

SNOWE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2128, a bill to make the moratorium on Internet access taxes and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce permanent.

S. 2136

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2136, a bill to address the treatment of primary mortgages in bankruptcy, and for other purposes.

S. 2139

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2139, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, provide educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill for members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve extended period of continuous active duty that include a prolonged period of service in certain theaters of operation, and for other purposes.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to authorize and facilitate the improvement of water management by the Bureau of Reclamation, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy to increase the acquisition and analysis of water resources for irrigation, hydroelectric power, municipal, and environmental uses, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 48, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding high level visits to the United States by democratically-elected officials of Taiwan.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution recognizing the increasingly mutually beneficial relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Indonesia.

S. RES. 345

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 345, a resolution supporting the work of firefighters to educate and protect the Nation's communities, and the goals and ideals of Fire Prevention Week, October 7–13, 2007, as designated by the National Fire Protection Association.

AMENDMENT NO. 3208

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3208 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Com-

merce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3234

At the request of Mr. COBURN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3234 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3256

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3256 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3256 proposed to H.R. 3093, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 3274

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3274 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3279

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3279 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3289

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3289 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3289 proposed to H.R. 3093, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 3290

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as co-

sponsors of amendment No. 3290 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3300

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3300 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3314

At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3314 proposed to H.R. 3093, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2168. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enable increased federal prosecution of identity theft crimes and to allow for restitution to victims of identity theft; to the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this month the Nation is observing National Cyber Security Awareness Month and, today, I am pleased to have Senator SPECTER join me in introducing our Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act of 2007. This bipartisan criminal bill will provide new tools to federal prosecutors to combat identity theft and other cyber crimes.

Senator SPECTER has been a valuable partner in addressing the growing problem of identity theft for many years. When he served as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we worked closely together on comprehensive data privacy legislation to combat identity theft. During my tenure as Chairman, we have continued our efforts to enact comprehensive data privacy legislation. I appreciate Senator SPECTER's willingness to work with me once again on this important privacy issue and I look forward to our close partnership yielding results in this Congress.

When Senator SPECTER and I first introduced our comprehensive data privacy bill in 2005, we both knew that there was an urgent need to bring data privacy reforms to the American people. The Judiciary Committee has twice favorably reported the Leahy-Specter Personal Data Privacy and Security Act, most recently in May 2007, and that important privacy bill is now

awaiting consideration by the full Senate as S.495. The privacy reforms in that bill are long overdue and I sincerely hope that the Senate will fulfill its obligation to bring meaningful privacy protections to the American people.

The bipartisan Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act that we are introducing today takes several important steps to build upon our past efforts to protect Americans from the dangers of identity theft. First, our bill provides the victims of identity theft with the ability to seek restitution in Federal court for the loss of time and money spent restoring their credit and remedying the harms of identity theft. Unfortunately, under current law, restitution for identity theft victims is only available to recover the direct financial costs incurred by victims, such as recovering funds for unauthorized credit card charges. But, many identity theft victims incur other, indirect costs, such as lost wages due to time taken off from work to resolve credit disputes. Our bill amends the Federal criminal code to clarify that restitution orders in identity theft cases may include a recovery of these kinds of indirect costs, so that identity theft victims can be made whole.

Second, to address the more sophisticated and complex identity theft crimes committed in today's digital era, our bill also expands the scope of the Federal identity theft statutes so that the law keeps up with the ingenuity of today's identity thieves. The bill expands the definition of "aggravated identity theft" under existing law, to include the crime of "conspiracy" to commit any of the crimes defined as aggravated identity theft in the criminal code. The bill also adds three new crimes—passing counterfeit securities, mail theft, and tax fraud—to the list of predicate offenses for aggravated identity theft. In order to better deter this kind of criminal activity, the bill significantly increases the criminal penalties for these crimes.

In addition, our bill addresses several growing and disturbing trends in the area of cyber crime. To address the increasing number of computer hacking crimes that involve computers located within the same state, the bill eliminates the jurisdictional requirement that a computer's information must be stolen through an interstate or foreign communication in order to federally prosecute this crime. Our bill also addresses the growing problem of the malicious use of spyware to steal sensitive personal information, by amending the criminal code to eliminate the requirement that the loss resulting from the damage to a victim's computer must exceed \$5,000 in order to federally prosecute this offense.

Our bill also addresses the increasing number of cyber attacks on multiple computers, by making it a felony to employ spyware or keyloggers to damage ten or more computers, regardless of the aggregate amount of damage

caused. By making this crime a felony, the bill ensures that the most egregious identity thieves will not escape with minimal punishment under Federal cyber crime laws.

Lastly, our bill strengthens the protections for American businesses which are more and more becoming the focus of identity thieves. Because in today's digital economy, cyber-criminals often seek to extort money from American businesses without explicitly threatening to shut down or otherwise cause damage to a company computer, our bill amends the Federal criminal code to expressly cover extortion plots that do not involve a specific threat to damage a computer. The current law does not reach this kind of bad conduct; but, our bill corrects this shortcoming by adding two new causes of action under the cyber extortion statute, threatening to obtain or release information from a protected computer and demanding money in relation to a protected computer, so that this bad conduct can be federally prosecuted. In addition, because a business as well as an individual can be a prime target for identity theft, our bill also closes several gaps in the federal identity theft and the aggravated identity theft statutes, so that identity thieves who steal sensitive information belonging to a small business or a corporation may also be prosecuted under these laws.

Senator SPECTER and I have worked closely with the Department of Justice in crafting this criminal legislation and the Leahy-Specter Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act has the strong support of the Department of Justice, the Secret Service and the Federal prosecutors and investigators who are on the front lines of the battle against identity theft and other cyber crimes. The bill is also supported by the business community and consumer groups.

Enacting good, bipartisan legislation to combat identity theft and to protect American consumers should be one of the Senate's top legislative priorities. Senator SPECTER and I are deeply committed to bringing long overdue data privacy protections to the American people. I hope that all Members of the Senate will join with us in supporting this important privacy legislation.

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 printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2168

*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 "Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. CRIMINAL RESTITUTION.

Section 3663(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ";" and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";" and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) in the case of an offense under sections 1028(a)(7) or 1028A(a) of this title, pay an amount equal to the value of the time reasonably spent by the victim in an attempt to remediate the intended or actual harm incurred by the victim from the offense."

#### SEC. 3. PREDICATE OFFENSES FOR AGGRAVATED IDENTITY THEFT AND MISUSE OF IDENTIFYING INFORMATION ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IDENTITY THEFT.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by inserting "(including an organization as defined in section 18 of this title)" after "person"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(7), by inserting "or other person" after "specific individual".

(b) AGGRAVATED IDENTITY THEFT.—Section 1028A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "(including an organization as defined in section 18 of this title)" after "person"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ", or a conspiracy to commit such a felony violation," after "any offense that is a felony violation";

(B) by redesignating—

(i) paragraph (11) as paragraph (14);

(ii) paragraphs (8) through (10) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively; and

(iii) paragraphs (1) through (7) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively;

(C) by inserting prior to paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

"(1) section 513 (relating to making, uttering, or possessing counterfeited securities);"

(D) by inserting after paragraph (8), as so redesignated, the following:

"(9) section 1708 (relating to mail theft);"

(E) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking ";" or" and inserting a semicolon; and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (12), as so redesignated, the following:

"(13) section 7201, 7206, or 7207 of title 26 (relating to tax fraud); or".

#### SEC. 4. ENSURING JURISDICTION OVER THE THEFT OF SENSITIVE IDENTITY INFORMATION.

Section 1030(a)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "if the conduct involved an interstate or foreign communication".

#### SEC. 5. MALICIOUS SPYWARE, HACKING AND KEYLOGGERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "(A)(i) knowingly" and inserting "(A) knowingly";

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking ";" and" and inserting a period;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "(a)(5)(A)(iii)";

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking "(a)(5)(A)(iii)";

(C) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4)(A) except as provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, in the case of—

"(i) an offense under subsection (a)(5)(B), which does not occur after a conviction for another offense under this section, if the offense caused (or, in the case of an attempted offense, would, if completed, have caused)—

"(I) loss to 1 or more persons during any 1-year period (and, for purposes of an investigation, prosecution, or other proceeding

brought by the United States only, loss resulting from a related course of conduct affecting 1 or more other protected computers) aggregating at least \$5,000 in value;

“(II) the modification or impairment, or potential modification or impairment, of the medical examination, diagnosis, treatment, or care of 1 or more individuals;

“(III) physical injury to any person;

“(IV) a threat to public health or safety;

“(V) damage affecting a computer used by or for an entity of the United States Government in furtherance of the administration of justice, national defense, or national security; or

“(VI) damage affecting 10 or more protected computers during any 1-year period; or

“(ii) an attempt to commit an offense punishable under this subparagraph;

“(B) except as provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, in the case of—

“(i) an offense under subsection (a)(5)(A), which does not occur after a conviction for another offense under this section, if the offense caused (or, in the case of an attempted offense, would, if completed, have caused) a harm provided in subclauses (I) through (VI) of subparagraph (A)(i); or

“(ii) an attempt to commit an offense punishable under this subparagraph;

“(C) except as provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, in the case of—

“(i) an offense or an attempt to commit an offense under subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(5) that occurs after a conviction for another offense under this section; or

“(ii) an attempt to commit an offense punishable under this subparagraph;

“(D) a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, in the case of—

“(i) an offense or an attempt to commit an offense under subsection (a)(5)(C) that occurs after a conviction for another offense under this section; or

“(ii) an attempt to commit an offense punishable under this subparagraph;

“(E) if the offender attempts to cause or knowingly or recklessly causes serious bodily injury from conduct in violation of subsection (a)(5)(A), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both;

“(F) if the offender attempts to cause or knowingly or recklessly causes death from conduct in violation of subsection (a)(5)(A), a fine under this title, imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or both; or

“(G) a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for—

“(i) any other offense under subsection (a)(5); or

“(ii) an attempt to commit an offense punishable under this subparagraph; and

(D) by striking paragraph (5); and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking “in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subsection (a)(5)(B)”, and inserting “in subclauses (I), (II), (III), (IV), (V), or (VI) of subsection (c)(4)(A)(i)”; and

(B) in the third sentence, by striking “subsection (a)(5)(B)(i)” and inserting “subsection (c)(4)(A)(i)(I)”.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES.—Section 2332b(g)(5)(B)(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “1030(a)(5)(A)(i) resulting in damage as defined in 1030(a)(5)(B)(ii) through (v)”, and inserting “1030(a)(5)(A) resulting in damage as defined in 1030(c)(4)(A)(i)(II) through (VI)”.

#### SEC. 6. CYBER-EXTORTION.

Section 1030(a)(7) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(7) with intent to extort from any person any money or other thing of value, transmits in interstate or foreign commerce any communication containing any—

“(A) threat to cause damage to a protected computer;

“(B) threat to obtain information from a protected computer without authorization or in excess of authorization or to impair the confidentiality of information obtained from a protected computer without authorization or by exceeding authorized access; or

“(C) demand or request for money or other thing of value in relation to damage to a protected computer, where such damage was caused to facilitate the extortion;”.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition today to discuss the Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act of 2007, which I am introducing with Senator LEAHY.

In 2006, some 8.4 million Americans became victims to identity theft. Victims are often left with a bad credit report and must spend months and even years regaining their financial health. In the meantime, victims have difficulty getting credit, obtaining loans, renting apartments, and even getting hired. On a national level, experts estimate that identity theft costs the U.S. economy \$49.3 billion last year and costs each victim an average of \$617.

Identity thieves frequently acquire a person's existing credit account information and then purchase products and services using either the actual credit card or simply the account number and expiration date. They also use Social Security numbers and other identifying information to open new accounts in a person's name. Identity thieves frequently obtain both existing account information and the information needed to open new accounts electronically—either by gaining unauthorized access to a computer or by fraudulently inducing victims to provide such information.

The Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act will provide Federal prosecutors with new tools to combat identity theft.

First, the bill will expand Federal computer fraud statutes to cover business organizations. Identity thieves frequently impersonate businesses in order to steal sensitive personal information from consumers. However, current law only provides for prosecution of identity theft perpetrated against an individual.

Under the bill, prosecutors will be able to go after identity thieves even when the computer they use to steal information is located in the same State as the victim's computer. Under current law, Federal courts only have jurisdiction if the thief uses an interstate communication to access the victim's computer.

The bill will make it a crime to threaten to steal or release information from a computer. Under current law, prosecutors can only bring extortion charges against those who threaten to shut down or damage a computer.

The bill will make it a crime to use malicious “spyware” to damage a computer, regardless of the amount of damage. Under current law, damage to a victim's computer must exceed \$5,000 before a prosecutor can bring charges.

The bill will also increase the penalties Federal prosecutors can seek for identity theft.

The bill will enable prosecutors to seek enhanced penalties where a violation of the Federal computer fraud statutes includes conspiracy.

Prosecutors also will be able to seek enhanced penalties where a violation of the Federal computer fraud statutes involves passing counterfeit securities, mail theft, and tax fraud.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the bill will enable Federal prosecutors to seek restitution for the time and money that victims spend restoring their credit. The impact of identity theft is not limited to direct financial loss. Victims frequently spend significant amounts of time fixing or monitoring credit reports and disputing charges with individual creditors. The Federal Trade Commission has reported that victims spend an average of 30 hours trying to resolve identity theft-related issues with banks, credit agencies, and other institutions. According to the FTC, a total of 297 million hours were expended in 1 year by victims trying to deal with the impact of identity theft.

The Criminal Code currently allows prosecutors to seek restitution for the direct financial losses that victims experience. However, the code does not expressly permit prosecutors to obtain restitution for the time and money victims spend resolving the problems that arise as a result of identity theft. The Identity Theft Enforcement and Restitution Act of 2007 will allow prosecutors to seek restitution from a criminal defendant for the time and resources victims spend trying to repair their credit. The bill will require judges to determine the amount of time reasonably spent and the value of the victim's time.

Many of these provisions were included in the recommendations of the President's Identity Theft Task Force. These changes were recommended by the agency responsible for prosecuting identity theft, the Justice Department. I expect broad bipartisan support for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 2171. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a uniform set of customer service and consumer protection requirements for providers of wireless telecommunications services; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will bring important consumer protections to millions of wireless telephone customers across the country. The Uniform Wireless Consumer Protection

Act requires the Federal Communications Commission to establish uniform national customer service and consumer protection rules for wireless customers that are both timely and necessary. My bill is identical to language approved with bipartisan support by the Senate Commerce Committee during the 109th Congress.

In 1993, through the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, Congress limited State and local regulatory authority on wireless carriers to help the fledgling industry establish itself in the communications arena. That decision has helped to drive today's market of 240 million wireless customers in the U.S. Today, carrying a wireless telephone, a BlackBerry, or some other kind of wireless device has become part of the fabric of many peoples' lives. Wireless technology has become a commonplace communication option, and an increasing number of Americans have replaced their landline telephone in favor of a purely mobile telephone service.

While we have accomplished the goal of growing the wireless industry, we have yet to establish a uniform set of customer service and consumer protection requirements. Now is the time to finish the job we started in 1993 by enacting a national framework that will drive a new era of consumer-friendly wireless services.

This national consumer framework is not without challenges. The ability of wireless to travel beyond State boundaries tests our customary approaches to customer service and consumer protection standards at the state and local level. But nothing in this bill should be misconstrued as a statement against consumer obligations by State and local governments. As a former Attorney General of Arkansas, I feel very strongly about the inimitable ability of State and local governments to oversee and enforce consumer protections. State and local governments are unmatched in their function to provide effective protection and enforcement, and final rules must recognize and require a strong role for states in wireless consumer protection.

In addition, my colleagues Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator ROCKEFELLER have introduced a bill, S. 2033, the Cell Phone Consumer Empowerment Act of 2007, that shares the same goal of protecting wireless consumers, and I look forward to working with them. Uniform wireless consumer protection rules must be comprehensive and address a broad range of issues, including disclosures of contract terms and conditions, service-area maps, trail periods and early termination fees. We also need to weigh the benefits and the burdens of government fees and taxes, as well as the costs of compliance with government regulations on wireless services.

I know my constituents want to be assured of their consumer protections when they buy and use wireless service, wherever they go and wherever they

use their wireless phones. This bill begins an important debate on building uniform, comprehensive rules that provide a fair, transparent and quality wireless service to consumers across the Nation. While there is much work to be done in achieving a balance of rules that truly work for consumers, there is a clear need for a federal wireless regulatory framework. I am confident that we can reach this goal.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 2172. A bill to impose sanctions on officials of the State Peace and Development Council in Burma, to prohibit the importation of gems and hardwoods from Burma, to support democracy in Burma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the world has reacted with horror and revulsion at the Burmese junta's recent brutal crackdown against peaceful demonstrators. In crushing the Saffron Revolution, killing hundreds and jailing thousands, including countless Buddhist monks, the junta has left no doubt about its blatant disregard for basic human decency. We, as Americans, stand on the side of freedom, not fear; of peace, not violence; and of the millions in Burma who aspire to a better life, not those who would keep them isolated and oppressed.

Our response must go beyond statements of condemnation, and the time to act is now. That is why today I am introducing the Saffron Revolution Support Act of 2007 in the U.S. Senate. This legislation imposes meaningful and effective punitive action against the cruel, thuggish, and illegitimate Burmese government. We must not sit idly by while the junta continues to deprive the Burmese people of their fundamental human rights.

This legislation would impose targeted sanctions against Burmese officials who played a direct role in the violent repression of peaceful political dissent, and also against those who provide, or have provided, substantial political and economic support for the junta. These individuals would be subject to a visa ban and a ban on business dealings with any United States entity or person. This legislation would also close a loophole that exists in current U.S. import policy that allows imports of Burmese gems and hardwoods, which together add tens of millions of dollars to the junta's coffers. It would eliminate the remaining U.S. energy investment in Burma's gas sector and significantly increase U.S. Government support for democracy in Burma.

Specifically, the Saffron Revolution Support Act of 2007: states that it is the policy of the United States to condemn the Burmese junta's continued repressions, support the democratic aspirations of the Burmese people, provide support to aid a democratic transition in Burma, and hold accountable those individuals responsible for the ongoing repression; imposes targeted financial sanctions against Burmese of-

ficials who played a direct role in the violent repression of peaceful political dissent, and also against those who provide, or have provided, substantial political and economic support for the junta government; imposes a visa ban on these individuals; prohibits the importation of Burmese gems and hardwoods, including materials that are mined or harvested in Burma but shaped, cut, or assembled in other countries not subject to current U.S. sanctions; prohibits investment in Burma by U.S. companies, including investment agreements reached prior to the imposition of the May 20, 1997 sanctions; permits the President to terminate sanctions once the Government of Burma has: unconditionally released all political prisoners, including Aung San Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy; entered into a substantive dialogue with democratic forces on a transition to democratic government under the rule of law; allowed humanitarian access to populations affected by armed conflict in all regions of Burma; authorizes \$20 million for FY 2008 and FY 2009 in aid to democracy activists in Burma, for the expansion of radio and television broadcasting into Burma, and for support to individuals and groups compiling evidence of the junta's crimes; expresses the sense of Congress that the Director of National Intelligence should target intelligence resources to identify those responsible for the crackdown and for other human rights abuses; authorizes the Secretary of State to fund the establishment of an independent, searchable, Internet database that would compile evidence of human rights abuses in Burma, permitting increased international research aimed at holding human rights abusers accountable; requires a report by the Secretary of State on international sources of military aid to the Burmese regime.

The next phase of political life in Burma has begun. The junta's thugs cannot forever postpone the blossoming of freedom and democracy within its nation's borders. By enacting the Saffron Revolution Support Act of 2007, the Congress can help ensure that they do not. I urge my colleagues to support this vital piece of legislation.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 347—DESIGNATING MAY 2008 AS “NATIONAL BE BEAR AWARE AND WILDLIFE STEWARDSHIP MONTH”

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 347

Whereas wildlife and wildlife viewing enrich the shared outdoor heritage of the people of the United States;

Whereas it is possible to enjoy wildlife in a way that is prudent, safe, and educational