

most of their small business statutory “goaling” requirements. For example, in fiscal year 2006, the Historically Underutilized Business Zone, HUBZone, program met only 2.1 percent of its three percent goal, while our Nation’s service-disabled, veteran-owned small businesses received a Government-wide, paltry total of only 0.9 percent of its three percent small business goal. This longstanding area of concern is coupled with a litany of deficiencies that include “contract bundling,” subcontracting misrepresentations, inaccurate small business size determinations, flawed reporting data, and under-utilization of key small business contracting programs.

As the Chairman is well aware, these problems are not new, and our Committee has held countless hearings on various contracting concerns throughout the years. Business opportunities through Federal contracts provide vital economic benefits for small businesses, which is why last year, my Small Business Administration Reauthorization Bill, which passed our Committee unanimously, contained a robust package of small business contracting initiatives.

Our legislation builds on the contracting provisions of that bill, by improving all of the small business contracting programs—including the HUBZone, small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business programs. It equips the SBA with additional tools to meet the demands of an ever-changing 21st century contracting environment.

This bipartisan measure also includes several other priorities that I have long championed—most notably, enhancing the HUBZone program. In my home state of Maine, only 118 of 41,026 small businesses are qualified HUBZone businesses. HUBZones represent a tremendous tool for replacing lost jobs for our Nation’s declining manufacturing and industrial sectors—clearly, this program should be better utilized.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to pass this bipartisan small business contracting legislation to ensure that all small business “goals” are not only met—but exceeded.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 363—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY “NOTCH BABIES”

Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 363

Whereas the Social Security Amendments of 1977, legislation designed to correct the Social Security benefit formula, resulted in

a discrepancy in benefits—a “notch”—between individuals born in the years immediately following 1916 and other beneficiaries;

Whereas Senate legislation introduced in the 105th through 108th Congresses sought to correct the “notch baby” problem;

Whereas those born during the “notch” years are the same Americans who fought and sacrificed during World War II;

Whereas the “notch babies” who receive lower Social Security benefits than those individuals born between 1911 and 1916 are at the same time among the seniors hit hardest by rising health care costs; and

Whereas those affected by the “notch” are leaving us at a rapid rate, with the youngest “notch babies” now over 80 years old: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) honors the sacrifice of those born in the “notch” years of 1917 through 1926;

(2) recognizes the difference in Social Security benefits calculated for those born in 1917 and the years following, as compared with those born between 1911 and 1916;

(3) expresses regret that there has been no resolution to the satisfaction of the millions of seniors born from 1917 through 1926; and

(4) should consider corrective legislation similar to bills introduced in the Senate in the 105th through 108th Congresses, to address the “notch” benefit disparity.

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 364—COMMANDING THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR SHOWING THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON’S VETERANS AND ENCOURAGING RESIDENTS OF OTHER STATES TO PURSUE CREATIVE WAYS TO SHOW THEIR OWN SUPPORT FOR VETERANS

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:

S. RES. 364

Whereas every day, American men and women risk their lives serving the country in the Armed Forces;

Whereas it is important to many Americans to be able to donate money directly to causes about which they care;

Whereas it is important for residents to have a tangible way to demonstrate their support for veterans;

Whereas despite Government funding for the Nation’s veterans, many important needs of veterans remain unmet;

Whereas citizens in the State of Washington have banded together in a grassroots effort to create a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit;

Whereas any bank in the State of Washington can choose to offer a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit;

Whereas the Bank of Clark County has become the first institution to offer these Certificates of Deposit;

Whereas the Governor of the State of Washington and the Washington State Veterans Affairs Department have expressed the State’s support for this program;

Whereas when a person buys a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit from a participating bank, half of the interest is automatically donated to the State of Washington’s Veterans Innovation Program to address the unmet needs of the State of Washington’s veterans and their families;

Whereas the Veterans Innovation Program provides emergency assistance to help cur-

rent or former Washington National Guard or Reserve service members cope with financial hardships, unemployment, educational needs, and many basic family necessities; and

Whereas the Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit will be officially launched on November 8, 2007; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commends the people of the State of Washington for showing their support for the needs of the State of Washington’s veterans; and

(2) encourages residents of other States to pursue creative ways to show their own support for veterans.

##### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52—ENCOURAGING THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS TO TAKE ACTION TO ENSURE A PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN BURMA

Mrs. BOXER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 52

Whereas hundreds of thousands of citizens of Burma have risked their lives in demonstrations to demand a return to democracy and respect for human rights in their country;

Whereas the repressive military Government of Burma has conducted a brutal crackdown against demonstrators, which has resulted in mass numbers of killings, arrests, and detentions;

Whereas Burma has been a member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) since 1997;

Whereas foreign ministers of other ASEAN member nations, in reference to Burma, have “demanded that the government immediately desist from the use of violence against demonstrators”, expressed “revulsion” over reports that demonstrators were being suppressed by violent and deadly force, and called for “the release of all political detainees including Daw Aung San Suu Kyi”;

Whereas the foreign ministers of ASEAN member nations have expressed concern that developments in Burma “had a serious impact on the reputation and credibility of ASEAN”;

Whereas Ibrahim Gambari, the United Nations (UN) Special Envoy to Burma, has called on the member nations of ASEAN to take additional steps on the Burma issue, saying, “Not just Thailand but all the countries that I am visiting, India, China, Indonesia, Malaysia and the UN, we could do more”;

Whereas the ASEAN Security Community Plan of Action adopted October 7, 2003, at the ASEAN Summit in Bali states that ASEAN members “shall promote political development . . . to achieve peace, stability, democracy, and prosperity in the region”, and specifically says that “ASEAN Member Countries shall not condone unconstitutional and undemocratic changes of government”;

Whereas the Government of Singapore, as the current Chair of ASEAN, will host ASEAN’s regional summit in November 2007 to approve ASEAN’s new charter;

Whereas the current Foreign Minister of Singapore, George Yeo, has publicly expressed, “For some time now, we had stopped trying to defend Myanmar internationally because it became no longer credible”;

Whereas, according to the chairman of the High Level Task Force charged with drafting

the new ASEAN Charter, the Charter “will make ASEAN a more rules-based organization and . . . will put in place a system of compliance monitoring and, most importantly, a system of compulsory dispute settlement for noncompliance that will apply to all ASEAN agreements”;

Whereas upon its accession to ASEAN, Burma agreed to subscribe or accede to all ASEAN declarations, treaties, and agreements;

Whereas 2007 marks the 30th anniversary of the relationship and dialogue between the United States and ASEAN;

Whereas the Senate passed legislation in the 109th Congress that would authorize the establishment of the position of United States Ambassador for ASEAN Affairs, and the President announced in 2006 that an Ambassador would be appointed; and

Whereas ASEAN member nations and the United States share common concerns across a broad range of issues, including accelerated economic growth, social progress, cultural development, and peace and stability in the Southeast Asia region: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) joins the foreign ministers of member nations of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) that have expressed concern over the human rights situation in Burma;

(2) encourages ASEAN to take more substantial steps to ensure a peaceful transition to democracy in Burma;

(3) welcomes steps by ASEAN to strengthen its internal governance through the adoption of a formal ASEAN charter;

(4) urges ASEAN to ensure that all member nations live up to their membership obligations and adhere to ASEAN’s core principles, including respect for and commitment to human rights; and

(5) would welcome a decision by ASEAN, consistent with its core documents and its new charter, to review Burma’s membership in ASEAN and to consider appropriate disciplinary measures, including suspension, until such time as the Government of Burma has demonstrated an improved respect for and commitment to human rights.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution to encourage the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, to take action to ensure a peaceful transition to democracy in Burma.

In late September, tens of thousands of Burmese citizens, including thousands of Buddhist monks, took to the streets to demand a return to democracy in Burma. Tragically, the world watched in horror as Burma’s military junta implemented a brutal and ruthless crackdown resulting in the death of hundreds and the detention of thousands.

The current Burmese government, the State Peace and Development Council, SPDC, is a military dictatorship that refused to relinquish power even after the Burmese people voted them out in a democratic election in 1990. The winner of that election, the National League for Democracy was not allowed to take power, and its leader, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, was placed under house arrest, where she remains today.

The world must not stay silent while the people of Burma struggle for democracy and basic human rights. We

have a moral responsibility to speak out for the Burmese people who have been silenced by the junta.

The events of the last several weeks are reminiscent of the crackdown on a similar uprising in the summer of 1988, in which an estimated 3,000 people were killed. Today, the remaining leaders of that uprising, known as “The 88 Generation Students,” issued a letter to the Chairman of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, asking that it “consider suspending the SPDC’s membership in ASEAN if it continues to ignore the requests of the international community.” This resolution echoes that suggestion.

ASEAN has expressed “revulsion” over reports that the SPDC is using deadly force to suppress demonstrators. I appreciate this strong statement. Unfortunately, it is clear that words alone are not enough to force change within Burma. Later this month, ASEAN will hold its regional summit—a prime opportunity for ASEAN to back its words with concrete action.

Yesterday, it was reported that the Buddhist monks were again marching in the streets of Burma in clear defiance of the military junta. It is time for Burma’s neighbors to apply real pressure on the military government so that future violence can be avoided. I urge my colleagues to stand with the people of Burma and support this resolution.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

**SA 3497.** Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3963, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 3498.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3963, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3497.** Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3963, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

##### SEC. 117. TREATMENT OF UNBORN CHILDREN.

(a) **CODIFICATION OF CURRENT REGULATIONS.**—Section 2110(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1397jj(c)(1)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and includes, at the option of a State, an unborn child. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term ‘unborn child’ means a member of the species *Homo sapiens*, at any stage of development, who is carried in the womb.”.

(b) **CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING COVERAGE OF MOTHERS.**—Section 2103 (42 U.S.C. 1397cc) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE POSTPARTUM SERVICES AND MATERNAL HEALTH CARE.—Any State that provides child health assistance to an unborn child under the option described in section 2110(c)(1) may continue to provide such assistance to the mother, as well as postpartum services, through the end of the month in which the 60-day period (beginning on the last day of pregnancy) ends, in the same manner as such assistance and postpartum services would be provided if provided under the State plan under title XIX, but only if the mother would otherwise satisfy the eligibility requirements that apply under the State child health plan (other than with respect to age) during such period.”.

**SA 3498.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3963, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

##### SEC. 110. REQUIREMENT THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR CHIP AND EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE USE THE EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE INSTEAD OF CHIP.

Section 2105(c) (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(c)), as amended by section 601(a)(1), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

##### “(13) REQUIREMENT REGARDING EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), on and after the date of enactment of the Children’s Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007, no payment may be made under this title with respect to an individual who is eligible for coverage under a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered through an employer, either as an individual or as part of family coverage.

##### “(B) STATE OPTION TO OFFER PREMIUM ASSISTANCE FOR HIGH-COST PLANS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is otherwise eligible for coverage under this title but for the application of subparagraph (A) and who is eligible for high-cost health insurance coverage, a State may elect to offer a premium assistance subsidy for such coverage.

“(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount of a premium assistance subsidy under this paragraph shall be determined by the State but in no case shall exceed the lesser of—

“(I) an amount equal to the value of the coverage under this title that would otherwise apply with respect to the individual but for the application of subparagraph (A); or

“(II) an amount equal to the difference between—

“(aa) the amount of the employee’s share of the premium costs for the high-cost health insurance coverage (for the family or the individual, as the case may be); and

“(bb) an amount equal to 20 percent of the total premium costs for such coverage, including both the employer and employee share, (for the family or the individual, as the case may be).

“(C) HIGH-COST HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘high cost health insurance coverage’ means a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered through an employer in which the employee is required to pay more than 20 percent of the premium costs.