

compliance with basic standards for all-terrain vehicles in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1843

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1843, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify that an unlawful practice occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes.

S. 1851

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1851, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow personal exemptions under the individual alternative minimum tax, and for other purposes.

S. 1855

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1855, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide relief to individuals from the penalty for failure to pay estimated taxes on amounts attributable to the alternative minimum tax in cases where the taxpayer was not subject to the alternative minimum tax in the preceding year.

S. 1881

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1881, a bill to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to restore the intent and protections of that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1894

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1894, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide family and medical leave to primary caregivers of servicemembers with combat-related injuries.

S. RES. 276

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 276, a resolution calling for the urgent deployment of a robust and effective multinational peacekeeping mission with sufficient size, resources, leadership, and mandate to protect civilians in Darfur, Sudan, and for efforts to strengthen the renewal of a just and inclusive peace process.

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 276, supra.

S. RES. 278

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 278, a resolution expressing the

sense of the Senate regarding the announcement of the Russian Federation of its suspension of implementation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty.

S. RES. 281

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 281, a resolution congratulating Cal Ripken Jr. for his induction into the Baseball Hall of Fame, for an outstanding career as an athlete, and for his contributions to baseball and to his community.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1895. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce with my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, the Prescribe A Book Act.

Our legislation amends the No Child Left Behind Act to create a federal pediatric early literacy grant initiative based on the long-standing, successful Reach Out and Read program. The program would award grants to highly qualified nonprofit entities to train doctors and nurses in advising parents about the importance of reading aloud and to give books to children at pediatric check-ups from 6 months to five years of age, with a priority for children from low-income families. It builds on the relationship between parents and medical providers and helps families and communities encourage early literacy skills so children enter school prepared for success in reading.

The Reach Out and Read model has consistently demonstrated effectiveness in increasing parent involvement and boosting children's reading proficiency. Research published in peer-reviewed, scientific journals has found that parents who have participated in the program are significantly more likely to read to their children and include more children's books in their home, and that children served by the program show an increase of 4-8 points on vocabulary tests. I have seen up close the positive impact of this program on children and their families when visiting a number of the 40 Rhode Island Reach Out and Read sites.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Prescribe A Book Act and work for its inclusion in the upcoming reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act.

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

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

S. 1895

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 "Prescribe A Book Act".

SEC. 2. PEDIATRIC INVOLVEMENT IN READING AND EDUCATION.

Part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6361 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 5—Pediatric Early Literacy Program

"SEC. 1261. DEFINITIONS.

"In this subpart:

"(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means a nonprofit organization that has, as determined by the Secretary, demonstrated effectiveness in the following areas:

"(A) Providing peer-to-peer training to healthcare providers in research-based methods of literacy promotion as part of routine pediatric health supervision visits.

"(B) Delivering a training curriculum through a variety of medical education settings, including residency training, continuing medical education, and national pediatric conferences.

"(C) Providing technical assistance to local healthcare facilities to effectively implement a high-quality Pediatric Early Literacy Program.

"(D) Offering opportunities for local healthcare facilities to obtain books at significant discounts, as described in section 1266.

"(E) Integrating the latest developmental and educational research into the training curriculum for healthcare providers described in subparagraph (B).

"(2) PEDIATRIC EARLY LITERACY PROGRAM.—The term 'Pediatric Early Literacy Program' means a program that—

"(A) creates and implements a 3-part model through which—

"(i) healthcare providers, doctors, and nurses, trained in research-based methods of early language and literacy promotion, encourage parents to read aloud to their young children, and offer developmentally appropriate recommendations and strategies to parents for the purpose of reading aloud to their children;

"(ii) healthcare providers, at health supervision visits, provide each child between the ages of 6 months and 5 years a new, developmentally appropriate children's book to take home and keep; and

"(iii) volunteers in waiting areas of healthcare facilities read aloud to children, modeling for parents the techniques and pleasures of sharing books together;

"(B) demonstrates, through research published in peer-reviewed journals, effectiveness in positively altering parent behavior regarding reading aloud to children, and improving expressive and receptive language in young children; and

"(C) receives the endorsement of nationally-recognized medical associations and academies.

"SEC. 1262. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"The Secretary is authorized to award grants to eligible entities under this subpart to enable the eligible entities to implement Pediatric Early Literacy Programs.

"SEC. 1263. APPLICATION.

"An eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this subpart shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and including such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"SEC. 1264. MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

"An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subpart shall provide either directly or through private contributions, in cash or in-kind, non-Federal matching funds equal to not less than 50 percent of the grant received by the eligible entity under this subpart.

SEC. 1265. USE OF GRANT FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subpart shall—

“(1) enter into contracts with private non-profit organizations, or with public agencies, selected based on the criteria described in subsection (b), under which each contractor will agree to establish and operate a Pediatric Early Literacy Program;

“(2) provide such training and technical assistance to each contractor of the eligible entity as may be necessary to carry out this subpart; and

“(3) include such other terms and conditions in an agreement with a contractor as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to ensure the effectiveness of such programs.

“(b) CONTRACTOR CRITERIA.—Contractors shall be selected under subsection (a)(1) on the basis of the extent to which the contractors give priority to serving a substantial number or percentage of at-risk children, including—

“(1) low-income children (defined in this section as children from families with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty line), particularly low-income children in high-poverty areas;

“(2) children without adequate medical insurance;

“(3) children enrolled in a State Medicaid program, established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or in the State Children’s Health Insurance Program established under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.);

“(4) children living in rural areas;

“(5) migrant children; and

“(6) children with limited access to libraries.

SEC. 1266. RESTRICTION ON PAYMENTS.

“The Secretary shall make no payment to eligible entities under this subpart unless the Secretary determines that the eligible entity or a contractor of the eligible entity, as the case may be, has made arrangements with book publishers or distributors to obtain books at discounts that are at least as favorable as discounts that are customarily given by such publisher or distributor for book purchases made under similar circumstances in the absence of Federal assistance.

SEC. 1267. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

“An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subpart shall report annually to the Secretary on the effectiveness of the program implemented by the eligible entity and the programs instituted by each contractor of the eligible entity, and shall include in the report a description of each program.

SEC. 1268. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subpart—

“(1) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

“(2) \$16,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(3) \$17,000,000 for fiscal year 2011;

“(4) \$18,000,000 for fiscal year 2012; and

“(5) \$19,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.”

By Mr. SUNUNU (for himself and Mr. GREGG):

S. 1896. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Central Street in Hillsborough, New Hampshire, as the “Officer Jeremy Todd Charron Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I rise to honor a fallen officer of the Epsom, NH, Police Department, Officer Jeremy Todd Charron, by introducing a bill to designate the United States Postal

Service facility at 11 Central Street in Hillsborough, New Hampshire, as the Officer Jeremy Todd Charron Post Office.

Born on March 18, 1973, Officer Charron was the third of five children to Bob and Fran Charron. Originally from Pittsfield, NH, Jeremy and his family moved to Hillsborough in 1977. Throughout his early life, Jeremy grew intensely goal orientated, a trait that persisted throughout his shortened life, and by the time he had reached second grade he knew his calling was to one day serve as a U.S. Marine.

Although he was an outstanding athlete in many sports, he excelled at playing defense on the soccer field. The same tenacity that Jeremy used on the soccer field, he carried with him off the field. One poignant example of Jeremy’s developing leadership occurred as a friend lost his hair from cancer treatments and was teased by fellow classmates. While it may have been easier for most students to ignore the taunting of other classmates, Jeremy actively defended his friend. Throughout Jeremy’s life, he stood up for what he thought was right and protected those who could not defend themselves.

During Jeremy’s high school years at Hillsborough-Deering High School, he grew into a leader, quickly becoming active in all aspects of the school community. His peers voted him “most spirited” and elected him class president. At the same time, he had convinced 8 classmates to join the Marines with him following graduation. Together, they would dedicate their weekends to training for their future service in the Marine Corps.

After graduating high school in 1992, Jeremy entered the Marine Corps and proudly served his country for 4 years. As his enlistment term drew to a close, he had a new aspiration, which was to become a New Hampshire State Trooper, and looked forward to starting a family.

To achieve this objective, Jeremy enrolled at the New Hampshire Technical College in Concord to study Criminal Justice, and was hired by the Epsom, New Hampshire Police Department as a part-time and then full-time police officer.

Sadly, Jeremy’s dream was cut short. On August 24, 1997, the morning after he attended the funerals of New Hampshire State Troopers Leslie Lord and Scott Phillips, Officer Charron was responding to a report of a suspicious car, which contained two men. Tragically, while Officer Charron questioned one of the men, the individual pulled out a gun and opened fire. Although Jeremy was wearing a bullet-proof vest, one of the bullets struck him in an unprotected area. Despite his fatal wounds, Jeremy heroically returned fire until he collapsed, forcing his two killers to abandon their car and steal a near-by truck that could be identified by police, eventually leading to their capture.

Had Jeremy’s dreams not been cut short at the age of 24, he would have achieved his goals of becoming a State Trooper and having a family of his own. Jeremy’s murderers stripped our Nation, the State of New Hampshire and the community of a true patriot, citizen, and role model, as well as a loving friend and family member.

Ten years have gone by since Jeremy’s passing and a new generation of 7 nieces and nephews know Jeremy’s stories. People of Hillsborough, NH, still have stories to share and lessons to learn from their very own American hero. As the years move forward, the citizens and future generations of Hillsborough will always remember Jeremy and share anecdotes about his life when they visit the Officer Jeremy Todd Charron Post Office Building.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BROWN)):

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to expand family and medical for spouses, sons, daughters, and parents of servicemembers with combat-related injuries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Military and Family Medical Leave Act, bipartisan legislation that extends the Family and Medical Leave Act, FMLA, for up to 6 months for children, spouses and parents of soldiers who have been injured in combat. This legislation implements a key recommendation made last week by the Commission on Care for America’s Returning Wounded Warriors. I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues Senators DOLE, MIKULSKI, GRAHAM, KENNEDY and BROWN whose partnership on this legislation reflects the fact that supporting our families and service-members is a bipartisan, common sense issue.

The families of our servicemen and women face extraordinary demands as they struggle to care for loved ones injured in service to our Nation. Yet, currently, family members of these injured servicemembers receive no additional leave to accommodate the support they need.

The Commission on Care for America’s Returning Wounded Warriors was established in March 2007 with the specific goals of conducting a comprehensive review of services the Government currently provides to our wounded warriors and delivering recommendations to the President, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

In its review, the commission found that 33 percent of active duty, 22 percent of reserve component, and 37 percent of retired/separated servicemembers report that a family member or close friend relocated for extended periods of time to be with them while

they were in the hospital. In addition, 21 percent of active duty, 15 percent of reserve component, and 24 percent of retired/separated servicemembers say friends or family gave up a job to be with them or act as their caregiver.

To address this situation and help support these caregivers, the commission recommended strengthening family support programs by extending the FMLA for up to 6 months for the family members of seriously injured soldiers. This is a step we can make immediately that will make a real difference. Our men and women in uniform have made tremendous sacrifices on our behalf and we have a responsibility to do everything we can to make sure they have the care and support they need.

The Military Family and Medical Leave Act will enact this recommendation by amending the FMLA to allow up to 6 months leave for a family member of a servicemember who has a combat-related injury and meets the eligibility requirements in the law.

It is my hope that my colleagues will join Senators DOLE, MIKULSKI, GRAHAM, KENNEDY, BROWN and me in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1899. A bill to require every American to have health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to explain a bill I am filing today that will establish universal health coverage called Universal Health Coverage Act. Let me tell you why I am introducing this bill.

Our health care system provides the highest quality health care in the world if you are fortunate to get access to it. People come from all over the world to come to our great academic centers to get their health care needs met and to train their health care professionals.

In my home State of Maryland, I am very proud of the University of Maryland Medical Center and Johns Hopkins University. We have great institutions, such as the National Institutes of Health, that provide top-quality health care.

The problem is too many people cannot get access to affordable quality health care in America. We have 46 million uninsured; 9 million are children. We spend more money than any other country by far on health care, and yet our health care results do not reflect that type of investment of our public funds.

The No. 1 problem in health care in America today is the number of uninsured. We need to do something about it. The Universal Health Coverage Act does exactly that. It says every person in this country must have health insurance.

We are paying for the people who do not have health insurance. Those of us who have health coverage are paying more for our doctors and hospitals. We pay more in taxes because people have

no health insurance. The reason is they have delayed diagnosis and treatment that leads to more serious illness and treatment for those who have no health insurance.

We all pay the price with higher premiums and cost. According to the Institute of Medicine, taxpayers shoulder 65 percent of the total cost of uncompensated care through subsidies to hospitals and clinics. The same study showed that poor health care status from being uninsured costs our Nation between \$65 billion and \$130 billion a year. It is in our interest as those who have health insurance and as taxpayers that we have universal health coverage in America.

Why does it cost more for someone who has no health insurance? With two people with the same types of conditions, it can actually cost our system more for those who have no health insurance because they do not seek preventative health care. Fewer than one-half of uninsured women ages 50 to 64 have received a mammogram in the past 2 years compared to 75 percent of women with insurance. Only 18 percent of uninsured adults over the age of 50 have had colon cancer screenings in the last 5 years compared to 56 percent of adults with insurance. Only 35 percent of uninsured Americans had dental examinations in the last year. When uninsured receive care, it is often at a much later point and is more costly and less efficient. We can do something about it.

Who are the uninsured? Another myth: Eighty-one percent of the uninsured actually come from working families. These are working families who are unable, for whatever reasons, to get affordable health care coverage. Low-income Americans with family incomes below 200 percent of poverty run the highest risk of being uninsured. More than one-third of the poor and 30 percent of the near poor with incomes between 100 percent and 200 percent of poverty lack health insurance.

My legislation is simple. The Universal Health Coverage Act requires personal responsibility, requires everyone to have health insurance, and it builds on the current employer-based system and protects government-sponsored health programs.

We would require every American to have qualified health coverage. That qualified health coverage could be Medicare, it could be our veterans health care, it could be one of the governmental programs, or it could be an employer-sponsored health plan.

We then empower the Secretary of Health to work with the State insurance commissioners to develop three low-cost plans in every State in the Nation so there will be an available product to those who cannot find an affordable health care plan.

The plans would be available for those whose incomes are below 400 percent of poverty. The reason we picked that number, 400 percent of poverty, is those above generally have the oppor-

tunity to buy insurance at work. Those below are the most vulnerable in our community.

Those who fail to enroll in any coverage would be required to pay a tax which would be equal to the premiums so that the Government can enroll them in one of the low-cost plans within their State.

This plan makes sense. It is a framework on which we can build. It says we will not tolerate 46 million people without health insurance, 9 million children without health insurance. It allows the States to do innovative approaches to deal with those who otherwise would have problems affording their health care. We expect States to act. States are already acting. States are already showing leadership. This framework will give States the incentive to move further along. Employers who now know every employee needs health benefits are more likely to provide insurance for their workforce, and there would be an affordable product because everyone would be in the system. We would not have adverse risk collection or cherry-picking by insurance companies. It gives us the framework to move forward and will allow the Federal Government to move in those areas in which the Federal Government can do best to help those who are otherwise vulnerable.

I hope we will not let this opportunity go without dealing with the No. 1 problem in our health care system, and that is dealing with people who do not have health insurance. I look forward to working with all my colleagues so we can work on a doable plan, so this country not only has the highest quality health care, but we have a system in which all Americans have access to that quality care.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1900. A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation to continue Federal support for the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Congressman GRIJALVA has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives.

In 1998, the Congress enacted legislation to establish the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution with the purpose of offering an alternative to litigation for parties in dispute over environmental conflicts. As we know, many environmental conflicts often result in lengthy and costly court proceedings and may take years to resolve. In cases involving Federal Government agencies, the costs for court proceeding are usually paid for by taxpayers. While litigation is still a recourse to resolve disputes, the Congress recognized the need for alternatives, such as mediation and facilitated collaboration, to address the rising number of environmental conflicts

that have clogged Federal courts, executive agencies, and the Congress.

The Institute was placed at the Morris K. Udall Foundation in recognition of former Representative Morris K. Udall from Arizona and his exceptional environmental record, as well as his unusual ability to build a consensus among fractious and even hostile interests. The Institute was established as an experiment with the idea that hidden within fractured environmental debates lay the seeds for many agreements, an approach applied by Mo Udall with unsurpassed ability.

The success of the institute is far greater than we could have imagined. The institute began operations in 1999. Agencies from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the U.S. Navy, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and others have all called upon the Institute for assistance.

Among its many accomplishments, the Institute has also assisted in facilitating interagency teamwork for the Everglades Task Force which oversees the South Everglades Restoration Project. The U.S. Forest Service requested assistance to bring ranchers and environmental advocates in the southwest to work on grazing and environmental compliance issues. Even Members of Congress have sought the institute's assistance to review implementation of the Nation's fundamental environmental law, the National Environmental Policy Act, to assess how it can be improved using collaborative processes.

The demand on the institute's assistance had been much greater than anticipated. At the time the Institute was created, we did not anticipate the magnitude of the role it would serve to the Federal Government. The institute has served as a mediator between agencies and as an advisor to agency dispute resolution efforts involving overlapping or competing jurisdictions and mandates, developing long-term solutions, training personnel in consensus-building efforts, and designing international systems for preventing or resolving disputes.

This legislation simply extends the authorization for the Institute for an additional 5 years. Support for the institute's service is an investment that will ultimately benefit the taxpayers by preventing costly litigation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1902. A bill to limit cost growth associated with major defense base closures and realignments implemented as part of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, one of the primary goals of the Pentagon's Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, process is to reduce costs. Unfortu-

nately, we have seen the cost of implementing BRAC balloon out of control. Back in 2005, Congress agreed to implement the recommendations of the BRAC Commission based on the understanding that it would cost the American taxpayers \$21 billion, a substantial investment. But now, only two years later, we are looking at a price tag of \$30 billion, which is a 43 percent increase.

If costs continue to rise at this rate, we will be looking at even more of a burden on the American taxpayer by the time the base closures and realignments are completed in 2011. In my home State of New Jersey, we are keenly aware of some of the wildly inaccurate cost estimates used in the BRAC process. The closing of New Jersey's army base at Fort Monmouth was originally expected to cost \$780 million, now we are looking at a \$1.5 billion price tag. Part of this inflated cost is due to the egregious miscalculations on how much it would cost to move the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, currently located in New Jersey, to West Point, NY. Although the BRAC Commission's original, one-time implementation cost estimate was \$29 million, current estimates put the move at nearly \$200 million. Many communities and families will be greatly impacted by the closing of Fort Monmouth and the relocation of the military prep school. Knowing that these decisions were based on miscalculations and misinformation does not sit well with our State, and it should not sit well with taxpayers across the country either. If American families are being forced to foot a bill they weren't expecting, there should be an escape hatch.

That is why I am introducing the BRAC Cost Overruns Protection Act of 2007 or the BRAC COP Act. This legislation will work to control the excessive cost overruns in BRAC and ensure that BRAC is maximizing our taxpayers' money. This bill, which I am introducing with Senator LAUTENBERG, is based on principles found in existing law concerning cost overruns in weapons programs, known as the Nunn-McCurdy amendment. Let me take a few moments to discuss exactly how this legislation will work.

The BRAC COP Act will create a trigger mechanism to require a re-evaluation of any major base closure or realignment should the actual cost exceed BRAC's estimated cost by more than 25 percent. In order to monitor BRAC costs, this bill will require the Secretary of Defense to write biannual reports on the costs of implementing the pending base closure or realignment recommendations mandated by BRAC law. If the secretary determines that the actual cost of implementing a major base closure or realignment recommendation has exceeded the 25 percent threshold, the Defense Secretary will then notify the Chairman and Ranking Member the Congressional Defense Committees and devise a business

plan to reduce the cost, without readjusting the baseline estimated cost, so that it does not exceed the 25 percent limit.

The Secretary will then make a recommendation to the President on whether to continue the base closure or realignment. The BRAC COP Act also supports transparency in this process, so if the Defense Secretary recommends that the President continue or modify the base closure or realignment, despite the excessive cost overruns, the Secretary must include an explanation of why it is necessary to continue with these expenditures. After reviewing the Secretary's recommendation, the President will make his own recommendation and submit it to Congress. Just like the congressional procedure for voting on BRAC law, Congress will then have the option to vote to disapprove the President's recommendation.

Let me be clear: this legislation will not overturn BRAC, nor is it intended to re-open the BRAC process. This bill simply asks that the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the Congress take a second look when we face exorbitant cost overruns. The BRAC COP Act will only affect the largest base closures and realignments that are over budget, so we will not be analyzing every single one of the BRAC recommendations.

It is time that the Defense Department is held more accountable for its expenditures. This Congress and the American people do not want to continue providing blank checks so that the Pentagon can rework its accounting tables, regardless of the costs. Congress supported the recommendations of the 2005 BRAC Commission based on the fact that these closures and realignments, although inconvenient, would end up saving money in the long run and addressing the changing requirements of our military. It now appears that cost-benefit analysis has changed. The BRAC COP Act will work to ensure that the 2005 BRAC law, and any future BRAC laws, do not go grossly over budget.

This bill is good for our military and our communities, and I ask my colleagues to support this fiscally responsible legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—EX-
PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE
SENATE THAT THE UNITED
STATES POSTAL SERVICE
SHOULD DISCONTINUE THE
PRACTICE OF CONTRACTING OUT
MAIL DELIVERY SERVICES

Mr. CASEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 283

Whereas letter carriers of the United States Postal Service provide mail delivery