

that is opposed by Democratic and Republican home state Senators is one that cannot move.

When the President sends on well-qualified consensus nominations, we can work together and continue to make progress as we are today.

I congratulate Joseph and his family on his confirmation today.

#### NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. SCHROEDER

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Senate continues, as we have all year, to make progress filling judicial vacancies by considering yet another nomination reported out of Committee this month. The nomination before us today for a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench is Thomas D. Schroeder, to the Middle District of North Carolina. He has the support of both home State Senators. I acknowledge the support of Senators DOLE and BURR, and want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for chairing the hearing on this nomination.

Last month, the Judiciary Committee reached a milestone by voting to report our 40th judicial nominee this year. That exceeds the totals reported in each of the previous 2 years, when a Republican-led Judiciary Committee was considering this President's nominees.

Thomas D. Schroeder is a Partner at the Winston-Salem, NC, office of the law firm of Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Price, PLLC, where he has worked almost his entire legal career. Mr. Schroeder served as a law clerk for Judge George E. MacKinnon on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. He graduated from Kansas University and Notre Dame Law School, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the Notre Dame Law Review.

When we confirm the nomination we consider today, the Senate will have confirmed 39 nominations for lifetime appointments to the Federal bench this session alone. That exceeds the totals confirmed in all of 2004, 2005, and 2006 when a Republican-led Senate was considering this President's nominees; all of 1989; all of 1993, when a Democratic-led Senate was considering President Clinton's nominees; all of 1997 and 1999, when a Republican-led Senate was considering President Clinton's nominees; and all of 1996, when the Republican-led Senate did not confirm a single one of President Clinton's circuit nominees.

When this nomination is confirmed, the Senate will have confirmed 139 total Federal judicial nominees in my tenure as Judiciary Chairman. During the Bush Presidency, more circuit judges, more district judges—more total judges—were confirmed in the first 24 months that I served as Judici-

ary Chairman than during the 2-year tenures of either of the two Republican chairmen working with Republican Senate majorities.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts will list 44 judicial vacancies and 14 circuit court vacancies after today's confirmations. Compare that to the numbers at the end of the 109th Congress, when the total vacancies under a Republican controlled Judiciary Committee were 51 judicial vacancies and 15 circuit court vacancies. That means, that despite the additional vacancies that arose at the beginning of the 110th Congress and throughout this year, the current vacancy totals under my chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee are below where they were under a Republican led-Judiciary Committee. They are almost half of what they were at the end of President Clinton's term, when Republican pocket filibusters allowed judicial vacancies to rise above 100 before settling at 80. Twenty-six of them were for circuit courts.

When the President consults and sends the Senate well-qualified, consensus nominations, we can work together and continue to make progress as we are today.

I congratulate the nominee and his family on his confirmation today.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NO. 373

Mr. REID. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers Executive Calendar No. 373, the nomination of John Tinder to be U.S. circuit judge, there be a time limit of 30 minutes for debate, equally divided, between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senators LEAHY and SPECTER; that at the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the confirmation of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OPENNESS PROMOTES EFFECTIVENESS IN OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration S. 2488.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2488) to promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2488) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2488

*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 "Openness Promotes Effectiveness in our National Government Act of 2007" or the "OPEN Government Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Freedom of Information Act was signed into law on July 4, 1966, because the American people believe that—

(A) our constitutional democracy, our system of self-government, and our commitment to popular sovereignty depends upon the consent of the governed;

(B) such consent is not meaningful unless it is informed consent; and

(C) as Justice Black noted in his concurring opinion in *Barr v. Matteo* (360 U.S. 564 (1959)), "The effective functioning of a free government like ours depends largely on the force of an informed public opinion. This calls for the widest possible understanding of the quality of government service rendered by all elective or appointed public officials or employees.";

(2) the American people firmly believe that our system of government must itself be governed by a presumption of openness;

(3) the Freedom of Information Act establishes a "strong presumption in favor of disclosure" as noted by the United States Supreme Court in *United States Department of State v. Ray* (502 U.S. 164 (1991)), a presumption that applies to all agencies governed by that Act;

(4) "disclosure, not secrecy, is the dominant objective of the Act," as noted by the United States Supreme Court in *Department of Air Force v. Rose* (425 U.S. 352 (1976));

(5) in practice, the Freedom of Information Act has not always lived up to the ideals of that Act; and

(6) Congress should regularly review section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), in order to determine whether further changes and improvements are necessary to ensure that the Government remains open and accessible to the American people and is always based not upon the

“need to know” but upon the fundamental “right to know”.

**SEC. 3. PROTECTION OF FEE STATUS FOR NEWS MEDIA.**

Section 552(a)(4)(A)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“In this clause, the term ‘a representative of the news media’ means any person or entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience. In this clause, the term ‘news’ means information that is about current events or that would be of current interest to the public. Examples of news-media entities are television or radio stations broadcasting to the public at large and publishers of periodicals (but only if such entities qualify as disseminators of ‘news’) who make their products available for purchase by or subscription by or free distribution to the general public. These examples are not all-inclusive. Moreover, as methods of news delivery evolve (for example, the adoption of the electronic dissemination of newspapers through telecommunications services), such alternative media shall be considered to be news-media entities. A freelance journalist shall be regarded as working for a news-media entity if the journalist can demonstrate a solid basis for expecting publication through that entity, whether or not the journalist is actually employed by the entity. A publication contract would present a solid basis for such an expectation; the Government may also consider the past publication record of the requester in making such a determination.”.

**SEC. 4. RECOVERY OF ATTORNEY FEES AND LITIGATION COSTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 552(a)(4)(E) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by inserting “(i)” after “(E)”; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, a complainant has substantially prevailed if the complainant has obtained relief through either—

“(I) a judicial order, or an enforceable written agreement or consent decree; or

“(II) a voluntary or unilateral change in position by the agency, if the complainant’s claim is not insubstantial.”.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, no amounts may be obligated or expended from the Claims and Judgment Fund of the United States Treasury to pay the costs resulting from fees assessed under section 552(a)(4)(E) of title 5, United States Code. Any such amounts shall be paid only from funds annually appropriated for any authorized purpose for the Federal agency against which a claim or judgment has been rendered.

**SEC. 5. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS FOR ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS REJECTIONS OF REQUESTS.**

Section 552(a)(4)(F) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by inserting “(i)” after “(F)”; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) The Attorney General shall—

“(I) notify the Special Counsel of each civil action described under the first sentence of clause (i); and

“(II) annually submit a report to Congress on the number of such civil actions in the preceding year.

“(iii) The Special Counsel shall annually submit a report to Congress on the actions taken by the Special Counsel under clause (i).”.

**SEC. 6. TIME LIMITS FOR AGENCIES TO ACT ON REQUESTS.**

- (a) **TIME LIMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 552(a)(6)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“The 20-day period under clause (i) shall commence on the date on which the request is first received by the appropriate component of the agency, but in any event not later than ten days after the request is first received by any component of the agency that is designated in the agency’s regulations under this section to receive requests under this section. The 20-day period shall not be tolled by the agency except—

“(I) that the agency may make one request to the requester for information and toll the 20-day period while it is awaiting such information that it has reasonably requested from the requester under this section; or

“(II) if necessary to clarify with the requester issues regarding fee assessment. In either case, the agency’s receipt of the requester’s response to the agency’s request for information or clarification ends the tolling period.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **COMPLIANCE WITH TIME LIMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **SEARCH FEES.**—Section 552(a)(4)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(viii) An agency shall not assess search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II), duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency fails to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6), if no unusual or exceptional circumstances (as those terms are defined for purposes of paragraphs (6)(B) and (C), respectively) apply to the processing of the request.”.

(B) **PUBLIC LIAISON.**—Section 552(a)(6)(B)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “To aid the requester, each agency shall make available its FOIA Public Liaison, who shall assist in the resolution of any disputes between the requester and the agency.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and apply to requests for information under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, filed on or after that effective date.

**SEC. 7. INDIVIDUALIZED TRACKING NUMBERS FOR REQUESTS AND STATUS INFORMATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) Each agency shall—

“(A) establish a system to assign an individualized tracking number for each request received that will take longer than ten days to process and provide to each person making a request the tracking number assigned to the request; and

“(B) establish a telephone line or Internet service that provides information about the status of a request to the person making the request using the assigned tracking number, including—

“(i) the date on which the agency originally received the request; and

“(ii) an estimated date on which the agency will complete action on the request.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and apply to requests for information under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, filed on or after that effective date.

**SEC. 8. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 552(e)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting after the first comma “the number of occasions on which each statute was relied upon.”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and average” after “median”;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by inserting before the semicolon “, based on the date on which the requests were received by the agency”;

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (N) and (O), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) the average number of days for the agency to respond to a request beginning on the date on which the request was received by the agency, the median number of days for the agency to respond to such requests, and the range in number of days for the agency to respond to such requests;

“(G) based on the number of business days that have elapsed since each request was originally received by the agency—

“(i) the number of requests for records to which the agency has responded with a determination within a period up to and including 20 days, and in 20-day increments up to and including 200 days;

“(ii) the number of requests for records to which the agency has responded with a determination within a period greater than 200 days and less than 301 days;

“(iii) the number of requests for records to which the agency has responded with a determination within a period greater than 300 days and less than 401 days; and

“(iv) the number of requests for records to which the agency has responded with a determination within a period greater than 400 days;

“(H) the average number of days for the agency to provide the granted information beginning on the date on which the request was originally filed, the median number of days for the agency to provide the granted information, and the range in number of days for the agency to provide the granted information;

“(I) the median and average number of days for the agency to respond to administrative appeals based on the date on which the appeals originally were received by the agency, the highest number of business days taken by the agency to respond to an administrative appeal, and the lowest number of business days taken by the agency to respond to an administrative appeal;

“(J) data on the 10 active requests with the earliest filing dates pending at each agency, including the amount of time that has elapsed since each request was originally received by the agency;

“(K) data on the 10 active administrative appeals with the earliest filing dates pending before the agency as of September 30 of the preceding year, including the number of business days that have elapsed since the requests were originally received by the agency;

“(L) the number of expedited review requests that are granted and denied, the average and median number of days for adjudicating expedited review requests, and the number adjudicated within the required 10 days;

“(M) the number of fee waiver requests that are granted and denied, and the average and median number of days for adjudicating fee waiver determinations.”;

(b) **APPLICABILITY TO AGENCY AND EACH PRINCIPAL COMPONENT OF THE AGENCY.**—Section 552(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Information in each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be expressed in terms of each principal component of the agency and for the agency overall.”.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—Section 552(e)(3) of title 5, United States Code, (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended by adding at the end “In addition, each agency shall make the raw statistical data used in its reports available electronically to the public upon request.”.

**SEC. 9. OPENNESS OF AGENCY RECORDS MAINTAINED BY A PRIVATE ENTITY.**

Section 552(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) ‘record’ and any other term used in this section in reference to information includes—

“(A) any information that would be an agency record subject to the requirements of this section when maintained by an agency in any format, including an electronic format; and

“(B) any information described under subparagraph (A) that is maintained for an agency by an entity under Government contract, for the purposes of records management.”.

**SEC. 10. OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SERVICES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h)(1) There is established the Office of Government Information Services within the National Archives and Records Administration.

“(2) The Office of Government Information Services shall—

“(A) review policies and procedures of administrative agencies under this section;

“(B) review compliance with this section by administrative agencies; and

“(C) recommend policy changes to Congress and the President to improve the administration of this section.

“(3) The Office of Government Information Services shall offer mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making requests under this section and administrative agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation and, at the discretion of the Office, may issue advisory opinions if mediation has not resolved the dispute.

“(i) The Government Accountability Office shall conduct audits of administrative agencies on the implementation of this section and issue reports detailing the results of such audits.

“(j) Each agency shall designate a Chief FOIA Officer who shall be a senior official of such agency (at the Assistant Secretary or equivalent level).

“(k) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall, subject to the authority of the head of the agency—

“(1) have agency-wide responsibility for efficient and appropriate compliance with this section;

“(2) monitor implementation of this section throughout the agency and keep the head of the agency, the chief legal officer of the agency, and the Attorney General appropriately informed of the agency’s performance in implementing this section;

“(3) recommend to the head of the agency such adjustments to agency practices, policies, personnel, and funding as may be necessary to improve its implementation of this section;

“(4) review and report to the Attorney General, through the head of the agency, at such times and in such formats as the Attorney General may direct, on the agency’s performance in implementing this section;

“(5) facilitate public understanding of the purposes of the statutory exemptions of this section by including concise descriptions of the exemptions in both the agency’s handbook issued under subsection (g), and the agency’s annual report on this section, and by providing an overview, where appropriate, of certain general categories of agency records to which those exemptions apply; and

“(6) designate one or more FOIA Public Liaisons.

“(1) FOIA Public Liaisons shall report to the agency Chief FOIA Officer and shall serve as supervisory officials to whom a requester under this section can raise concerns about the service the requester has received from the FOIA Requester Center, following an initial response from the FOIA Requester Center Staff. FOIA Public Liaisons shall be responsible for assisting in reducing delays, increasing transparency and understanding of the status of requests, and assisting in the resolution of disputes.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 11. REPORT ON PERSONNEL POLICIES RELATED TO FOIA.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to Congress a report that examines—

(1) whether changes to executive branch personnel policies could be made that would—

(A) provide greater encouragement to all Federal employees to fulfill their duties under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) enhance the stature of officials administering that section within the executive branch;

(2) whether performance of compliance with section 552 of title 5, United States Code, should be included as a factor in personnel performance evaluations for any or all categories of Federal employees and officers;

(3) whether an employment classification series specific to compliance with sections 552 and 552a of title 5, United States Code, should be established;

(4) whether the highest level officials in particular agencies administering such sections should be paid at a rate of pay equal to or greater than a particular minimum rate; and

(5) whether other changes to personnel policies can be made to ensure that there is a clear career advancement track for individuals interested in devoting themselves to a career in compliance with such sections; and

(6) whether the executive branch should require any or all categories of Federal employees to undertake awareness training of such sections.

**SEC. 12. REQUIREMENT TO DESCRIBE EXEMPTIONS AUTHORIZING DELETIONS OF MATERIAL PROVIDED UNDER FOIA.**

Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter after paragraph (9)—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting after “amount of information deleted” the following: “, and the exemption under which the deletion is made.”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by inserting after “amount of the information deleted” the following: “, and the exemption under which the deletion is made.”.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am pleased that, once again, the Senate has reaffirmed its bipartisan commitment to open and transparent government by unanimously passing the

Openness Promotes Effectiveness in our National Government Act, the “OPEN Government Act—the first major reform to the Freedom of Information Act, “FOIA”, in more than a decade. I commend the bill’s chief Republican cosponsor, Senator JOHN CORNYN, for his commitment and dedication to passing FOIA reform legislation this year. I am also appreciative of the efforts of Senator JON KYL for co-sponsoring this bill and helping us to reach a compromise on this legislation, so that the Senate could consider and pass meaningful FOIA reform legislation this year.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed this historic FOIA reform legislation, S. 849, before adjourning for the August recess. Now that the Senate has unanimously passed a modified bill, to ensure that “pay/go” and other concerns of the House are adequately addressed, I hope that the House will promptly enact this bill and send it to the President without further delay.

I have worked very hard to address the concerns of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, to ensure that the Congress can enact meaningful FOIA reform legislation this year. I commend Congressman WAXMAN, the distinguished Chairman of that Committee, for his commitment to FOIA reform and I thank him and his staff for all of their hard work on this legislation.

The bill that the Senate passed today includes “pay/go” language that has been requested by the House and it also eliminates a provision on citations to FOIA exemptions in legislation that was in the previous bill. To accommodate other concerns of the House, the bill also includes a new provision that requires Federal agencies to disclose the FOIA exemptions that they rely upon when redacting information from documents released under FOIA. In addition, the bill adds FOIA duplication fees for noncommercial requesters, including the media, to the fee waiver penalty that will be imposed when an agency fails to meet the 20-day statutory clock under FOIA. While I will continue to work with the House and others to further strengthen this critical open government law, I hope that the House will promptly take up the bipartisan FOIA compromise bill that we have been able to pass so that it may be signed into law before the end of the year.

As the first major reform to FOIA in more than a decade, the OPEN Government Act will help to reverse the troubling trends of excessive delays and lax FOIA compliance in our government and help to restore the public’s trust in their government. This bill will also improve transparency in the Federal Government’s FOIA process by restoring meaningful deadlines for agency action under FOIA; imposing real consequences on federal agencies for missing FOIA’s 20-day statutory deadline; clarifying that FOIA applies to Government records held by outside private

contractors; establishing a FOIA hotline service for all Federal agencies; and creating a FOIA Ombudsman to provide FOIA requestors and, federal agencies with a meaningful alternative to costly litigation.

Specifically, the OPEN Government Act will protect the public's right to know, by ensuring that anyone who gathers information to inform the public, including freelance journalists and bloggers, may seek a fee waiver when they request information under FOIA. The bill ensures that Federal agencies will not automatically exclude Internet blogs and other Web-based forms of media when deciding whether to waive FOIA fees. In addition, the bill also clarifies that the definition of news media, for purposes of FOIA fee waivers, includes free newspapers and individuals performing a media function who do not necessarily have a prior history of publication.

The bill also restores meaningful deadlines for agency action, by ensuring that the 20-day statutory clock under FOIA starts when a request is received by the appropriate component of the agency and requiring that agency FOIA offices get FOIA requests to the appropriate agency component within 10 days of the receipt of such requests. To ensure accuracy in FOIA responses, the bill allows federal agencies to toll the 20-day clock while they are awaiting a response to a reasonable request for information from a FOIA requester on one occasion, or while the agency is awaiting clarification regarding a FOIA fee assessment. In addition, to encourage agencies to meet the 20-day time limit the bill requires that an agency refund FOIA search fees—and duplication fees for noncommercial requestors—if it fails to meet the 20-day deadline, except in the case of exceptional circumstances as defined by the FOIA statute.

The bill also addresses a relatively new concern that, under current law, Federal agencies have an incentive to delay compliance with FOIA requests until just before a court decision is made that is favorable to a FOIA requestor. The Supreme Court's decision in *Buckhannon Board and Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Dep't of Health and Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598, 2001, eliminated the "catalyst theory" for attorneys' fees recovery under certain federal civil rights laws. When applied to FOIA cases, Buckhannon precludes FOIA requesters from ever being eligible to recover attorneys fees under circumstances where an agency provides the records requested in the litigation just prior to a court decision that would have been favorable to the FOIA requestor. The bill clarifies that Buckhannon does not apply to FOIA cases. Under the bill, a FOIA requester can obtain attorneys' fees when he or she files a lawsuit to obtain records from the Government and the Government releases those records before the court orders them to do so. But, this provision would not allow the re-

quester to recover attorneys' fees if the requester's claim is wholly insubstantial. To address House "pay/go" concerns, the bill also requires that any attorneys' fees assessed under this provision be paid from any annually appropriated agency funds.

To address concerns about the growing costs of FOIA litigation, the bill also creates an Office of Government Information Services in the National Archives and creates an ombudsman to mediate agency-level FOIA disputes. In addition the bill ensures that each federal agency will appoint a Chief FOIA Officer, who will monitor the agency's compliance with FOIA requests, and a FOIA Public Liaison who will be available to resolve FOIA related disputes.

Finally, the bill does several things to enhance the agency reporting and tracking requirements under FOIA. The bill creates a tracking system for FOIA requests to assist members of the public and the media. The bill also establishes a FOIA hotline service for all Federal agencies, either by telephone or on the Internet, to enable requestors to track the status of their FOIA requests. The bill also clarifies that FOIA applies to agency records that are held by outside private contractors, no matter where these records are located.

The Freedom of Information Act is an essential tool to ensure that all Americans can access information about the workings of their government. But, after four decades, this open government law needs to be strengthened. I am pleased that the reforms contained in the OPEN Government Act will ensure that FOIA is reinvigorated—so that it works more effectively for the American people.

Again, I commend Senators CORNYN and KYL and the many other cosponsors of this legislation for their dedication to open government. But, most importantly, I especially want to thank the many concerned citizens who, knowing the importance of this measure to the American people's right to know, have demanded action on this bill. This bill is endorsed by more than 115 business, public interest, and news organizations from across the political and ideological spectrum, including the American Library Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, OpenTheGovernment.org, Public Citizen, the Republican Liberty Caucus, the Sunshine in Government Initiative and the Vermont Press Association. The invaluable support of these and many other organizations is what led the opponents of this bill to come around and support this legislation.

By passing this important FOIA reform legislation, the Senate has reaffirmed the principle that open government is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. But, rather, it is an American issue and an American value. I strongly encourage the House of Representatives, which overwhelmingly passed a similar measure earlier this year, to promptly take up and enact this bill before adjourning for the year.

RELATIVE TO THE HANGING OF NOOSES FOR THE PURPOSE OF INTIMIDATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 543, S. Res. 396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 396) expressing the sense of the Senate that the hanging of nooses for the purpose of intimidation should be thoroughly investigated by Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities and that any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title, as follows:

[Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.]

[Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.]

S. RES. 396

Whereas, in the fall of 2007, nooses have been found hanging in or near a high school in North Carolina, a Home Depot store in New Jersey, a school playground in Louisiana, the campus of the University of Maryland, a factory in Houston, Texas, and on the door of a professor's office at Columbia University;

Whereas the Southern Poverty Law Center has recorded between 40 and 50 suspected hate crimes involving nooses since September 2007;

Whereas, since 2001, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has filed more than 30 lawsuits that involve the displaying of nooses in places of employment;

Whereas nooses are reviled by many Americans as symbols of racism and of lynchings that were once all too common;

Whereas, according to Tuskegee Institute, more than 4,700 people were lynched between 1882 and 1959 in a campaign of terror led by the Ku Klux Klan;

Whereas the number of victims killed by lynching in the history of the United States exceeds the number of people killed in the horrible attack on Pearl Harbor (2,333 dead) and Hurricane Katrina (1,836 dead) combined; and

Whereas African-Americans, as well as Italian, Jewish, and Mexican-Americans, have comprised the vast majority of lynching victims, and only when we erase the terrible symbols of the past can we finally begin to move forward on issues of race in the United States: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas, in the fall of 2007, nooses have been found hanging in or near a high school in North Carolina, a Home Depot store in New Jersey, a school playground in Louisiana, the campus of the University of Maryland, a factory in Houston, Texas, and on the door of a professor's office at Columbia University;

Whereas the Southern Poverty Law Center has recorded between 40 and 50 suspected hate crimes involving nooses since September 2007;

Whereas, since 2001, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has filed more than 30 lawsuits that involve the displaying of nooses in places of employment;

Whereas nooses are reviled by many Americans as symbols of racism and of lynchings that were once all too common;

Whereas, according to Tuskegee Institute, more than 4,700 people were lynched between