beyond negotiation. It is an enemy that believes it is on a mission from God to establish a worldwide theocracy and destroy all those who preach tolerance of other ideas. It is an enemy that regards mercy as a moral failing, and proudly plays videotapes of its followers beheading innocent civilians.

At the same time, no one disputes that we must, in fighting to preserve America, ensure that we protect what is uniquely American—our way of life, our principles, and our belief in liberty. Throughout our history, we have balanced the need to protect our Nation with the need to preserve our freedom.

No one disputes that we must continue to achieve both of these ends. The question is how to do so.

I believe that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Improvement and Enhancement Act goes a long way to answering this question. It is a responsible bill that establishes a workable framework for the future.

This bill eliminates some artificial and outdated constraints in FISA:

It grants the executive branch 7 days, instead of 3 days, for seeking an emergency order—a change that the FISA judges who testified before the Judiciary Committee advocated; it cuts through redtape by confirming that applications for FISA orders may be made by delegates of the Attorney General, such as the Deputy Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General of the National Security; it creates new emergency provisions, allowing extended periods of surveillance in the event our Nation is once again attacked; and it allocates additional personnel to DOJ to prepare applications for FISA orders in a prompt and timely manner.

This bill also ensures that our civil liberties are protected by strengthening oversight of the executive branch:

It eliminates the current ambiguity in FISA and the National Security Act of 1947, and makes it clear the executive branch must inform all members of the Senate and House Intelligence Committees on all electronic surveillance programs; it requires the executive branch to submit an additional report to the congressional Intelligence Committees listing any recommendations for legislative or administrative improvements in FISA, so that we in Congress can update FISA as needed; it establishes rigorous reporting requirements for the exercise of emergency surveillance powers; and it establishes a document management system to ensure that information concerning electronic surveillance programs is readily available for review by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and Congress, to allow for short term decisions and long-term accountability.

I do have one concern over the bill, a concern over constitutionality. The bill states that the only way the Presi-

dent may carry out electronic surveillance is through the procedures outlined in FISA or the Federal Criminal Code. During the four hearings I held in the Senate Judiciary Committee, numerous scholars and five FISA judges called this provision into question. They testified that the President has certain inherent powers that we in Congress cannot take away. They explained that to the extent a bill purports to override the President's inherent powers, and tell the President that he may not use them, the bill might be unconstitutional.

I think this is precisely the type of complex and weighty concern that we should work out in the Judiciary Committee, through study, analysis, and discussion. And I look forward to having those discussions with Senator FEINSTEIN and the other members of the committee.

I urge my colleagues to support the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Improvement and Enhancement Act of 2006.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CHAFEE):

S.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, the senior Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, and Senator CHAFEE in introducing this joint resolution, which would affirm the Senate's commitment to recognize the International Emergency Management Assistance Compact, IEMAC. The purpose of IEMAC is to provide mutual assistance among the States of the Northeastern United States and the Provinces of eastern Canada for responding to any type of disaster, whether arising from natural or man-made causes.

A number of recent disasters and emergencies have necessitated mutual aid and assistance among the Northeastern States and eastern Canadian Provinces. For example, both the January 1998 ice storm and the August 2003 blackout left millions of people without electrical power, knocked out public water supplies and other essential services, and caused billions of dollars in property damage or business losses. In the past quarter century alone, there have been more than 100 presidentially declared disasters and emergencies in the Northeast, or, on average, about four per year. Many of these events required State and Provincial emergency management organizations to request out-of-jurisdiction mutual assistance to deal with the emergency.

The importance of mutual assistance was made clear by Hurricane Katrina, in which 44 States and the District of

Columbia received presidential emergency declarations. This was the largest number of declarations ever made for a single disaster in FEMA history. Most of these declarations were not the result of States receiving direct damage from the storm but rather because they reached out to assist the devastated States through the nationwide Emergency Management Assistance Compact, EMAC, sending personnel, equipment and supplies into the stricken areas. In addition, numerous host States opened shelters to assist hurricane evacuees.

The genesis of IEMAC was the 1998 ice storm. The worst ice storm in our region's history demolished power lines from Quebec, through upstate New York, across Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine. As many as 4 million people were without electricity, some 700,000 people for as long as 3 weeks, and damage topped \$6 billion.

The following June, the New England Governors Conference and Eastern Canadian Premiers signed Resolution No. 23-5 to adopt an International Emergency Management Assistance Agreement. The resulting memorandum of understanding was adopted by the conference in July 2000. In October of 2004, the memorandum of understanding was the renamed International Emergency Management Assistance Compact. The Governors and Premiers established the International Emergency-Management Group, IEMG, to implement the compact and to work closely developing plans to train and exercise for disasters and emergencies that could affect the Northeastern States and Provinces. The Management Group meets regularly and has recently developed a draft operational manual to fully implement the compact, which is slated to be approved at the IEMG meeting in Quebec this month.

The members of the compact are the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and the Provinces of Québec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland. Other States and Provinces may join the compact in the future.

IEMAC provides form and structure to international mutual aid between the Northeastern States and eastern Canadian Provinces. It addresses such issues as liability, payment, and credentialing before the emergency occurs, which allows for expedited deployment of resources and personnel in time of emergency. Working out the myriad legal and technical details in advance is especially important when resources and personnel must cross international boundaries.

The value of the compact already has been demonstrated. When Hurricane Juan slammed into Nova Scotia in late September of 2003, partners in the existing memorandum of understanding provided quick and substantial aid to the stricken province. When Nova Scotia, still recovering from the hurricane, was hit again just a few months later

by "White Juan," a powerful blizzard, effective mutual aid again alleviated the suffering.

The compact was formed in the aftermath of a powerful ice storm, but the terrorist attacks of 9/11 amplified its importance. The Northeastern United States and eastern Canada are home to major population centers, vast industrial facilities, major cargo ports, and nuclear power plants—all potential terrorist targets. In the event of an attack, tighter border security would be both inevitable and necessary, and the prearrangements made through the compact would be invaluable.

The role of the compact is ever expanding. There are a multitude of threats facing the Northeast States and eastern Canadian Provinces today, and the close working relationship of the member jurisdictions fosters a cooperative environment and creates a strong partnership. These strong bonds contribute to the goals of a more secure region and an effective response capability when a disaster or emergency does occur.

As has been seen numerous times in the past, disasters know no boundaries—municipal, State, provincial or international. I ask you to join me in adopting the International Emergency Management Assistance Compact so that in a time of disaster the boundaries that separate jurisdictions are not barriers to cooperation.

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

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

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT.

Congress consents to the International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut and the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. The compact is substantially as follows:

"Article I—International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding Purpose and Authorities

"The International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding, hereinafter referred to as the 'compact,' is made and entered into by and among such of the jurisdictions as shall enact or adopt this compact, hereinafter referred to as 'party jurisdictions.' For the purposes of this agreement, the term 'jurisdictions' may include any or all of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut and the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and such other states and provinces as may hereafter become a party to this compact.

"The purpose of this compact is to provide for the possibility of mutual assistance among the jurisdictions entering into this compact in managing any emergency or disaster when the affected jurisdiction or juris-

dictions ask for assistance, whether arising from natural disaster, technological hazard, manmade disaster or civil emergency aspects of resources shortages.

"This compact also provides for the process of planning mechanisms among the agencies responsible and for mutual cooperation, including, if need be, emergency-related exercises, testing, or other training activities using equipment and personnel simulating performance of any aspect of the giving and receiving of aid by party jurisdictions or subdivisions of party jurisdictions during emergencies, with such actions occurring outside actual declared emergency periods. Mutual assistance in this compact may include the use of emergency forces by mutual agreement among party jurisdictions.

"Article II—General Implementation

"Each party jurisdiction entering into this compact recognizes that many emergencies may exceed the capabilities of a party jurisdiction and that intergovernmental cooperation is essential in such circumstances. Each jurisdiction further recognizes that there will be emergencies that may require immediate access and present procedures to apply outside resources to make a prompt and effective response to such an emergency because few, if any, individual jurisdictions have all the resources they need in all types of emergencies or the capability of delivering resources to areas where emergencies exist.

"The prompt, full, and effective utilization of resources of the participating jurisdictions, including any resources on hand or available from any other source that are essential to the safety, care, and welfare of the people in the event of any emergency or disaster, shall be the underlying principle on which all articles of this compact are understood.

"On behalf of the party jurisdictions participating in the compact, the legally designated official who is assigned responsibility for emergency management is responsible for formulation of the appropriate inter-jurisdictional mutual aid plans and procedures necessary to implement this compact, and for recommendations to the jurisdiction concerned with respect to the amendment of any statutes, regulations, or ordinances required for that purpose.

"Article III—Party Jurisdiction Responsibilities

"(a) FORMULATE PLANS AND PROGRAMS.—It is the responsibility of each party jurisdiction to formulate procedural plans and programs for inter-jurisdictional cooperation in the performance of the responsibilities listed in this section. In formulating and implementing such plans and programs the party jurisdictions, to the extent practical, shall—

"(1) review individual jurisdiction hazards analyses that are available and, to the extent reasonably possible, determine all those potential emergencies the party jurisdictions might jointly suffer, whether due to natural disaster, technological hazard, manmade disaster or emergency aspects of resource shortages;

"(2) initiate a process to review party jurisdictions' individual emergency plans and develop a plan that will determine the mechanism for the inter-jurisdictional cooperation;

"(3) develop inter-jurisdictional procedures to fill any identified gaps and to resolve any identified inconsistencies or overlaps in existing or developed plans;

"(4) assist in warning communities adjacent to or crossing jurisdictional boundaries;

"(5) protect and ensure delivery of services, medicines, water, food, energy and fuel, search and rescue, and critical lifeline equipment, services and resources, both human

and material to the extent authorized by law;

“(6) inventory and agree upon procedures for the inter-jurisdictional loan and delivery of human and material resources, together with procedures for reimbursement or forgiveness; and

“(7) provide, to the extent authorized by law, for temporary suspension of any statutes or ordinances, over which the province or state has jurisdiction, that impede the implementation of the responsibilities described in this subsection.

“(b) **REQUEST ASSISTANCE.**—The authorized representative of a party jurisdiction may request assistance of another party jurisdiction by contacting the authorized representative of that jurisdiction. These provisions only apply to requests for assistance made by and to authorized representatives. Requests may be verbal or in writing. If verbal, the request must be confirmed in writing within 15 days of the verbal request. Requests must provide the following information:

“(1) A description of the emergency service function for which assistance is needed and of the mission or missions, including but not limited to fire services, emergency medical, transportation, communications, public works and engineering, building inspection, planning and information assistance, mass care, resource support, health and medical services, and search and rescue.

“(2) The amount and type of personnel, equipment, materials, and supplies needed and a reasonable estimate of the length of time they will be needed.

“(3) The specific place and time for staging of the assisting party's response and a point of contact at the location.

“(c) **CONSULTATION AMONG PARTY JURISDICTION OFFICIALS.**—There shall be frequent consultation among the party jurisdiction officials who have assigned emergency management responsibilities, such officials collectively known hereinafter as the International Emergency Management Group, and other appropriate representatives of the party jurisdictions with free exchange of information, plans, and resource records relating to emergency capabilities to the extent authorized by law.

“Article IV—Limitation

“Any party jurisdiction requested to render mutual aid or conduct exercises and training for mutual aid shall undertake to respond as soon as possible, except that it is understood that the jurisdiction rendering aid may withhold or recall resources to the extent necessary to provide reasonable protection for that jurisdiction. Each party jurisdiction shall afford to the personnel of the emergency forces of any party jurisdiction, while operating within its jurisdictional limits under the terms and conditions of this compact and under the operational control of an officer of the requesting party, the same powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as are afforded similar or like forces of the jurisdiction in which they are performing emergency services. Emergency forces continue under the command and control of their regular leaders, but the organizational units come under the operational control of the emergency services authorities of the jurisdiction receiving assistance. These conditions may be activated, as needed, by the jurisdiction that is to receive assistance or upon commencement of exercises or training for mutual aid and continue as long as the exercises or training for mutual aid are in progress, the emergency or disaster remains in effect or loaned resources remain in the receiving jurisdiction or jurisdictions, whichever is longer. The receiving jurisdiction is responsible for informing the

assisting jurisdictions of the specific moment when services will no longer be required.

“Article V—Licenses and Permits

“Whenever a person holds a license, certificate, or other permit issued by any jurisdiction party to the compact evidencing the meeting of qualifications for professional, mechanical, or other skills, and when such assistance is requested by the receiving party jurisdiction, such person is deemed to be licensed, certified, or permitted by the jurisdiction requesting assistance to render aid involving such skill to meet an emergency or disaster, subject to such limitations and conditions as the requesting jurisdiction prescribes by Executive order or otherwise.

“Article VI—Liability

“Any person or entity of a party jurisdiction rendering aid in another jurisdiction pursuant to this compact are considered agents of the requesting jurisdiction for tort liability and immunity purposes. Any person or entity rendering aid in another jurisdiction pursuant to this compact are not liable on account of any act or omission in good faith on the part of such forces while so engaged or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith. Good faith in this article does not include willful misconduct, gross negligence, or recklessness.

“Article VII—Supplementary Agreements

“Because it is probable that the pattern and detail of the machinery for mutual aid among 2 or more jurisdictions may differ from that among the jurisdictions that are party to this compact, this compact contains elements of a broad base common to all jurisdictions, and nothing in this compact precludes any jurisdiction from entering into supplementary agreements with another jurisdiction or affects any other agreements already in force among jurisdictions. Supplementary agreements may include, but are not limited to, provisions for evacuation and reception of injured and other persons and the exchange of medical, fire, public utility, reconnaissance, welfare, transportation and communications personnel, equipment, and supplies.

“Article VIII—Workers' Compensation and Death Benefits

“Each party jurisdiction shall provide, in accordance with its own laws, for the payment of workers' compensation and death benefits to injured members of the emergency forces of that jurisdiction and to representatives of deceased members of those forces if the members sustain injuries or are killed while rendering aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within their own jurisdiction.

“Article IX—Reimbursement

“Any party jurisdiction rendering aid in another jurisdiction pursuant to this compact shall, if requested, be reimbursed by the party jurisdiction receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in, the operation of any equipment and the provision of any service in answering a request for aid and for the costs incurred in connection with those requests. An aiding party jurisdiction may assume in whole or in part any such loss, damage, expense, or other cost or may loan such equipment or donate such services to the receiving party jurisdiction without charge or cost. Any 2 or more party jurisdictions may enter into supplementary agreements establishing a different allocation of costs among those jurisdictions. Expenses under article VIII are not reimbursable under this section.

“Article X—Evacuation

“Each party jurisdiction shall initiate a process to prepare and maintain plans to fa-

cilitate the movement of and reception of evacuees into its territory or across its territory, according to its capabilities and powers. The party jurisdiction from which the evacuees came shall assume the ultimate responsibility for the support of the evacuees, and after the termination of the emergency or disaster, for the repatriation of such evacuees.

“Article XI—Implementation

“(a) This compact is effective upon its execution or adoption by any 2 jurisdictions, and is effective as to any other jurisdiction upon its execution or adoption thereby: subject to approval or authorization by the United States Congress, if required, and subject to enactment of provincial or State legislation that may be required for the effectiveness of the Memorandum of Understanding.

“(b) Any party jurisdiction may withdraw from this compact, but the withdrawal does not take effect until 30 days after the governor or premier of the withdrawing jurisdiction has given notice in writing of such withdrawal to the governors or premiers of all other party jurisdictions. The action does not relieve the withdrawing jurisdiction from obligations assumed under this compact prior to the effective date of withdrawal.

“(c) Duly authenticated copies of this compact in the French and English languages and of such supplementary agreements as may be entered into shall, at the time of their approval, be deposited with each of the party jurisdictions.

“Article XII—Severability

“This compact is construed to effectuate the purposes stated in Article I. If any provision of this compact is declared unconstitutional or the applicability of the compact to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability of the compact to other persons and circumstances are not affected.

“Article XIII—Consistency of Language

“The validity of the arrangements and agreements consented to in this compact shall not be affected by any insubstantial difference in form or language as may be adopted by the various states and provinces.

“Article XIV—Amendment

“This compact may be amended by agreement of the party jurisdictions.”.

SEC. 2. INCONSISTENCY OF LANGUAGE.

The validity of the arrangements consented to by this Act shall not be affected by any insubstantial difference in their form or language as adopted by the States and provinces.

SEC. 3. RIGHT TO ALTER, AMEND, OR REPEAL.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 491—RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF IGNACY JAN PADEREWSKI AS A MUSICIAN, COMPOSER, STATESMAN, AND PHILANTHROPIST, AND COMMEMORATING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH ON JUNE 29, 1941

Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 491

Whereas Ignacy Jan Paderewski, born in Poland in 1860, was a brilliant and popular