

advocate for Vermont's waters. He serves on the Lake Champlain Basin Program Steering Committee and as chair of its executive committee, bringing the States of Vermont and New York and the Province of Quebec together to work for a clean, healthy lake. He also serves on the Lake Memphremagog Steering Committee, working with the Province of Quebec to protect and enhance that international water.

Canute received his bachelors degree from Columbia University in New York City and served in the 101st Airborne Division in the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War. He and his wife Diane have two sons, Layton and Canute. He is a longtime resident of Stowe, VT, and is a past president of Stowe Youth Hockey and chair of the Stowe Recreation Commission.

Canute Dalmasse is a tribute to his State, his community, and to protecting Vermont's natural environment. The great State of Vermont, with its celebrated natural beauty and well-deserved reputation for exemplary environmental stewardship, honors Canute's dedication, devotion, and hard work that helped set the course for Vermont's environmental future. It is an honor and a privilege to recognize Canute today in the U.S. Senate.

#### TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to speak to legislation to fight a discrepancy in access to care that prevents hundreds of our Nation's heroes from receiving the best possible care for traumatic brain injury.

Traumatic brain injury has been identified as the "signature injury" afflicting armed servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. After sacrificing so much, we have a moral obligation to ensure that these men and women receive the best care available to them. Unfortunately, administrative and medical capacity problems have prevented many of our heroes from receiving the care they desperately need and deserve. There is an immediate solution to address this.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has made clear progress in research and development of rehabilitation treatment for individuals who have incurred traumatic brain injuries. However, VA medical facilities have not yet reached the level of private rehabilitation facilities, which have been developing cognitive treatment for the past 30 years.

While VA medical centers offer excellent services, there are barriers to receiving the optimal health care options. These include a confusing array of benefits, overworked and under-trained case managers, and, most importantly, a discrepancy between benefits for those on active duty versus those who are medically retired. This discrepancy in benefits leads to confusion among families who are forced to try to determine what is in the best in-

terest of the servicemember, often without having full knowledge of the difference in benefits offered to Active Duty and veterans. Currently, the TRICARE plan that is available to Active Duty servicemembers permits them to receive coverage for cognitive therapy obtained in private non-military facilities. However, medical retirees do not have this health care coverage option. Consequently, severely injured TBI patients struggle to obtain the critical care they desperately need.

Further, while many armed servicemembers have dedicated family members and loved ones who fight to ensure that they receive the best care possible, not all servicemembers have family to speak and act on their behalf. Thus, many are left without optimal treatment and without an advocate.

The need to ensure that every TBI patient receives the best care possible cannot be understated. This is an immediate problem with an immediate solution. We have the ability to provide a crucial, temporary answer to our armed services members while the VA develops the capability to facilitate care for this unique population. We can not stand idly by, as hundreds of our bravest Americans are prevented from receiving the care they deserve.

#### HONORING PASTOR RHIO CLEIGH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I take a few minutes to honor a great man of faith. Pastor Rhio Cleigh dedicated the past 25 years to serving his community through the church. The last 15 of those years have been at my home church—Prairie Lakes Church in Cedar Falls, IA.

The work of a pastor is not always easy but, much like my work, it is very rewarding. As a minister in our church, Rhio was responsible for counseling individuals through difficult times, visiting the sick in the hospital, and ministering to the senior citizens of our congregation.

This Sunday our membership will honor Pastor Cleigh as he retires from the ministry. Rhio plans to spend his retirement enjoying time with his wife Patti, his 6 children, 10 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandchild. He also hopes to have a little more time for some of his hobbies—things like woodworking, camping, fishing, and gardening.

Barbara joins me in sincere appreciation to Rhio for his contributions to our church and community. Together we wish him a long and happy retirement.

#### U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AGENDA

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a sense-of-the-Congress amendment my good friend and colleague Senator INHOFE has just submitted regarding Presidential authority over setting American foreign policy. Like all of my colleagues, I have the right to visit foreign countries in

my capacity as a Member of Congress. However, the Constitution is quite clear about the separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of our government, and the executive branch has the exclusive authority to conduct negotiations with foreign countries.

As we all know, the Logan Act prohibits American citizens from negotiating with foreign governments without the authority of the United States. What would it mean if a Member of the House or Senate, and especially a member of the leadership, was to visit a foreign country and in discussions with their government, explicitly speak out against our Nation's foreign policy agenda? High ranking Members of Congress, I believe, are seen by foreign governments as carrying an official message of foreign policy, and if such members contradict the administration, it can be very damaging to our country politically and diplomatically.

Members of Congress have the ability to express their dissent from the floor of their respective Chambers, but under no circumstances should Members visit with foreign governments for the sole purpose of demonstrating their opposition to the administration's foreign policy. Such actions would show a sincere lack of respect for the boundaries drawn out by our Constitution, and I would hope that all Members of Congress will use good judgment when visiting with foreign governments in the future.

It is a very dangerous precedent to set if Members of Congress decide to buck the American foreign policy agenda and carry mixed messages to foreign governments, especially foreign governments hostile to our country. While I will continue to support congressional rights to travel abroad and meet with government officials, there is a responsibility that comes along with those visits, and that responsibility is to uphold and support the administration's foreign policy agenda.

For this reason I have joined my colleague Senator INHOFE in submitting this amendment. I believe it sends a clear and strong message that Members of Congress have the responsibility to defer to and support the administration on setting our Nation's foreign policy agenda, and under no circumstances should Members blatantly defy our administration for purely political gain.

#### REAL ID ACT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today my home State of Montana becomes the fourth State in the Nation to declare its opposition to the REAL ID Act by enacting binding legislation that opts Montana out of REAL ID. With it, my State is opting out of the onerous regulation, blatant invasion of privacy, and the high cost of compliance that will come from implementing REAL ID.

I congratulate my Governor, Brian Schweitzer, and both houses of the

Montana State Legislature. Both houses of the legislature approved this legislation unanimously. Thirteen other States have anti-REAL ID legislation that has passed one of the houses of the legislature. In Montana and the rest of these States, opposition to this poorly constructed law is bipartisan.

That is why I am pleased to once again offer my support for the Identification Security Enhancement Act, introduced by Senator AKAKA and Senator SUNUNU—another bipartisan show of opposition to the REAL ID Act.

Why is there so much opposition to REAL ID beyond the beltway? It comes down to three reasons. First, the REAL ID Act puts massive new Federal regulations on the States. From new databases and fraud monitoring, to new network and data storage capacity, the States will be tasked with an enormous range of new regulations and requirements. Once REAL ID becomes effective, every State's Department of Motor Vehicles will have to play immigration official by reconciling discrepancies in social security numbers with the Social Security Administration. DMVs will have to require proof of "legal presence" in the United States from immigrants.

I am for a strong immigration policy. I believe we ought to enforce our borders and enforce the laws we have on the books. But it is completely unreasonable for the Federal Government to put that job on the Montana Department of Motor Vehicles, or any other State's DMV.

And these new regulations carry with them a hefty pricetag. DHS now estimates that Real ID will cost the states and their taxpayers \$23.1 billion.

Finally, REAL ID raises some very real privacy concerns. Data mining and data theft have become all too common phrases for too many Americans who resent having their personal information collected by the government, or worse, having it stolen from the government. We all recall the massive potential problems that arose from the theft of personal data from the VA last year. I have no doubt that the databases called for in REAL ID will be an even greater target for data thieves.

We can do better than REAL ID. Senator AKAKA's legislation shows that. Today, Montana adds its voice to those calling for the Federal Government to go back to the drawing board. Let's listen to what Montana has to say.

#### PAYOLA SETTLEMENT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to briefly comment on an important settlement that has been recently announced by the Federal Communications Commission, FCC.

Four major radio station groups, Clear Channel, Entercom, Citadel, and CBS Radio, have taken an important first step in cleaning up the radio industry through today's consent decree with the FCC and side agreement with

the independent music community on airplay and rules of engagement. I want to especially commend Commissioner Adelstein for his tireless work to bring these groups together and then-Attorney General Spitzer for spearheading the initial investigation that has led to State and now Federal settlements.

I was encouraged to see internal business reforms, increased recordkeeping for transactions between labels and radio stations and unfettered access to these records by the FCC as part of the consent decrees. While these provisions are not as broad as those included in my previous payola legislation, the increased recordkeeping and disclosure in the consent decrees represent a step in the right direction. Transparency and accountability through sustained oversight will go a long way in eliminating the pervasive shadowy practices that have plagued the radio industry on and off almost since its inception.

While the parties to the consent decrees do not directly admit wrongdoing, the payment of \$12.5 million to the U.S. Treasury from the four station groups is an implicit acknowledgement that the evidence uncovered by then-Attorney General Eliot Spitzer showed that significant abuses had taken place. From all accounts, the stations also deserve some credit for working in good faith with the FCC and the independent music community to work toward a solution that did more than just put this matter behind them. The internal reforms and side agreement negotiated with the American Association of Independent Music, AZIM, appear to show a real desire to change and include the voices of local, unsigned and independent musicians that have unfortunately been missing more often than not from our public airwaves over the past decade or more.

I am pleased by the voluntary side agreement by the radio station groups to provide more airtime and fair rules of engagement. These rules of engagement require nondiscriminatory treatment for labels and musicians seeking to be played at the stations and echo requirements from my previous payola legislation. I am heartened that these major radio station groups have apparently come to the realization that the old system wasn't working and that it was in their best interest to make it easier for small labels and local musicians to be heard. With more and more musicians being successful without or with limited radio airplay—just look at the commercial and critical success of the Dixie Chicks' last album—I hope radio stations are realizing they must change and play what their potential listeners want to hear in order to remain relevant. I hope this important commitment by four station groups will be replicated throughout the rest of the radio industry.

I have a few lingering concerns that both the consent decrees and side agreement depend heavily on continued good faith instead of strong en-

forceable standards. I have no reason to believe that the potential good from these agreements will not be fulfilled, but we can't allow backsliding, especially after the 3-year term of the decrees expires. This means that the FCC will need to maintain vigorous and continued oversight. I urge the FCC to take the next step of building on this first wave of settlements and reaching agreements or taking enforcement action against the other stations implicated by the Spitzer investigation.

#### TAX RELIEF

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a posting by someone under the name "Blue Bunting" made to the Care2 News Network be printed in the RECORD. This posting is a supplement to a speech I gave last Thursday, April 12, on attempts by some Democrats to elude responsibility for tax relief permanence.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Care2 News Network]

THE MONSTER REPUBLICAN TAX HIKE  
COMMENTS

Blue Bunting: Tuesday April 3, 2007, 8:32 pm

Last week I made a note to link to this post at Obsidian Wings. I just spotted the note.

Hilzoy notes the commentary in some quarters that:

Following the example set by their Senate brethren last Friday, House Democrats will adopt a budget resolution containing the largest tax increase in U.S. history amid massive national inattention.

Bet you didn't know that, eh? The Dems are already pushing through the largest tax increase in U.S. history! and nobody is paying attention!

Anyway, Hilzoy digs a bit further into the story. It really is worth reading.

Long story short . . . Republican Congresses chose not to make their tax cuts (or, as PGL would note, their tax deferments) permanent. They didn't have to put in a sunset clause—they chose to, in an attempt to make long term projections look better. Even with that obfuscation, the situation no longer looks quite so rosy. But . . . if the new Democratic Congress doesn't do what the Republican Congresses that preceded it failed to do, namely make the tax cut permanent, well, that's the equivalent of the Democrats pushing the largest tax increase in history.

Maybe it's just me . . . but since this whole thing was planned and executed by a Republican Congress under a Republican President, shouldn't we be referring to this as the Republican's tax increase? And my bet is that there are a lot of Republicans in Congress now, and that will be seeking re-election some time soon, that voted for this massive tax increase.

Blue Bunting: Tuesday April 3, 2007, 9:07 pm

Fact Check

Robert Novak wrote this in today's Washington Post:

"Following the example set by their Senate brethren last Friday, House Democrats will adopt a budget resolution containing the largest tax increase in U.S. history amid massive national inattention.

Nobody's tax payment will increase immediately, but the budget resolutions set a pattern for years ahead. The House version