

However, not a single colleague on the other side of the aisle voted in its favor. Repealing the AMT would put lawmakers on notice to either trim Federal spending by a like amount or be transparent about the revenue base.

On the House side, we hear that the Ways and Means Committee is doing a lot of talking about the AMT, but they have yet to move to action. We are forced to wonder what their plans may be. To do that, we need only read what they have been saying and think through the conclusions on such proposals.

It has been reported that some in the other body—the majority party, the Democrats—plan to exempt everybody who earns less than \$250,000 a year from the AMT. It sounds to me as if they might be on the right track to full repeal when I hear that. However, we need to follow through on what exactly they would do if they insist on providing pay-fors to cover the lost revenue under the new pay-go rules that are being adopted.

One option is reportedly being floated on the House side which is to pay for a \$250,000 AMT exclusion by raising the top marginal income tax rate. Well, we have found some shocking numbers when we examine that issue further. In order to exempt folks who earn less than \$250,000 from the AMT, if you insist on raising taxes to offset it, you would have to raise the top marginal tax rate to over 46 percent.

Now, we have a chart showing the top marginal tax rate. Back in the 1970s, it was 70 percent, and it gradually went down to a low of 28 percent. Now it is back at 35 percent, and the red mark would have the highest marginal tax rates that we have had since 1980. I will take a few minutes to put that regular income tax rate into a historical perspective.

In 1913, when less than 1 percent of the population was subject to the income tax, the rate ranged from 1 percent to 7 percent. Rates increased significantly during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, up to a top marginal tax rate of over 90 percent. The concept of deduction for home mortgages, interest, charitable contributions, State and local taxes, to name a few, became ingrained in the code during that period of stifling high tax rates.

During the President Kennedy administration, tax rates were reduced from 91 percent to 70 percent on the highest income levels, and rates fell again during the Reagan administration, first from 70 percent to 50 percent, and then again the top marginal tax rate was 28 percent by the 1986 Tax Act. The top rate now stands at 35 percent.

It is important to remember that when we look at those historical rates, the tax base was narrower prior to 1986 than it is today. Many phaseout and phasein concepts took hold in 1986, such as PEP and Pease limits. Today, substantially all individual tax incentives are phased out and capped, and

the result of this base broadening is that if the Tax Code were to approach a tax rate similar to the highest marginal rate under the more narrow pre-1986 tax base, it would result in substantially higher effective tax rates than in the pre-1986 tax rates. A marginal regular income tax rate of over 46 percent may actually exceed the top effective rate that was in place before 1986 because of the increase in the tax base.

Another option that may be working its way through the mill on the House side is to pay for that exemption by raising the top alternative minimum tax rate. Again, with that option, the tax rate increase is staggering. The top AMT rate would go up to nearly 37 percent.

There is a popular misconception that Congress can sit on its hands on tax policy before the next election and that there will be no tax increase until 2011. While that view is comforting, it is uninformed. Just enacting the alternative minimum tax patch for 2007 will cost over \$50 billion. That also means that without doing the patch, Americans then will pay the \$50 billion higher alternative minimum tax, and it is coming from middle-income taxpayers who were never intended to be taxed when the alternative minimum tax was put in place back in 1969. So we must act to prevent such an unfair tax increase.

The folks who voted against my amendment to take the AMT revenue off the table for the tax and spenders have some real explaining to do soon. It is possible that they will do nothing on the tax side. The result is a \$50 billion tax increase on families, middle-income-tax families, who are going to be subject to the AMT for the first time and are subject to it right now, or they may propose some sort of exemption or relief that is paid for by other tax increases and face the music on proposing a massive tax increase on the neighbors of those who have been paying the AMT, or perhaps they may provide AMT relief but fiddle away the money in the budget anyway and increase the deficit.

I suggest that the tax and spenders consider learning to hum a different tune and spend within their means soon or folks may just figure out that they planned to raise their tax rates all along. So the sad reality is that while it is the new congressional majority that needs to face the music, it is likely to be the American taxpayers who will end up singing the blues.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1495, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1065

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1065.

It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 1065.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, May 10, 2007, under "Text of Amendments.")

AMENDMENT NO. 1086 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1065

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I see my leader is here, but before he starts, I wish to also call up the Feingold amendment No. 1086, and ask that be brought up and laid aside and considered as read.

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

The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 1086 to amendment No. 1065.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Friday, May 11, 2007, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mrs. BOXER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1097

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the manager of the bill, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the distinguished Senator from California, allowing me to obtain the floor.

We all know 2 weeks ago President Bush vetoed the supplemental appropriations bill, a bill to fully fund the troops in Iraq and change the course of

that conflict in Iraq. Late last week, the House sent a new bill to the Senate. We received that within the past hour. The ball is now in our court, the Senate's court. Democrats and Republicans agree the Senate needs to get a bill in conference as soon as possible and we need to work together to make that happen.

I have had a number of conversations with Senator McCONNELL the last several days. I spoke to him earlier today at some length. As much as we all recognize how badly we need to get a bill to conference, we have not, on this side of the aisle, lost sight of the fact that the American people have concluded the President's Iraq policy has failed and we are now demanding a new way forward on behalf of the American people.

In an effort to ensure quick Senate passage of our conference vehicle later this week, as well as to give Senators an opportunity to express their views on the President's Iraq policy, I will offer two important amendments. The first amendment is Feingold-Reid, to safely redeploy United States troops from Iraq by March 31 of next year, and transition the mission to fighting al-Qaida and other terrorist organizations, providing security for United States infrastructure and personnel, and training Iraqi forces.

Of course, after the 1st of April of next year, our troops will be in Iraq for counterterrorism, force protection—that is to protect American assets in Iraq—and to help train the Iraqis.

I will also offer a Levin-Reid amendment which is consistent with the bipartisan legislation approved by Congress with one change: It permits the President to waive the timeline for redeployments. It has in it some things some Members want very badly, including the Presiding Officer, to deal with how our troops are taken care of, how often they have to go back to battle, how much time they have to have before being returned to the battlefield after having been deployed. We will have votes on these two amendments at the earliest possible date. I will work with the distinguished Republican leader to see when that will happen. These votes represent an opportunity for the Senate to shape the important conference we hope will begin this week upon passage of the Senate version of the supplemental.

There is probably no end of amendments that could be offered, as I have here today, but on our side of the aisle, Democrats believe we should do something very close to what was done in the bill we sent to the President which he vetoed.

Basically that is what we have here—except getting the President the ability to waive the timelines we have in the legislation.

Finally, there are those on this side who believe there should be some end in sight. That is why I indicated that as of April 1 of next year, the funding would still go on but it would be lim-

ited to the counterterrorism, force protection, and training Iraqis.

It is very important to understand that transitioning this mission to fighting al-Qaida is a part of the recognition of what we and the American people believe is important. At present, as you know, American troops are over there protecting the Shias, protecting the Sunnis, protecting the Kurds, and at all times all these different elements are shooting at the Americans. We should limit our focus to al-Qaida.

Mr. President, I call up the Levin-Reid amendment first.

That is No. 1097.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. LEVIN, for himself and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1097 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1065.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1097

SEC. 1. MILITARY READINESS—MISSION CAPABLE UNITS.

(a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that units should not be deployed for combat unless they are rated "fully mission capable".

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services at least 15 days in advance of the deployment that the unit is fully mission capable.

(c) For purposes of subsection (b), the term "fully mission capable" means capable of performing assigned mission essential tasks to prescribed standards under the conditions expected in the theater of operations, consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Department of Defense readiness reporting system.

(d) The President may waive the limitation prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that he has authorized the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's deployment is necessary despite the chief of the military department's assessment that the unit is not fully mission capable.

SEC. 2. MILITARY READINESS—DURATION OF TOURS OF DUTY IN IRAQ.

(a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard units should not be deployed for combat beyond 365 days or that Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve units should not be deployed for combat beyond 210 days.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to initiate the development of, continue the development of, or execute any order that has the effect of extending the deployment for Operation Iraqi Freedom of—

(1) any unit of the Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard beyond 365 days; or

(2) any unit of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve beyond 210 days.

(c) The President may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that he has authorized the extension of a unit's deployment in Iraq beyond the periods specified in subsection (b) and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's extended deployment is necessary.

SEC. 3. MILITARY READINESS—MULTIPLE DEPLOYMENTS.

(a) Congress finds that it is Defense Department policy that Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard units should not be redeployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within the previous 365 consecutive days or that Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve units should not be redeployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within the previous 210 days.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to initiate the development of, continue the development of, or execute any order that has the effect of deploying for Operation Iraqi Freedom of—

(1) any unit of the Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard if such unit has been deployed within the previous 365 consecutive days; or

(2) any unit of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve if such unit has been deployed within the previous 210 consecutive days.

(c) The President may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services that he has authorized the redeployment of a unit to Iraq in advance of the periods specified in subsection (b) and by submitting along with the certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's redeployment is necessary.

SEC. 4. BENCHMARKS.

(a) Beginning on July 15, 2007, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, after consultation with the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Commander U.S. Central Command, and Commander, Multi-National Forces Iraq, shall jointly submit to Congress a report describing and assessing in detail the progress made by the Government of Iraq in meeting each of the benchmarks set forth in subsection (1), the security objectives set forth in the President's revised strategy of January 10, 2007, and answering the questions posed in subsections (2) and (3).

(1) whether the Government of Iraq has:

(i) enacted a broadly accepted hydro-carbon law that equitably shares oil revenues among all Iraqis;

(ii) adopted legislation necessary for the conduct of provincial and local elections including setting a schedule to conduct provincial and local elections;

(iii) reformed current laws governing the de-Baathification process to allow for more equitable treatment of individuals affected by such laws;

(iv) amended the Constitution of Iraq consistent with the principles contained in Article 140 of such constitution, including, at a minimum, the submission of such amendments to the Iraqi Parliament for the protection of minority rights; and

(v) allocated and expended \$10,000,000,000 in Iraqi revenues for reconstruction projects,

including delivery of essential services, on an equitable basis.

(2) whether the Government of Iraq and United States Armed Forces has made substantial progress in reducing the level of sectarian violence in Iraq; and

(3) whether each battalion of the security forces of Iraq has achieved a level of combat proficiency such that it can conduct independent combat operations without support from Coalition forces in Iraq.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 75 percent of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other act for assistance for Iraq under the headings “Economic Support Fund” and “International Narcotics and Law Enforcement” shall be withheld from obligation until the President certifies to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress towards meeting each of the benchmarks set forth in subsection (a)(1).

(c) The requirement to withhold funds from obligation pursuant to subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to funds made available under the heading “Economic Support Fund” for continued support for the Community Action Program and the Community Stabilization Program in Iraq administered by the United States Agency for International Development, or for programs and activities to promote democracy and human rights in Iraq.

SEC. 5. REDUCTION OF FORCES.

(a) Subject to the waiver authority provided for in subsection (e), the Secretary of Defense shall commence the reduction of the number of United States Armed Forces in Iraq not later than October 1, 2007, with a goal of completing such reduction within 180 days. The goal of completing such reduction shall be accelerated if the President is unable to report that the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress towards meeting each of the benchmarks set forth in subsection (a)(1) of Section 4 by October 15, 2007.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act are available for obligation and expenditure to plan and execute a safe and orderly reduction of the Armed Forces in Iraq.

(c) The reduction of forces required by this section shall be implemented as part of a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq’s neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq.

(d) After the conclusion of the reduction required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may not deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq for any purpose other than the following:

(1) Protecting American diplomatic facilities and American citizens, including members of the U.S. armed forces;

(2) Serving in roles consistent with customary diplomatic positions;

(3) Engaging in targeted actions against members of al-Qaeda and allied parties and other terrorist organizations with global reach; and

(4) Training and equipping members of the Iraqi Security Forces.

(e) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the reduction of forces requirements of this section if he submits to Congress a written certification setting forth a detailed justification for the waiver, which shall include a detailed report describing the actions

being taken by the United States to bring about the meeting of the benchmarks set forth in subsections (a)(1) of section ____ by the Iraqis. The certification shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(2) DURATION.—The Waiver under paragraph (1) shall be effective for 90 days beginning on the date of the submittal of the certification under that paragraph.

(3) RENEWAL.—A waiver under paragraph (1) may be renewed if, before the end of the expiration of the waiver under paragraph (2), the President submits to Congress before the end of the effective period of the waiver under paragraph (2) a certification meeting the requirements of this subsection. Any waiver so renewed may be further renewed as provided in this paragraph.

AMENDMENT NO. 1098 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1097

Mr. REID. I now ask the clerk report the Feingold-Reid amendment No. 1098.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. FEINGOLD, for himself and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1098 to amendment No. 1097.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(a) TRANSITION OF MISSION.—The President shall promptly transition the mission of United States forces in Iraq to the limited purposes set forth in subsection (d).

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF SAFE, PHASED REDEPLOYMENT FROM IRAQ.—The President shall commence the safe, phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq that are not essential to the limited purposes set forth in subsection (d). Such redeployment shall begin not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any provision of law may be obligated or expended to continue the deployment in Iraq of members of the United States Armed Forces after March 31, 2008.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR LIMITED PURPOSES.—The prohibition under subsection (c) shall not apply to the obligation or expenditure of funds for the limited purposes as follows:

(1) To conduct targeted operations, limited in duration and scope, against members of al Qaeda and other international terrorist organizations.

(2) To provide security for United States infrastructure and personnel.

(3) To train and equip Iraqi security services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on these amendments, I am a cosponsor of both.

I thank the manager very much. I hope she and Senator INHOFE can move the WRDA amendment along. It is an important piece of legislation for the whole country and it is way past due when we should have had this completed.

Mrs. BOXER. Before the leader leaves, I hope I can get the attention of the floor staff, to make sure—my understanding is you have now offered the amendments on Iraq to the underlying bill, but the text that is before us is clean of the Iraq amendments? I think it is a good thing to do because we can move on here with WRDA, as

the amendments were applied to the underlying text, not to the amendment we are working on.

I thank my colleague for thinking it through. I am proud he is with us in wanting to move this WRDA bill forward.

Let a message go out we are going to move this bill forward. One of the reasons I say to my friend, thank you—I don’t want to keep him here, I just want to thank him.

We have received a letter from the National Construction Alliance. It is the Laborers International Union of North America, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America.

The reason I am bringing this up is they are very strong supporters of WRDA. I think their letter lays out why, so I am actually going to read it so it goes into the RECORD at this point. It says:

Dear Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE: The National Construction Alliance, representing the three leading construction unions advocating for robust federal infrastructure investment, endorses the Senate version of the Water Resources Development Act reauthorization. This vital Federal infrastructure legislation should be considered and passed by the United States Senate. Our three constituent unions, the Laborers, Operating Engineers and the Carpenters, commend you both for your strong, bipartisan leadership on this legislation.

This gets to the heart of why Senator INHOFE and I and all on the committee believe so strongly about the bill.

The \$13.9 billion authorization of Corps of Engineers projects is an important and necessary step in addressing our country’s serious backlog of water projects. From harbor improvement to flood protection, to lock and dam construction, dredging and environmental infrastructure, your bill will immeasurably strengthen America’s water resources. As labor unions representing nearly one million skilled construction workers, we recognize that this WRDA reauthorization will create tens of thousands of good paying construction jobs.

We strongly urge the Senate to pass your legislation in an expeditious manner so that America’s critical water infrastructure needs can be addressed.

I say to the President—who is sitting in the chair today, as opposed to the President of the United States—he has so long been speaking about the problem of our loss of middle-class jobs. What is so important about this particular bill is that while we are doing things the Nation must have in order to grow and in order to protect itself from the ravages of Mother Nature, as we saw in Katrina—in the course of doing the right thing we are creating good jobs. It is a wonderful winner for everybody.

That is why we have more letters I want to share with colleagues. The American Society of Civil Engineers has added its voice to all these unions, to both Senator INHOFE and myself, saying they are very pleased with this bill, they are very pleased with the levee system fixes; they believe this is

overdue legislation and that it ensures we have learned the lessons from Hurricane Katrina. It "goes far toward protecting human life and property in flood-prone areas."

They ask us if the American Society of Civil Engineers can be of more assistance, please call them. We may, because we want everybody to weigh in here and help us.

We have a letter from the Audubon Society. You have heard from the business side, the union side, now the environmental side. They have a million members. They say, please, let's have prompt consideration of WRDA because it restores America's natural resources. It includes:

... Corps modernization provisions, including independent review of costly or controversial Corps projects and ensuring that mitigation for Corps projects is consistent with stricter State laws.

This refers to the Corps' formula in the last bill which is embedded in this bill.

Audubon also talks about:

... two crucial Everglades restoration projects—Indian River lagoon and Picayune Strand—that would mitigate harmful federal drainage projects, restore more than 160,000 acres of wetlands and significant estuarine habitat, and help secure Florida's tourism and outdoor recreation economy.

They also cite the upper Mississippi River restoration program, in its first 15-year increment, will preserve 105,000 acres of habitat; protect 35,000 acres of floodplain habitat in five States along the river.

The Coastal Louisiana restoration program will begin to reverse the devastating pattern of land loss, protecting important habitat for birds and fish and other wildlife as well as the region's economy and quality of life.

The bill permanently authorizes the Asian Carp Barrier to protect the Great Lakes from this looming threat. The Audubon Society, which is so well respected on both sides of the aisle, closes and says that ecosystem restoration projects for the Everglades, the Mississippi, Louisiana's coastal wetlands, and the Great Lakes are overdue, as is Corps modernization.

Then I will add to these letters, Mr. President, a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers. I mean, this is one of those bills that gets everybody's support. It is something that is important for everyone.

They say: On behalf of more than 14 million manufacturing employees in the U.S., they are thanking us for our leadership, and they are saying: Let's move forward with WRDA. It is important. They say that: America's water resources infrastructure needs to be reliable and productive.

They applaud our efforts and they say how vitally needed WRDA is, including the modernization of locks, harbors, canals, and other key infrastructure that is vital to America's competitiveness. They say: WRDA will authorize many of these needs. So that is the National Association of Manufacturers. So it goes on and on.

The Pacific Northwest Waterways Association has a similar letter that is very important to us. The American Farm Bureau. The American Farm Bureau has entered this, and they have written us saying it is a good bill, urging us to support WRDA, and they oppose any amendment that would hinder our progress in moving forward.

The corn growers of America, they have weighed in and they say: It is important. They have sent a letter to HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL, our leaders, saying we need to have this bill. They need to have efficient transportation networks and so on. This is a very important letter, I think. They say that continued development of our water resources in an environmentally sound manner will contribute mightily to our Nation's well-being.

Congress needs to act now to address issues such as environmental restoration, navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, water supply, irrigation, beach nourishment, and recreation.

So that is yet another letter. The American Public Works Association has sent us a letter. They have a similar message: With adequate dredging, our ports and waterways are the backbone of our transportation system, ensuring domestic and international trade opportunities and low-cost, environmentally sensitive goods movements. It goes on.

Now, I have already placed some of those letters in the RECORD, and I am going to do it again today because I think every day, as colleagues will look at the RECORD, they will see their importance.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mrs. BOXER. The reason I like to share these letters is that it shows the breadth of support this bill has. We know we come to the floor with a lot of legislation that is contentious, that is contentious between the parties, that is contentious with people throughout America, one group supports it. For example, the labor unions might but the bosses do not. This is a place where everybody comes together. I think that is very important.

So colleagues know what is happening today, you know we do not have votes today. But we are going to try to debate some amendments today. We have already debated the Feingold amendment, so that is ready to be voted on tomorrow. I understand that Senator COBURN is on his way over to offer at least the one—we are hoping three amendments. He can debate today, and then we can have votes on those as we agree between the sides. The way we have decided to handle this bill, because it has been such a delicate balance, is the following: We are working across party lines to come up with

amendments we can agree to. We have taken the amendments that have been submitted thus far, and we are sort of categorizing those amendments in what is easy for us to agree to, what is more difficult. We are going to try to work through the easier amendments, and the more contentious ones we will have to have votes.

Now, what we call the big four of the committee, the Chairman of the full committee, the Chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking members of both the full committee and the subcommittee, we have made an agreement that we will oppose all amendments. Why are we doing this? Believe me, that is not an easy thing for us to do. We feel we have worked so closely, in a bipartisan fashion, we want to keep this bill totally bipartisan. We are trying to keep the most contentious items out of the bill to make sure it gets to the President's desk and he signs it.

Now, the good news is we have a score on the bill. That means how much the bill is scored at. It is \$13.9 billion. It makes it lower than the House bill. This is very good news because we want to be fiscally responsible.

We also want to make sure all the projects in this bill meet certain criteria, that they have been studied, they have been looked at, that there is a fair cost share, unless there is an usual circumstance.

So Senator INHOFE has been very strong on conditions. I expect him to come to the floor very soon. He actually had a weekend trip to Iraq. I do appreciate the fact that he has gone and that he is going to be here, we believe, at about 3:30—as a matter of fact, in about 10 minutes—at which point I hope he will make some of his comments on this bill.

But the way we have set the bill up is we now have the committee substitute pending in the form of an amendment. Leader REID has sent forward two amendments, but they are not to the substitute bill, they are to the underlying bill about Iraq, as a way to expedite the consideration of the Iraq supplemental. He has done that with the knowledge of Senator MCCONNELL so there are no surprises here. We have discussed this with Senator FEINGOLD in terms of offering his amendment, which he already debated. That will be ready for a vote later. I hope we can set aside all these amendments and vote on them tomorrow morning at such time as the leader agrees.

At this point, since I think I have laid out the reason why we so much need this bill, after 7 long years of not having a WRDA bill, we so much need this bill, and we are so proud of the committee that they voted this bill out in a very harmonious way and that we are still working side by side, the majority and minority side, on crafting the amendments we need to push this over the finish line.

I look forward to the comments of Senator INHOFE. We also will, of course,

entertain the amendments of Senator TOM COBURN when he gets to the floor. I urge anybody else who wants to lay down amendments, please, you are absolutely welcome.

I understand Senator LANDRIEU would like the floor. So why don't I leave the floor with the understanding that if Senator INHOFE comes, would you wind down within 10 minutes so he can have the floor.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

PACIFIC NORTHWEST
WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION,
Portland, OR, May 10, 2007.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment
and Public Works, Washington, DC

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, DC

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOXER AND SENATOR INHOFE, We write to urge your support for the reauthorization of the Water Resources Development Act in 2007.

WRDA is fundamentally important to the economic health of our nation and particularly important to the states of Oregon, Washington, Idaho and California. Our region depends on international trade to a greater extent than any other region in the United States. In Washington state, one in four jobs are related to international trade. Cost-effective, efficient, and environmentally sound trade and transportation corridors are imperative to secure our place in the global economy. Delay in WRDA means exacerbated backlogs which will dull our competitive edge.

The Pacific Northwest Waterways Association (PNWA) membership includes nearly 100 organizations in Oregon, Washington, Idaho and California. PNWA represents public port authorities on the Pacific Coast, Puget Sound, and Columbia Snake River System; public utility districts, investor-owned utilities, electric cooperatives and direct service industries; irrigation districts, grain growers and upriver and export elevator companies; major manufacturers in the Pacific Northwest; forest products industry manufacturers and shippers; and tug and barge operators, steamship operators, consulting engineers, and others involved in economic development throughout the Pacific Northwest.

PNWA has a long history of working with the Committee and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on projects of regional and national importance, sharing the challenge to maintain and develop our transportation infrastructure. Our members wish to thank the Committee for its support of Pacific Northwest transportation programs and projects.

Issues of particular concern to the members of our Association follow:

MINIMUM DREDGE FLEET

The federally-owned hopper dredge fleet and the Corps of Engineers' dredges *Essayons* and *Yaquina*, are particularly important to the maintenance of ports and harbors in the Pacific Northwest. The goals of Congressional actions in 1978, 1993 and 1996, which limited the utilization of the federal dredge fleet and provided increased opportunity for industry, have been met.

Since passage of the Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 1993, designed to increase competition in the dredge industry, the number of private dredging contractors has declined. This is of concern because the Northwest has unique conditions such that, compared to other regions, Northwest ports depend to a greater degree on hopper dredging and on smaller class hopper dredges. The

Government Accountability Office found in a March 2003 to Congress (GAO-03-382) that operating restrictions have imposed additional costs on the Corps' dredging program, but have not resulted in proven benefits to the taxpayer.

PNWA strongly supports the language included in your bill to lift operating restrictions from the *Essayons* and *Yaquina*, which will enable the Corps of Engineers to utilize the *Essayons* and *Yaquina* to the maximum extent possible to maintain Northwest ports, harbors and channels, consistent with the safe and efficient performance of their missions.

MAKING SECTION 214 PERMANENT

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-541) provides the authority to the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities and to expedite the processing of permits. Section 214 has allowed local governments to move forward with vital infrastructure projects. By funding additional staff to work on specific, time-intensive permits, existing Corps staff members are able to process the significant permit application backlog much more quickly. Funding for additional Corps staff has resulted in a reduction of permit wait times not only for the funding entity, but for any individual or organization that makes an application with that District of the Corps.

This authority is currently scheduled to sunset on December 31, 2008. Though PNWA has been successful in working with Congress to secure short-term extensions for several years now, the time has come to give Corps regulatory offices as well as the contributing entities the predictability that would come with a permanent authority. PNWA strongly supports language in your bill that would make Section 214 permanent.

These provisions are strongly supported by PNWA's membership, and are important to improve the efficiency and cost competitiveness of Northwest ports engaging in international trade. Additional provisions that are supported by PNWA are included in the attached document, PNWA WRDA Requests. We appreciate the Committee's and Congress' attention to these important matters.

Sincerely,

KRISTIN MEIRA,
Government Relations Director.

PNWA MEMBER DIRECTORY

Alaska Assoc. of Port Managers & Harbormasters; Almota Elevator Company; Anderson-Perry & Associates, Inc.; Ball Janik LLP; Bell Buoy Crab Co.; Benton County PUD #1; Boise Cascade LLC; BST Associates; Central Washington Grain Growers, Inc.; CH2M Hill; Clark Public Utilities; Columbia Basin Development League; Columbia County Grain Growers, Inc.; Columbia River Bar Pilots; Columbia River Pilots; Columbia River Steamship Operators Assoc.; Cowlitz County Board of Commissioners; David B. Barrows Environmental Consulting; Douglas County PUD #1; Dustra Group.

East Columbia Basin Irrigation District; Foss Maritime Company; Office of Peter Friedmann; Gallatin Group; Gordon Thomas Honeywell Gov't Affairs; Harris Group Inc.; ID Wheat Commission; Jan T. Fancher, CPA, PLLC; Jefferson Government Relations; Kalama Export Company; Kleinfelder, Inc.; Lampson International, LLC; Lewis-Clark Terminal Association; Longview Fibre Company; Manson Construction; Moffatt & Nichol; Northwest Grain Growers, Inc.; Northern Star Natural Gas; OR Economic & Community Development Department (OECDD).

Oregon Int'l Port of Coos Bay; Oregon Iron Works, Inc.; OR Wheat Growers League; Pa-

cific Merchant Shipping Assoc. (PMSA); Pacific International Engineering (PIE); Parametrix; PB Ports & Marine, Inc.; PNGC Power; Pomeroy Grain Growers; Port of Anacortes; Port of Benton; Port of Brookings Harbor; Port of Camas-Washougal; Port of Cascade Locks; Port of Chelan County; Port of Chinook; Port of Clarkston; Port of Columbia County; Port of Garibaldi; Port of Gold Beach.

Port of Hood River; Port of Humboldt Bay; Port of Ilwaco, Port of Kalama; Port of Kennewick; Port of Klickitat; Port of Lewis; Port of Longview; Port of Morrow; Port of Newport; Port of Pasco; Port of Port Angeles; Port of Portland; Port of Ridgefield; Port of Royal Slope; Port of Seattle; Port of Suislaw; Port of Skagit County; Port of St. Helens; Port of Sunnyside; Port of Tacoma; Port of Toledo; Port of Umatilla; Port of Umpqua; Port of Vancouver; Port of Walla Walla; Port of Whitman County; Port of Woodland; Potlatch Corporation; Presnell, Gage & Company; Preston Gates & Ellis LLP; Primeland Cooperatives; Reid Middleton, Inc.; The Research Group; RETEC Group; Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt; Seattle Public Utilities; Shaver Transportation Company; Stoel Rives LLP; Teevin Brothers.

Tidewater Barge Lines; Ukiak Engineering Inc. (UEI); USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council; WA Association of Wheat Growers; WA Public Ports Association; WA State Office of Trade and Economic Development (CTED); WA State Potato Commission; WA Wheat Commission; Weyerhaeuser Company; Whitman County Growers.

MAY 10, 2007.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Chairwoman, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: On behalf of more than 4 million manufacturing employees in the U.S., we would like to thank you for your leadership in moving forward with the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA). It is vitally important that America's water resources infrastructure be reliable and productive. Therefore we applaud your efforts to end the stalemate over water resources project authorization by bringing H.R. 1495, WRDA, to the Senate floor. We firmly believe that it is time to end the impasse over passage of WRDA.

A Water Resources Development Act is vitally needed to accommodate the many important projects awaiting authorization, including the modernization of the locks, harbors, canals and other key infrastructure that are vital to the competitiveness of the U.S. economy. A sound national transportation system for the 21st century needs modern water projects, and WRDA will authorize many of those needs.

We look forward to working with you and your staff and issues of importance to the nation's economy and environment. Again, thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS.

AUDUBON,
May 10, 2007.

Re Act now to Restore America's Natural Treasures.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Audubon Society and our more than one million members and supporters, I urge you to help restore America's natural resources by advocating for prompt consideration and passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (S. 1248). WRDA 2007 would authorize unprecedented spending for ecosystem restoration projects, including Everglades, upper Mississippi River, coastal Louisiana, and Great Lakes.

The bill should include Corps modernization provisions, including independent review of costly or controversial Corps projects and ensuring that mitigation for Corps projects is consistent with stricter State laws.

WRDA 2007 contains two crucial Everglades restoration projects—Indian River Lagoon and Picayune Strand—that would mitigate harmful federal drainage projects, restore more than 160,000 acres of wetlands and significant estuarine habitat, and help secure Florida's tourism and outdoor recreation economy. The Upper Mississippi River Restoration Program, in its first 15-year increment, will restore 105,000 acres of habitat, protect 35,000 acres of floodplain habitat in five States along the river, and will include a significant monitoring program. The Coastal Louisiana Restoration program will begin to reverse this devastating pattern of land loss, protecting important habitat for birds, fish, and other wildlife, as well as the region's economy and quality of life. The bill would also permanently authorize the Asian Carp Barrier to protect the Great Lakes from this looming threat.

Ecosystem restoration projects for the Everglades, the Mississippi River, Louisiana's coastal wetlands, and the Great Lakes are overdue, as is Corps modernization. Thank you for helping to restore some of America's greatest natural treasures.

Sincerely,

JOHN FLICKER,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION
ALLIANCE,
Washington DC, May 10, 2007.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Chairwoman, Senate Environment and Public
Works Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
Ranking Member, Senate Environment and Public
Works Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER AND SENATOR INHOFE: The National Construction Alliance, representing the three leading construction unions advocating for robust federal infrastructure investment, endorses the Senate version of the Water Resource Development Act reauthorization. This vital federal infrastructure legislation should be considered and passed by the United States Senate. Our three constituent unions, the Laborers, Operating Engineers and the Carpenters, commend you both for your strong, bipartisan leadership on this legislation.

The \$13.9 billion authorization of Corps of Engineers projects is an important and necessary step in addressing our country's serious backlog of water projects. From harbor improvement, to flood protection, to lock and dam construction, dredging and environmental infrastructure, your bill will immeasurably strengthen America's water resources. As labor unions representing nearly one million skilled construction workers, we recognize that this WRDA reauthorization will create tens of thousands of good paying construction jobs.

We strongly urge the Senate to pass your legislation in an expeditious manner so that America's critical water infrastructure needs can be addressed.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND J. POUPORE,
Executive Vice President.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CIVIL ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2007.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Chair, Committee on Environment and Public
Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Environment
and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN AND SENATOR INHOFE: As the Senate begins its consideration of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 this week, the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) commends your efforts to bring a bipartisan bill to the floor. We appreciate your commitment to moving forward with responsible legislation to authorize much-needed improvements to the nation's water resources and public works infrastructure. We support WRDA's speedy passage into law.

ASCE is especially pleased to champion enactment of subtitle C of the Senate bill, which would require the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to establish a national levee safety program. Subtitle C would authorize the Secretary to spend \$100 million to inspect and inventory the nation's levee systems and fund state levee safety programs. This long overdue legislation ensures that we have learned the lessons from Hurricane Katrina and goes far toward protecting human life and property in flood-prone areas.

If ASCE can be of further assistance as this important legislation advances, please do not hesitate to contact Brian Pallasch of our Washington office.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. NATALE,
Executive Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak for a few moments about probably one of the most important bills that this Congress will consider relative to Louisiana and our ongoing attempt to protect the 3 million people who live in south Louisiana and also to protect the great infrastructure we have in this country, in a vast and broad way, not just from the energy sector but the fisheries but, most importantly, transportation and commerce.

There was an excellent article in the Post this weekend that I would like to have printed for the RECORD, written by one of the most distinguished citizens of our State, John Barry, who is a renowned author who wrote the book "Rising Tide," also a recent book about the influenza of 1917.

But he writes, in reference to the WRDA bill and to the amendments I am going to be offering to this bill, about the importance of acting now to save this great region of the Southern part of the United States, and the fact that this delta that we are attempting to save by building the right kind of levees, the right kind of gates and locks, the right kind of navigation channels, correcting some of our past mistakes that we made before we realized the damage that would occur by some of our own actions.

He writes about the importance of this Delta, that at one time it reached from Cape Girardeau, MO, all the way up the Mississippi River, down to the

present mouth of the river, that the entire delta, that it was created over thousands of years, and it was maintained as the river overflowed its banks. As the river overflowed, it carried silt. It built the Delta.

But as we have channeled the delta, channeled the river and built levees up along the river, we have caused the natural building up of the delta to stop.

Then as we cut channels through this great and amazing land, that reaches from the east of New Orleans all the way to the Texas-Louisiana border, as we crisscross it with pipelines and navigation channels to tap into the extraordinary oil and gas reserves both on land and offshore, it exacerbates an already tough situation.

Then to level on top of that the dredging of the Mississippi River, to keep the sandbars out of the mouth, the channel as we have made the water move faster, that has an impact on the way this delta is now lowering itself, if you will, into the water.

There are other contributing factors, but the bottom line is we have to take corrective action to reverse this. We cannot correct everything that we did, but we most certainly can pass this bill, the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act, which has—about 22 percent of the entire bill is dedicated basically to this purpose.

It is right that a large portion of this bill be dedicated to this purpose because this delta, this Mississippi River, does not just serve the 4.5 million people who call Louisiana home but it literally serves the 360 million people who call the United States of America home. It serves Canada and Mexico as well, as well as ports around the world. So it is not just for the people of Louisiana whom we act today, it is in the national interest to do so.

In the underlying bill, which Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE have so carefully crafted, the Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration system has \$1.133 billion. Morganza to the Gulf, a very important aspect of our protection of south Louisiana, is included in this bill at \$841 million.

Some port work at the Port of New Iberia for Vermilion and Iberia Parishes, which are two of our larger southern parishes, has an authorization that is overdue and most certainly timely. There is an amount of money to help relocate facilities from the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, both private and public, so we can close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, which is also, hopefully, going to be part of this bill, some work on the western side of our State, the Calcasieu River and Pass and rock bank protection, and there is a lock project around the capital city, to mention a few.

The bottom line is, there is about \$2.5 billion in this bill for Louisiana projects. It sounds like a lot, and it is. We are proud of the 8 years of work that have gone into building this WRDA bill, through past Congresses

and now this one. Under the leadership of Senator BOXER, she has committed to work with her colleague, Mr. OBER-STAR, on the House side to get a WRDA bill to the President's desk for him to sign. It doesn't do us any good to keep talking about a WRDA bill.

The only good that will come of this bill is if we can actually get it to the President's desk, get him to sign it, and get these projects underway. The people of Louisiana have waited for 8 years through any number of hurricanes, not the least of which in the last 2 years, we have had the unbelievable challenge of dealing with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the first and third largest hurricanes in terms of disaster and impact to ever hit this country. We are still fighting to rebuild and reeling from the damage of those storms. As I have said many times, it wasn't just the multiple levees that collapsed, it was really a Federal flood more than a hurricane that did us in. It was the multiple failure of levees that should have been maintained, should have been stronger, should have been higher, and were not.

It is also because of the loss of great wetlands. I would like to share what a healthy wetland looks like, with cypress trees and land where you can do a little swimming and boating and fishing—not, of course, a lot of walking and building. This wetland stretches from east of New Orleans to the Sabine River pass, which separates Louisiana and Texas. This is a lot of what our coast looks like. This doesn't look like a Florida beach or the Biloxi beach or the North Carolina beach. We actually don't have any beaches in Louisiana. We actually only have two. That is a little bit of a fib. We do have two. One is 7 miles long, and it is called Grand Isle, and the other one is Holly Beach. The rest of our coast basically looks like this. You can't even get to it because there are only two roads, two lanes each. We don't have any interstate highways on our coast. We have two two-lane roads, one down the east side of our State and one down the west. They basically dead-end into swampland. This is not wasteland. This is beautiful land. It nurtures migratory birds. It is 40 percent of the nurseries of the gulf coast, extraordinary wetlands we are trying to preserve. Without this bill, it will be impossible.

I would like to show a poster. I see Senator COBURN here, and I will finish in just a moment. I will resume after his comments.

As Senator BOXER knows, because she came down and flew over these wetlands—I am so grateful to my colleague from California, the chairman of this committee, for coming to fly over these wetlands—we flew over New Orleans, which is right here, and out to the coast. We got to see some of these wetlands. This is the coast of Louisiana. The red spots are land loss just since Katrina and Rita, the land loss from the storm. A lot of it is St. Bernard Parish, lower Plaquemine Parish, and

then over this way, which is where Hurricane Rita made landfall. So hurricanes exacerbate an already difficult situation. But because we have been putting navigation channels through these wetlands, we have been allowing for shipping, which is appropriate, but you have to have the right locks and dams and water control structures. Because mostly we have blocked the great Mississippi River, which is the largest river system on our continent, from naturally overflowing so that we could ship the grain out of the Midwest, so we could ship products from Canada down to the midsection of our country, this delta is starved for sediment. We don't have a choice.

I am going to end now by saying that this WRDA bill, as far as Louisiana is concerned, is the bill that is going to reverse this decline and start us on a path of safety for the residents, of protection for the environment, and of laying down the foundation for a great economy, which we need to do. We can't shut off this part of the Nation and call it quits. We can't shut down the refining capacity and oil and gas. We have to make it work. We can. It is going to take good science, long commitments, and more than this WRDA bill. But this legislation is a start.

In a few minutes, after Senator COBURN speaks, I will lay down an amendment that will lay the foundation for the category 5 protection we need. We do not expect, in Louisiana, this Congress to pick up the whole tab. We most certainly do not expect this Congress to pick up the tab in this bill. But we would like to lay the beginning foundation, knowing the people of Louisiana and Mississippi and Texas will pay our own way as well. The independent stream of revenue we now have from offshore oil and gas revenues can contribute to this project which is going to be several decades, and it will take anywhere from \$30 to \$50 billion. But there is no alternative. It is expensive, but the cost of doing nothing is even more.

Let me yield the floor for the Senator from Oklahoma who was scheduled before me. I will return to the debate at a later time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I have a couple amendments I will be offering in a few minutes. I wanted to spend a moment or two talking about priorities.

The work on the WRDA bill has been very important. I am supportive of us keeping our obligations, especially in Louisiana for the tremendous problems they have encountered. There is a legitimate role for the Federal Government as a partner with the people of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas in terms of restoration and also prevention so that we don't see the same things again. The WRDA bill is an important bill for a lot of States on a lot of projects, many of which have come about because the Federal Government

has overreached in some of its authority and demanded things of States they can no longer afford to do. That is where we sit today. That is the consequence sometimes of having a Federal Government that is a little bit bigger than what the Constitution envisioned and what our Forefathers envisioned as appropriate.

Let me talk about the process for a minute. The chairman asked me a moment ago if I was going to offer any other amendments other than amendments on this bill. I told her no, and I will not. But I think it is important for the American people to consider what we are doing here today. It is important work, but it certainly is not as important as funding our troops. We have asked American families and their children who are serving in the armed services to do a very difficult job. It is very controversial at this time. But regardless of where you are on that job, the fact that we continue to produce bills and not address their needs seems somewhat out of context for where we should be. It has been almost 60 days since the President asked for the additional funding. We have passed the COMPETES Act, spending money on the future, but we can't seem to pass the money for our troops in harm's way. We passed an FDA reauthorization with PDUFA for making sure drugs get cleared, but we can't seem to produce a consensus that our troops will be funded with the necessities they require since they are in harm's way. I find it ironic that we would do anything other than that.

When I look at the Constitution, our No. 1 priority is defense. Whether or not we agree with the foreign policy ongoing today, we all agree we don't want our troops to be in any way placed in harm's way because of our lack of action. That is a justified criticism today which may come true, that American troops are hampered because we cannot pass a bill. I won't offer that amendment, although I think that is what we should be discussing, rather than the WRDA bill.

I thank my colleagues, Senators INHOFE and BOXER, for their work on this bill. I know it means a lot to a lot of communities that don't have the resources to accomplish the things they need to. However, one of the things I am concerned about is priorities. Last year, we had a debate on the emergency status of funding the levees in Sacramento. I had offered an amendment. I talked with the Governor of California, with the two Senators from California. Ultimately, I withdrew that because I became convinced that, in fact, it was an emergency. It still is. Sacramento is the largest town in this country that is at major risk for a flood. The Corps of Engineers uses years for an event, and Sacramento sits at 85 years, the likelihood that 1 out of the next 85 years, Sacramento will be flooded, whereas New Orleans today, even post-Katrina, has a 1-in-250-year risk of being flooded again.

As we look at the WRDA bill, one of the things we ought to think about is how do we prioritize to make sure that where there is a legitimate Government role, we actually spend the money on that role. There is a lot of money in this bill. Granted, this is an authorization bill which will put forward a lot of new projects, some of which we know the cost and some we don't.

I remind my colleagues, right now we have enough work for the Corps of Engineers for the next 50 years, if we don't give them another job to do on their budget. In this bill, we are going to give them several more major projects and not the appropriate funding to do them. One of the reasons we will not give them the appropriate funding is because we don't have the money because, No. 1, we have \$200 billion a year in waste, fraud, and duplication in the money we appropriate presently, which the Senate and the Congress refuse to look at, and No. 2, because of the limitations we have in terms of the magnitude of the jobs we put before the Corps.

If you look at priorities in terms of what is important, California has several projects in this, as do several other States. You ask: What are the priorities? You say: We as a family have so many things we have to do. Should we do the most important ones first? If families have a roof they need to put on the house, it is highly unlikely they will build a swimming pool. They are going to fix the roof first and then save for the swimming pool. We don't do that in terms of many of the priorities in this bill.

Myself and seven other Members voted against going ahead with this bill for two reasons. No. 1 is the intent, although the details were not followed in terms of the new earmark proposals in the bill. No. 2 is that we think the priorities are out of whack.

I do have a couple of amendments I will offer.

AMENDMENT NO. 1089 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1065

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment 1089 be called up.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 1089 to amendment No. 1065

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prioritize Federal spending to ensure the needs of Louisiana residents who lost their homes as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita are met before spending money to design or construct a nonessential visitors center)

On page 209, line 1, strike "The" and insert "Subject to paragraph (5), the".

On page 210, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(5) REQUIREMENT.—No Federal funds shall be used to conduct any study, or to carry out

any activity relating to the design or construction, of the visitors center under this subsection until the date on which the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the State of Louisiana, certifies to Congress that all residents of the State of Louisiana who were displaced as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita in 2005 are no longer living in temporary housing.

Mr. COBURN. This is a simple amendment. It says that there are 100,000 people from Louisiana today in temporary housing. We have failed to move them from temporary housing into other housing.

There are, in this bill, plans and studies for a new visitor center to be set up in Morgan City, which will be a great thing for the area of Louisiana. I do not doubt that. The purpose of this amendment is to say we should not spend any money on that until we get the people affected by Katrina back into housing instead of temporary housing.

So it is not necessarily a criticism, although I generally have criticisms of the Federal Government's role in providing visitor centers for tourism, et cetera, in the States. More importantly, it is about priorities, of whether we ought to take care of those people who have been markedly impaired in their housing opportunities, which ultimately affects their ability to earn a living in Louisiana, before we build another visitor center, before we spend any money on it. We attempted to try to find out how much this visitor center would cost, and nobody could tell us. But the point is, we probably should not spend a penny on that until we have taken care of the people in Louisiana.

If you look at the stories that continue to come out—and Senator LANDRIEU has been a champion in this body of making sure the rest of the Members of this body are aware of the continuing needs of Louisiana for housing—we should not spend any money on anything other than those critical needs for the people of Louisiana. When those are met, then we go and build a visitor center. We do not do it at the same time. To do it at the same time says there is no limit on the amount of funds we have, and we know there are. So we should not put this forward.

This amendment does not take away the visitor center, it does not eliminate the visitor center; it just says you cannot spend any money on it until we have taken care of people in Louisiana and their housing. It is very simple, very straightforward, but puts a priority, much like you and I put a priority on what our needs are. One of our big failures in this body is picking priorities. If we had unlimited funds, we would not need to do that, but we do not have unlimited funds. Our true deficit was far in excess of \$300 billion last year, although we claimed it was under \$200 billion by Enron-style accounting. But, in fact, we added \$300 billion to our children's and grandchildren's debt.

So this is just a little, small amendment that says we should not do this

until we have taken care of the obligations that are in front of us in terms of people's lives. When we have done that, then go for it, go do it, but do not do it ahead of those people. When people cannot have services, cannot have what they need, who have been displaced by a natural disaster the likes of which we have never seen before in this country, we should not spend one penny on thing other than taking care of them. Once they are taken care of—a legitimate Federal role, to make sure the environment for housing has been created so Louisiana can get back on its feet—then we ought to do that. So we are not eliminating it. We are just saying, do not spend the money, there is no authorization until you have met and it has been certified that the housing needs of those who are in temporary housing today—trailers, tens and tens of thousands of people are still living in trailers, who still do not have access to housing—do not do that until you have met that need. It is very simple.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to yield for a question?

Mr. COBURN. Certainly.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, is the Senator now going to go to the second amendment?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I plan on it.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, would it be wise to have the Senator from Louisiana respond now, and then the floor would go back to the Senator for the next amendment?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I would be fine with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, let me respond to my colleague. I want to begin by first thanking my colleague from Oklahoma for his time and focus. He has come down to our State. He has viewed the damage. As you can tell, Mr. President, he is most familiar with our situation. He is absolutely correct, we have a great deal of work to do.

This particular visitor center, like several others, is not just for extra recreation, I say to my colleague. This is the heart and soul of tourism in this region. We do not have big cities like New York and Chicago in this region. Maybe they are somewhat like the Senator's cities in Oklahoma. They are small communities, but they are important communities. Throughout the southern part of our State, as I have shown on the maps, we do not have large communities but communities of 15,000 or 10,000, for example, high up on a ridge, surrounded by levees.

We are proud of these great wetlands. We want people to come see them. So it is not just saving them for the birds and the fish, which is very important, but it is actually saving them for the benefit of the people who live there, who want to be able to recreate on them, and we want to share them with the world.

I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, we think the more people can actually get their eyes on this problem, the more support we can get for doing the right things to preserve them, to taper down on unnecessary and unwanted development, to scale up the investments in the right kinds of levees and structures, that will help us preserve it over time.

So while I know on first blush it may seem to the Senator as if this is a frivolous expenditure, I would say this is part of a very comprehensive approach Louisiana has to save the wetlands. I do not think—I will be happy to submit for the RECORD the total cost because I most certainly can get that for the Senator—it is going to amount to very much money, but it is an important aspect of our redevelopment that has to do with science, with engineering, with the environment, with the basic industries, and with tourism and the education of people about what wetlands are.

I say to the Senator, as I said, one of the difficulties Senator VITTER and I are having in trying to explain this to the Nation is there are virtually no other shores in the country like this. There are low-lying areas, of course, in South Carolina and North Carolina, and marshes, but there is virtually no other delta like this in the country. So people literally have not been able to see it.

When you see something like a beach in Florida, the wonderful coast in California, which many of us have been to, or to Long Island in the Hamptons, in New York, when you have seen that with your own eyes, you can appreciate it, and you can understand it. The only way to get to the coast of Louisiana is literally by boat or by air, except for those two little highways I spoke about: LA1 on the east side and Holly Beach Road on the west side.

So having this center—I would like to show you where it might be, if I can find a picture of the Atchafalaya. I am not sure I have one. Let me show you the original picture I started with. I will show it, not to make too much of this because it is just a small education center. The center would allow people to come down into this wetlands area and see some of the great Atchafalaya Basin that is sort of the last standing Cypress swamp in the country. So again, it is a small item.

I object to the Senator taking it out of this bill, but I want him to know this is not because we do not think it is important to put people in housing and to build levees. We are doing all that and doing it as fast as we can, trying to reduce redtape, but we do think these educational centers which we are building serve a significant and important purpose. I do believe the State has already contributed in kind, as well as the local parish.

So I will leave my argument there and at the appropriate time come back to this subject.

I yield the floor, but I would like to speak sometime later this afternoon.

PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I would like to make some comments. First of all, we do not take this out. We do not eliminate it. We just say there ought to be a priority on the funds, and the funds for housing ought to come ahead of this. No. 2 is, 3 years ago, a new visitor center was opened for this very purpose for the Atchafalaya Basin, which is the focus of the new visitor center. This just opened 3 years ago.

Again, in a quote from it: Smack dab in the center of the Atchafalaya Basin is a very welcoming site for those traveling on Interstate 10. The Atchafalaya Welcome Center is open seven days a week from 8:30 to 5. The center is located off Interstate 10 at exit 121. It is a first class facility, quite impressive, with historical information within the walls. It is an Acadian-style cottage museum. Outside, wildlife and nature will take you back in time.

It was completed in June 2004. It has many of the same things the Senator wants to support. There are also two other visitor centers in Morgan City, so it is not that there is not some process out there already to do that.

Again, the point is not to eliminate this visitor center. The point is to say, shouldn't we have a priority—before we allow money to go for another visitor center where there is already one that has just opened 3 years ago, shouldn't we have the people who need housing taken care of? So I will stand with that and will not continue the debate on that.

AMENDMENT NO. 1090 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1065

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up amendment No. 1090.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 1090 to amendment No. 1065.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prioritize Federal spending to ensure the residents of the city of Sacramento are protected from the threat of floods before spending money to add sand to beaches in San Diego)

On page 11, strike line 5 and insert the following:

(6) IMPERIAL BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph

(B), the

On page 11, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(B) REQUIREMENT.—No Federal funds shall be used for beach nourishment for Imperial Beach, California, until the date on which the Secretary certifies to Congress that the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project has been completed.

Mr. COBURN. This, again, is for the restoration of beaches. It is a 30- or 40-year project, which I do not object to on its face. I love beaches. I take my family to Florida. I noticed recently they restored beaches down there. Again, the question is priorities. We have a tough time setting priorities. We take authorizations bills, we don't look at them. What we do is we get them authorized and then we fight like heck when the appropriations time comes around to get our projects funded.

The Sacramento levee system, according to the Corps of Engineers, is one of the most important projects they have in terms of reducing risk for people at risk of flood. We had a debate on this floor less than a year ago with the Senators from California. I talked to the Governor of California. I had attempted to strip out some of the funding of an emergency bill for emergency funds for the Corps of Engineers for this basin and for these levees. They convinced me with their argument that was a high priority. I actually withdrew my amendment. I did not ask for a vote on it.

We have a WRDA bill that has this in it, and then we have a beach restoration project, over which there is some significant debate in terms of Imperial Beach in southern California, restoring that beach over the next 40 to 50 years, with intermittent projects every 4 to 5 years, pumping sand to restore the beach. I am not against that, either. But what I think we have to do is set a priority.

Why shouldn't the priority be that we protect the people of Sacramento and finish the levee system? The answer will be: We can do both. Well, we really cannot do both. We will do both probably, but we cannot do both. We cannot do both with the money we have. So then it comes to: Where are the priorities? We will have this debate again when the bills come forward in the appropriations process, of where the priority is. We will probably fund both these projects. But when the American taxpayers ask: Now, which one is most important, which one is a true Federal responsibility, which one is a State responsibility, they are going to want some answers. When asked about protecting a major city such as Sacramento with a levee system that the Corps of Engineers designed, which was substandard to begin with, and redoing that to make sure we protect all these people, or letting the State of California restore its own beaches from sand erosion, I believe the vast majority of Americans will say: As to the beach, probably the local community can afford to do that. They get the benefits off of it. They get the property taxes off of it. They get the tourism off of it. But Sacramento is a different story. It is something the Federal Government started. It is something the Federal Government is responsible for, and something the Federal Government should respond to and finish.

Senator FEINSTEIN, in our debate last year, noted that the bottom line is that human life and property hangs in the balance based on the sustainability of these levees. I think that is right. I do not think human life stands in the balance on restoring the beaches, which is really a State responsibility.

What we are going to do in this bill is we are going to take taxpayer money. We are actually going to borrow the money to do it. We are not going to do it out of the regular budget. We are going to pay for something that is a State responsibility. The other factor that comes into it is that every State in the Union, save one, has a surplus this year. We have a \$300 billion deficit, if we are honest. So, again, it comes back: is it great if we have extra money, if we aren't borrowing the money for the future? Should we do this at the same time? I would agree.

The fact is, we don't want to make the hard choices. We don't want to tell anybody no, not now. What we want to do is be able to have both. We can satisfy people today, but the people who will be dissatisfied with the generational collar that we put around them will be our kids and grandkids as they repay the cost of out not prioritizing things, not looking at things that are most important, and otherwise not standing up to the line and doing what we should be doing, which is making the hard choices of priorities.

One of the things I think the American citizenry is upset with, as much as the war or more, is the fact that it seems as if we don't care about the future. We will throw money at anything, money we don't have.

So these two amendments I bring to the floor today are not big. They may not pass, but they are based on a principle. The principle is to be a good steward. We all, in our own personal lives, with our own money, have to make priorities. We have to put that roof on before we do something else to the house. We have to make a choice about where the first dollar should go. Unfortunately, sometimes we do a poor job of that in the Congress.

I believe, from the way this Senator sees it, securing the levees ought to be a much higher priority than restoring beach that can be restored by a local community or the State of California. It is not truly a Federal responsibility.

I have studied a great deal about the beach restoration project. They have a general plan. What has happened to them has been out of their control, the Tijuana River in terms of how it has been blockaded and dammed and the amount of sand that filters in and that is available for the beach. Several attempts at growing structures had been made in 1978. A plan was put forth that would have restored it. It did not meet the environmental impact statement. It was abandoned at that time.

What we know and what is predicted by those who have watched this—especially Orrin Pikley, the director of the

program for the State Developmental Shorelines at Duke University—is that we shouldn't be nourishing the beaches. President Clinton, much to his credit, saw the need for the States to take a greater burden in financing beach nourishment, and he proposed eliminating all funding for nourishment projects and studies, and he reduced the Federal share to 35 percent on any projects that weren't ongoing.

Where is the responsibility? Who is going to pay for it? It is easy to spend your money. It is easy to not tell anybody no. But the fact is, when we get down to the long and the short of it, we can't do everything everybody wants to do. I know a lot of people were told no in this bill about things they want to do, but we do some of it, to be fair. But in the long run, lives, safety, and housing have to take precedence over convenience and recreation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I would like to lay down the reasons why.

First, I do want to thank Senator COBURN because he was very accommodating to both Senator INHOFE and me by coming here on a Monday afternoon and putting these amendments down so we could begin the debate and hopefully vote on them tomorrow. I do appreciate that. It means a lot to us as managers because we worked long and hard on this bill.

Before I tell my colleagues why I call this amendment the Russian roulette amendment, let me just say I have supported Senator COBURN on many of his amendments where he is looking at the fiscally responsible thing to do, and I will continue to do so when I think those amendments make sense, and I am sure there will be more. But I do want to call to the Senator's attention, if you step back from this particular amendment, which I strongly disagree with—I think it is dangerous, and I will go into that in a minute. If you step back and look at the whole picture of this bill, we should be very proud that working together, Republicans and Democrats, we took a bill that was scored at about \$31 billion down to a bill that is about \$13.9 billion because we really did apply some strict standards to this bill.

There are no projects in this bill that are giveaways or handouts or make somebody's beachfront pretty. That is nonsense because neither side would approve of that.

I also want to make a point—because I think Senator FEINGOLD made this point very well, although I disagreed with him and we had a bit of a debate on it last week—that when colleagues use the word "prioritize," that we should "prioritize," and then they offer these amendments, they are putting out their priorities. That is not subjective. It is not subjective if I put out my priorities next to Senator COBURN's,

next to Senator FEINGOLD's, next to Senator INHOFE's. That is objective. I think the Presiding Officer who is now sitting in the chair knows because she sits on the committee that has jurisdiction over this bill. It is hard. We battle it out for what the right priorities should be.

Now, as I told Senator FEINGOLD last week when we had a debate, because he is offering an amendment dealing with prioritization and setting up a whole new way to prioritize this project, let's look at this process in which we are engaged because I think the Senator—the reason I believe the Senator is on weak ground is because he seems to be ignoring what has gone on before he got involved.

First of all, these projects start from the local governments up, and the local governments and the communities get together and say: We have a very rough situation and we pay Federal taxes and we would like to make a partnership to protect lives and property and businesses. From there, they put up their fair share. They have to be willing to put up their fair share. So this isn't Uncle Sam paying for all this. This is a joint effort, and they have to come forward and the various committees of jurisdiction approve a study.

Now, when these studies are looked at, I say to my friend, there is a cost-benefit ratio involved, and sometimes it is very tough on colleagues because they think they are going to get a project and realize it just doesn't add up. So everything before us that has passed muster, the local government, the local people, they pick up the share, and it has to be funded with a study. And that study, as I said, has to come in and show that this makes sense, and then it goes to the various committees or the administration will fund it. There is an environmental impact statement that goes along with all this. They are considered again in WRDA. I guess this is the chance for colleagues to say: We don't like this project or that, and we are having this debate. It is the Senator's absolute right to choose and pick what he thinks are not priorities. I understand. So after we pass it here, it then has to go forward and get appropriated as well.

This bill has been 7 years in the making. We have cut it more than in half. I think it is a proud product.

I would say to my colleague, the reason I say the amendment is playing Russian roulette is this: We don't know when a hurricane, a storm, is going to come up and hit us in the face. It may come in the northern part of my State, I say to my friend. I have a coastal State. I have a State that is beautiful. We have more beauty per square inch—of course, I am not subjective on the point—than I think any other State. We have 37 million people. We have a real problem. The fact is, we can't just do one thing—Sacramento—and not take care of all the other things.

I so appreciate my friend's coming around with us on the Sacramento

issue. I cannot tell my colleagues what it means to me because, as he now knows, we have to take care of Sacramento. It is low lying. It is a potential catastrophe. He is absolutely right to call attention to the levees. We have to do all that.

But the reason I say his amendment is Russian roulette is because it is essentially counting on the fact that we are not going to have this problem in Imperial Beach. I want to say this is not a beach project; this is a hurricane and storm damage reduction project. This is not about making somebody's property pretty to look at. This is serious business.

And speaking of business, if we don't do this work—the locals are going to pay, in the beginning, 30 percent and then 50 percent. If we don't take care of it, business is going to get the floods and it is going to be wiped out. So I wish I could say to my friend all I need is one flood control project in Sacramento and be done with it, but with 37 million people and an economy that if we were a separate Nation would be the fifth or sixth largest in the world, obviously California needs so much.

Now, we have stressed Louisiana and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Senator INHOFE and I pulled aside a lot of people and said: Look, we have to come together to help that region. But we also have a backlog of 7 years' worth of work. In the case of Imperial Beach, this project got started in 2007, and the people are waiting. The city of Imperial Beach is home to 26,000 people. Four thousand of its residents live within two to three blocks of the shoreline. It is located near San Diego, just to give everybody a picture, and the beaches and the sand dunes act as a buffer to protect residential and commercial properties. It is a defense. It is a defense against storms and storm surge. If we don't do that, we would be building walls, a very expensive way to get that hurricane damage reduction.

So nature provides our coastal communities with natural protection from violent storms and the waves they produce. In the Northeast it is the high rocky cliffs. From the Mid-Atlantic around the Gulf of Mexico, it is the wide, sandy beaches. In Louisiana, it is miles of wetlands. That is why both our colleagues, Senators VITTER and LANDRIEU, talk a lot about wetlands restoration, which we do in this, because that is the natural flood control, just as the beaches and the bluffs are natural flood control that God gave us.

The coast of my State is particularly prone to strong winter storms that blow in from the Pacific. During the El Nino years, storms can be especially dangerous. That is why I say Russian roulette. We are playing Russian roulette. This is not some project that sprung up because some individual looked out and said: You know, I want more beach in front of my house. No. It has nothing to do with that. It is a dangerous situation. The public is going to be paying for half of this.

The Army Corps of Engineers said 100,000 cubic yards per year is eroding from the beach, corresponding to a shoreline retreat rate of 6 feet per year. There is adequate protection from winter coastal storms. That is what the Army Corps of Engineers said. That is not me speaking. I am not an engineer. I respect what they say.

I know my friend says he is not striking this, he is just saying it is more important to do Sacramento first. We need to do all of it. We need to do this bill. We need to take care of our people in this bill wherever they live—east, west, the north of my State, the South, East or West of the country, Midwest—wherever they are, wherever they need help.

At the current retreat rate, the shoreline in the northern portion of the area could reach the first line of development this year—this year. That is why this bill is so needed. It is needed now—not next year, not after they finish Sacramento or after they finish Hurricane Katrina. We shouldn't be picking and choosing. We should be having an absolutely firm commitment to making sure every one of these projects fits the benchmarks we have set in a bipartisan way, meet the benchmarks, meet the criteria, and not punish people and say, gee, you people in Imperial Beach, you are paying and we are going to pay 50 percent out, but we are stopping because a lot of miles away in another part of the country, or this State, other people need help and they are more important than you. I don't think that is right.

We are Senators. We are Senators of all the people. We have to look at their needs. Absolutely, prioritizing is key. I have shown my colleague how we prioritize through this process and how we cut back the costs of this bill. The beaches, the coastline, the protective buffer is literally washing away.

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR assumed the Chair.)

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. Will the restoration project in this bill solve the problem of Imperial Beach?

Mrs. BOXER. This is considered a 50-year fix.

Mr. COBURN. It is a 50-year fix only if they continue to do the work every 5 years, correct?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, of course, all projects have to be maintained.

Mr. COBURN. According to the Corps, every 5 years we will pump the same amount of sand up there, and in 50 years we will be doing the same thing again. This isn't a long-term fix; this is a short-term fix, according to the Corps, not according to anybody else. They have to do the same thing every 5 years to maintain the status quo; is that correct?

Mrs. BOXER. No. The initial project consists of 1.214 million cubic meters of sand, resulting in a total beach with 32 meters beyond the existing beach line. That is the first phase. To get to your

point, it is estimated that once every 10 years, over the 50-year life of the project, they would replenish, not every 5 years.

Mr. COBURN. Every 10 years, they are going to have to bring back the sand the ocean naturally washes away from the beach because we have not done what needs to be done, which is a long, extended growing, to help the beach replenish itself.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me say, we continue to maintain the dams in Oklahoma, too. So whether you are maintaining a dam or maintaining this kind of project, yes, you have to take care of your house, your home, your project. This isn't a free lunch for anybody. The local people have to pay for that as well.

So the reason the Corps recommended this particular project is they say it is very cost effective, it provides a lot of protection for these people, and it has a very high cost benefit. For every dollar put in, the American people get \$1.70 in return, and few projects can claim such a return.

Mr. COBURN. I would not know how to argue with that. Would the Senator yield for a moment, and I will finish up?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am delighted.

Mr. COBURN. The difference between this and a dam is a dam is put there to control water or generate power. They have to be maintained. The way to fix this, according to the people we have talked to, is the original Corps plan is to put the money into an extended growing until the beach redevelops and replenishes itself. We will continue to do this every 10 years. I am not saying that is not a good priority, but it is not a priority like many of the other things.

I have a letter that I received from Dr. Serge Dedina, executive director of WILDCOAST, supporting our amendment and asking that this money be placed secondary to the efforts in Sacramento because their studies show one winter storm will wash away what this money was spent for. In fact, this isn't the best plan, although it is a plan and—again, if I was there, I would want this beach maintained and restored. But I understand the desire for it. I understand the priorities for it. I understand the decisions that have been made in terms of lessening priorities that weren't included in that bill.

I appreciate the time the chairman of the committee has given me to offer these amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 14, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR COBURN: Please accept this endorsement for your amendment to the WRDA that would require that residents of Sacramento be protected from the threat of floods by the completion of the Sacramento River Bank Protection Program before federal funds are spent to add sand to beaches in San Diego (Imperial Beach).

WILDCOAST represents the interests of Imperial Beach taxpayers who are solidly opposed to any public expenditures on beach replenishment projects in Imperial Beach. We have been informed by City of Imperial Beach staff that federally funded beach sand projects are designed to "enhance private property."

Our Beach Sand Stakeholder Advisory Group is formed of local Imperial Beach business owners and coastal engineering technical experts who all agree that the effort to have U.S. Taxpayers fund Imperial Beach sand replenishment is an absolute waste of scarce federal dollars. It has been scientifically proven that millions of dollars of sand that would be dumped on the beach of Imperial Beach would wash away in a single winter storm.

We appreciate your support for stopping wasteful expenditures of scarce federal dollars through badly planned and flawed sand replenishment projects in Imperial Beach, California.

Sincerely,

SERGE DEDINA,
Executive Director, WILDCOAST.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask where we are now. Senator COBURN has two pending amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. We now have Senator FEINGOLD's amendment pending on prioritization and two Coburn amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. I feel like I want to respond for a couple of minutes more to this amendment and say that my colleague says: Oh, my goodness, every 10 years you have to do more work. As I say, the Corps found that this is the most economical and sustainable way to resolve this problem. He talks about beaches—what were his words—being washed away. Yes, beaches will be washed away. We expect that, and every 10 years we will restore the beach. But it is better that that happens than houses washing away, businesses washing away or people washing away. So we have looked at the other options, such as concrete structures, walls—all very expensive and requiring a lot of maintenance and so on.

So we have a situation where the city is paying for 35 percent of the initial part of the project, 50 percent for the rest of the project. The city of Imperial Beach is not looking for a handout, but it is sharing the burden of protecting its people.

Again, I don't quite understand the prioritization of the Senator from Oklahoma, or why he picks on this particular project. This is a project that is more cost effective than any other alternative. It is one of the most cost effective in the Nation. We feel very good about it. But just as Louisiana's wetlands restoration will lessen impacts of hurricanes, because the wetlands are that natural absorber of the water and they also lessen the power of the hurricane, we are here using the God-given beaches as a way to do this flood control or, better said, hurricane impact reduction. So we learned from Hurri-

cane Katrina that we should address our flood threats before they materialize.

We are worried about this particular community. I am very pleased that this particular project certainly wasn't even controversial when we put together our package because it so clearly fits all the criteria we had in place. My colleague is saying don't do this until you do Sacramento, and it doesn't make any sense to me because we need to do it all. That is the point of the WRDA bill—to take care of as many people as we can, and that we can project with the most stringent criteria that we have. So this "Russian roulette" amendment plays with the fate of my community. I think Senator COBURN's other amendment, which would strike a blow at the tourism revival in Louisiana, is also an ill-fated amendment.

The reason I was so glad he came over this afternoon is I am hoping we can have votes on these three amendments tomorrow. If we send a signal that the members of the committee are sticking together on this in a bipartisan way and we are going to move this forward, I think it would be very good for the bill.

I look forward to Senator INHOFE's arrival. He has had a very grueling weekend in Iraq. I don't know exactly when he will arrive. At this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this week, the week of May 14, is National Police Week, and the streets here in Washington, DC are filled with tens of thousands of law enforcement officers, their families, and their children. This is the week we recognize 17,917 officers whose names are inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here on Judiciary Square, all of them people who gave their lives to make our communities a safer place.

It is the week we recognize 145 fallen heroes of our Nation lost this past year. The people of Alaska give thanks that we did not lose a law enforcement officer in the line of duty during 2006. This is also the week we add the names of 237 additional law enforcement officers to the memorial. These are officers who lost their lives in the line of duty in generations past but whose stories did not come to light until now. One of those 237 officers is William George Pfalmer, Jr.

Officer Pfalmer's career with the Anchorage Police Department came to an end on June 9, 1953, when he was shot following a traffic stop of a stolen vehicle. He was shot in the left arm and the right shoulder, shattering his spine and causing him to spend the remainder of his life in a wheelchair. Officer Pfalmer lost his battle to survive those wounds on December 26, 1970, at the age of 45, after undergoing one of many corrective surgeries.

I rise today in tribute to Officer Pfalmer and I rise to share the remarkable story of a present-day Anchorage officer, Officer Cathy Diehl Robbins, who made sure Officer Pfalmer's contributions were not lost to history. But for Cathy's determined research, the name of William George Pfalmer, Jr. might never have been inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

When Officer Pfalmer was shot on June 9, 1953, the city of Anchorage did not even pay him a full day's pay. At the time, the city did not offer a pension to police officers, nor did it compensate them for their injuries. Officer Pfalmer, who was 27 years old at the time, turned in his badge—which so happened to be badge No. 13—and was left to fend for himself. Anchorage is a city well known for its community spirit. This was true in 1953, it is true today. Officer Pfalmer was named Anchorage's Father of the Year, and the community helped to raise \$13,000 to help the family through their difficult time. But that was not enough to enable the Pfalmer family to remain in Alaska.

A World War II Coast Guard veteran, Officer Pfalmer moved his family to California where he could receive medical treatment without charge from the VA. The officer's wife Eleanor was his full-time caregiver. They were tough years financially, but love and commitment held the family together. Officer Pfalmer kept his family afloat for most of those 17 years by purchasing cars at auto auctions, reconditioning them, and reselling them. His three sons, Glenn, Garry, and Greg, helped out after school repairing the cars under their dad's supervision. The three sons were literally their dad's arms and legs. They all became mechanics, a trade their father taught them.

The Pfalmer family assumed that their father's service with the Anchorage Police Department was long forgotten, until one day, out of the blue, son Greg received a call from Cathy Diehl Robbins. Cathy, who had been researching the history of the Anchorage Police Department in her own time, came across an article of some 10 years earlier. That article led Cathy to believe there was a hero who somehow had fallen through the cracks. Cathy would not let go and was determined to run the story to the ground. After diligent research, she discovered the story was true. She tracked Greg down on the Internet and learned that his father was the Anchorage police officer

she had read about. She wondered whether the officer was still alive and, sadly, learned he was not. Cathy then made it her mission to ensure that Officer Pfalmer's contributions were not forgotten.

On June 9, 2006, 53 years after the fateful incident that cost the officer his career, the Anchorage Police Department acknowledged Officer Pfalmer's loss as a line-of-duty death. He was subsequently recognized by the Alaska Peace Officers Memorial, and this year his name is inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

It is fitting that Cathy Diehl Robbins was invited by the National Law Enforcement Officers Fund to read Officer Pfalmer's name at the annual candlelight ceremony, which was held last night, Sunday, May 13. I am pleased that Garry Pfalmer, one of Officer Pfalmer's three sons, was able to travel from Fairbanks to witness the ceremony.

During this National Police Week, we remember fallen officers for the way they lived their lives, not the way they gave them. Today, we remember Officer Pfalmer not only for the events of June 9, 1953, but also for the support and the inspiration he provided to his family during the next 17 years: a hero at home and a hero in the service of our community.

During this National Police Week, we recite again and again the phrase that "heroes never die." So let us spend a moment to reflect upon the life of Officer Pfalmer, and as we do, let us acknowledge the efforts of an angel named Cathy Diehl Robbins, who brought the story of Officer Pfalmer back to life.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, it took me a few minutes to get the details I needed to respond to Senator COBURN. I am sorry for the delay. But I want to continue the debate we had just about 45 minutes ago on his amendment No. 1089 about which he spoke earlier, and we are prepared, I think, to vote on in the morning.

I am hoping my good colleague from Oklahoma will think about the possibility of withdrawing his amendment because I am going to submit some things for the RECORD that I think might have a bearing.

First of all, I think he offered his amendment in a way to be somewhat critical—although he was very respectful—somewhat critical that the Federal Government would be funding visitors centers before we build our levees and protections that we need for south

Louisiana. I was a little puzzled by that, I went and found the facts.

Actually, we are not asking the Federal Government to spend a dime. What we are asking the Federal Government to do is simply to authorize a visitors center, type A as opposed to B, so we can be, as I said in the earlier debate, more interpretive—to have a real place where people can come and learn about the wetlands and the entire delta. The cost difference between B and A would be absorbed by Louisiana. So the Senator's main argument that it would cost the taxpayers of the United States, out of our budget, out of our money, is not accurate. I am not sure he understood that, but I think it has real bearing on the debate.

Again, in reference to Coburn amendment No. 1089, which is the Atchafalaya Basin Project, Eagle Point and Fosse Point Visitors Center, it is to simply authorize a larger type, more robust center, if you would, so we can have a kind of interpretive visitors center and education to go on in this part of the State, teaching not only ourselves in our State and the region but the country about the benefits and really extraordinary value of the wetlands.

Madam President, 8,000 visitors a month visit this center, which is already established. Again, it is at no cost to the Federal Government. I will speak with Senator COBURN in an effort to see if he can withdraw his amendment. If not, we will continue this debate tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent to have this document printed in the RECORD.

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

LOUISIANA ATCHAFALAYA BASIN PROGRAM
PROJECT PROFILES

The ultimate goal at Eagle Point Park is to enhance, promote, preserve and protect the ecosystem of the lake and the precious resources of the Atchafalaya Basin.

The development of Eagle Point Park will provide a sustainable recreation park facility designed to fulfill the needs of eco-tourism and become a welcomed regional and state amenity. The park's exceptional location near the Atchafalaya Basin will continue to remind visitors of what Louisiana once looked like in its pristine splendor of unbroken forests and swamps. Ultimately, Eagle Point Park will preserve the precious resources of the basin, recover the basin's majesty while managing the human impact, and enhance economic development to surrounding communities and the entire state.

The Corps of Engineers is developing a scope of work to produce Plans and Specifications for the Phase I analysis currently underway with the Team of the Corps of Engineers, URS, GSA, Wayne Labiche Engineering, and Sidney Bourgeois Architects. After completion of this work the Parish will be in a position to advertise and award a construction contract(s) for the Phase I development.

Additionally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is currently considering an aquatic restoration project in Lake Fausse Pointe. The lake has filled in to a depth of 1.5 feet in many places and the warm shallow water is not conducive to fish life. Plans are being considered for dredging a series of sink holes

and using the dredge material to build small islands which will provide animal and bird habitat and should eventually provide shade along the banks.

Aside from the Educational Value of facilities: State and Federal Agencies would be housed at Morgan City Interpretive Center; LSD will put research lab at the Morgan City Facility; and discussion is ongoing with other agencies for location.

It is important to note that Morgan City was the host of a FEMA trailer site, but the site has been closed.

8,000 visitors visit the Atchafalaya Basin Floodway each month.

Ms. LANDRIEU. In addition, Madam President, I referred earlier to a Washington Post article, an article written by John Barry. It was an opinion piece in Saturday's paper, May 12, I referred to it, but I am not sure that I technically asked for it to be printed in the RECORD. At this point I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Saturday, May 12, 2007.]

OUR COAST TO FIX—OR LOSE
(By John M. Barry)

There has been much debate in the past 20 months over protecting Louisiana from another lethal hurricane, but nearly all of it has been conducted without any real understanding of the geological context. Congress and the Bush administration need to recognize six facts that define the national interest.

Fact 1: The Gulf of Mexico once reached north to Cape Girardeau, Mo. But the Mississippi River carries such an enormous sediment load that, combined with a falling sea level, it deposited enough sediment to create 35,000 square miles of land from Cape Girardeau to the present mouth of the river.

This river-created land includes the entire coast, complete with barrier islands, stretching from Mississippi to Texas. But four human interventions have interfered with this natural process; three of them that benefit the rest of the country have dramatically increased the hurricane threat to the Gulf Coast.

Fact 2: Acres of riverbank at a time used to collapse into the river system providing a main source of sediment. To prevent this and to protect lives and property, engineers stopped such collapses by paving hundreds of miles of the river with riprap and even concrete, beginning more than 1,000 miles upriver—including on the Ohio, Missouri and other tributaries—from New Orleans. Reservoirs for flood protection also impound sediment. These and other actions deprive the Mississippi of 60 to 70 percent of its natural sediment load, starving the coast.

Fact 3: To stop sandbars from blocking shipping at the mouth of the Mississippi, engineers built jetties extending more than two miles out into the Gulf of Mexico. This engineering makes Tulsa, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh and other cities into ports with direct access to the ocean, greatly enhancing the nation's economy. The river carries 20 percent of the nation's exports, including 60 percent of its grain exports, and the river at New Orleans is the busiest port in the world. But the jetties prevent any of the sediment remaining in the river from replenishing the Louisiana and Mississippi coasts and barrier islands; instead, the jetties drop the sediment off the continental shelf.

Fact 4: Levees that prevent river flooding in Louisiana and Mississippi interfere with the replenishment of the land locally as well.

Fact 5: Roughly 30 percent of the country's domestic oil and gas production comes from offshore Louisiana, and to service that production the industry created more than 10,000 miles of canals and pipelines through the marsh.

Every inch of those 10,000-plus miles lets saltwater penetrate, and eat away at, the coast. So energy production has enormously accelerated what was a slow degradation, transforming a long-term problem into an immediate crisis. The deprivation of sediment is like moving a block of ice from the freezer to the sink, where it begins to melt; the effect of the canals and pipelines is like attacking that ice with an ice pick, breaking it up.

As a result, 2,100 square miles of coastal land and barrier islands have melted into the Gulf of Mexico. This land once served as a buffer between the ocean and populated areas in Louisiana and part of Mississippi, protecting them during hurricanes. Each land mile over which a hurricane travels absorbs roughly a foot of storm surge.

The nation as a whole gets nearly all the benefits of engineering the river. Louisiana and some of coastal Mississippi get 100 percent of the costs. Eastern New Orleans (including the lower Ninth Ward) and St. Bernard Parish—nearly all of which, incidentally, is at or above sea level—exemplify this allocation of costs and benefits. Three man-made shipping canals pass through them, creating almost no jobs there but benefiting commerce throughout the country. Yet nearly all the 175,000 people living there saw their homes flooded not because of any natural vulnerability but because of levee breaks.

Fact 6: Without action, land loss will continue, and it will increasingly jeopardize populated areas, the port system and energy production. This would be catastrophic for America. Scientists say the problem can be solved, even with rising sea levels, but that we have only a decade to begin addressing it in a serious way or the damage may be irreversible.

Despite all this and President Bush's pledge from New Orleans in September 2005 that "we will do what it takes" to help people rebuild, a draft White House cuts its own recommendation of \$2 billion for coastal restoration to \$1 billion while calling for an increase in the state's contribution from the usual 35 percent to 50 percent. Generating benefits to the nation is what created the problem, and the nation needs to solve it. Put simply: Why should a cab driver in Pittsburgh or Tulsa pay to fix Louisiana's coast? Because he gets a stronger economy and lower energy costs from it, and because his benefits created the problem. The failure of Congress and the president to act aggressively to repair the coastline at the mouth of the Mississippi River could threaten the economic vitality of the nation. Louisiana, one of the poorest states, can no longer afford to underwrite benefits for the rest of the nation.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Finally, Madam President, I spoke earlier and read some items into the RECORD. I perhaps read the wrong list. So I am going to resubmit this so the RECORD is clear. The \$3.3 billion in the underlying WRDA bill represents about 20 percent of the total bill. As I tried to explain to some of my constituents at home, if we were talking about a desert bill we would probably have zero money in this bill. But we are talking about a water bill, and Louisiana most certainly has a great deal of water—sometimes more than we need, more than we asked for, and more than we want.

But this is Congress's major water development bill. Because we sit at the mouth of the greatest river system in the country, which is the mouth of the Mississippi River, and because we have some of the greatest and last coastal wetlands in the country, of course, this would have a great many projects for us.

We really appreciate, Senator VITTER and I, the cooperation of Republicans and Democrats in being particularly supportive of us as we struggle to get many of these protection projects in this bill authorized because, of course, of our recent tragic experiences with the storms.

The \$3.3 billion in projects is significant, necessary, and essential to beginning to build a kind of barrier of protection that the people of south Louisiana, and I might add south Mississippi and part of south Texas, depend on to keep them safe.

We do not live right on the coast, as people do in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and actually in Texas. We are the only people actually moving from the coast. We are not moving to the beaches. There are no beaches to move to.

I ask unanimous consent the list be printed in the RECORD.

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

**WRDA 2007—SENATE FLOOR CONSIDERATION
(MAY 7–10, 2007)**

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF WRDA

WRDA 2007 authorizes more than an estimated \$13.9 billion of Corps projects.

In comparison—WRDA 2000 authorized \$4.1 billion; WRDA 1999 authorized \$2.5 billion.

The major authorization components of WRDA 2006 are:

Louisiana: **\$3.336 billion**—24%

Florida Everglades: \$1.73 billion—12%

Upper Mississippi River—Illinois Waterway: \$3.77 billion—27%

All Other Authorizations: **\$5.064 billion**—37%

Estimated Total: **\$13.90 billion**—100%

LOUISIANA PROJECTS

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration: \$1.133 million

Louisiana Coastal Ecosystem next wave: \$728 million

Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection: \$886 million

Port of Iberia Navigation/Storm Surge Protection: \$131 million

Jefferson Parish Consolidation: \$100 million

Larose to Golden Meadow certification up to 100 year level: \$90 million

MRGO Revolving Loan Fund for Private Facilities: \$85 million

MRGO Relocation Assistance for Public Facilities: \$75 million

Red River Waterway mitigation: \$33 million

Southeast Louisiana development planning: \$17 million

Calcasieu River and Pass Rock Bank Protection: \$15 million

Various Louisiana Environmental Infrastructure: \$13 million

Bayou Sorrel Lock: \$10 million

MRGO de-authorization: \$5 million

Total: **\$3.336 billion**

BOLD Text represents changes from WRDA 2006

Ms. LANDRIEU. These are coastal wetlands. We are proud of that. It is a

totally different environment and topography than exists in many other places. But we do have some very special and extraordinary needs, and I would be doing a great disservice to the people of our State if we didn't fight as hard as we could for the many projects in this bill—for the Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration; the Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection Project, which we literally have been working on for 20 years; the Port of Iberia Navigation and Vermilion Parish Hurricane Protection Project; Jefferson Parish consolidation; Larose to Golden Meadow, which is a little community down here in Lafourche Parish, but it was the only authorized Federal levee that did not collapse in the last hurricane. But it has been shrinking. This will help us to build it up, to strengthen it, and to keep that wonderful community safe and dry, as the next storms approach.

We understand people cannot live in some areas. They are prohibited from development. We are doing much more strict zoning and planning and community planning and design. In fact, some communities are picking up and moving north. Some communities are not building any more in flood zones. We are with the program when it comes to keeping our people safe.

We can do more in that regard and we will. But without these fundamental earthen barriers and levees and locks, this job will never get done. It is not going to get done overnight, but it will be done, to protect the 3.5 million people who live in the southern part of Louisiana, as well as about 1.5 million people who live in Mississippi.

As you can see, these are the great wetlands of Saint Bernard and Plaquemines Parish Project, Gulfport, and some parts of Pascagoula, and Pass Christian. The storms come from the west. It gives a tremendous buffer to Gulfport and Pascagoula. Of course, if the storms come more from the east, they are more vulnerable as they lay bare to those storm surges and high winds.

For these wetlands to stay and to be restored by the actions of this bill is incredibly important and actually essential to the preservation of this great metropolitan area. This is more than New Orleans, which is 450,000 people, or was before the storm. It is now down to about 200,000. Jefferson Parish, which is part of the metropolitan area, our suburban sister parish, is 450,000. That parish could have just as easily gone under 4 to 12 feet of water had the levees broken on the other side of the canal that sits about right here.

In addition, north of the lake—this is Lake Pontchartrain—we have 700,000 people ringing the north side of this lake, and hundreds of thousands of people who are living down in these ridges.

There is a tremendous amount of population that needs to be saved and protected and sustained. But as I said earlier, it is not just the people who

are there, it is the economy, the infrastructure of the economy we are protecting and supporting. Whether it is fisheries, transportation, navigation, 10,000 miles of pipeline, to keep the lights on and provide gas and electricity and fuel to the rest of this country—that comes from here, as do petrochemicals that help to make many of the products that we manufacture in this country better and safer for human use. That happens along the southern part of this great delta.

That is why we fought so hard for this bill. I want to end by saying I commend Senator BOXER, my colleague from California, for making this a priority. I thank our leader, HARRY REID. It has been 8 long years since WRDA has passed and Louisiana cannot wait another month, let alone another year.

There is a hurricane season literally right around the corner in June. This is the middle of May. People are still on pins and needles wondering whether the levees that we have reconstructed and fixed are going to hold for this next hurricane season. They are most certainly looking with great anticipation, and some anxieties, too, if this Congress will act.

I know there are some amendments that are going to be laid down complaining about some aspects of this bill, but I thank Senator BOXER, and I thank Senator INHOFF for his attention to the needs of Louisiana, and I thank this Congress for responding so generously and so quickly. Senator VITTER and I do have several amendments we would like to discuss later tomorrow, which would improve some things from our perspective. But we most certainly understand and appreciate the great work that has gone into this underlying bill.

This bill needs to pass now. It lays a foundation for the long-term recovery and restoration of this great delta. Some expense will be borne by the Federal Government, which is absolutely appropriate since the benefits go all over the Nation from the river systems and the other infrastructure, economic infrastructure that exists. And some of the costs will be borne, as it should be, by the people who call Louisiana home and call Calcasieu Parish or Cameron or Vermilion or Iberia, Orleans, Plaquemines, Saint Bernard, Saint Tammany, et cetera, home.

We are happy to make our own contributions to this effort. We love our home. We love where we live. We have to make it safer, and we have to be able to restore these wetlands and build better levees that do not fail and do not break in the middle of these storms.

We cannot stop the storms, but we most certainly can mitigate against the damage and use better science, better engineering, and, frankly, better leadership in this Congress to make sure the tragedies that happen in Katrina and Rita do not repeat themselves.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that any cloture filed tomorrow on amendments 1097 and 1098 be considered as having been filed prior to the motion to proceed to S. 1348.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1495 on Tuesday, May 15, the time until 11:45 a.m. be for debate with respect to the Coburn amendment No. 1099, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators BOXER and COBURN or their designees; that at 11:45 a.m., the Senate vote in relation to the amendment, with no intervening amendment in order prior to the vote.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL MILITARY SPOUSES APPRECIATION DAY

• Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, Friday, May 11, 2007, was National Military Spouses Day. Oftentimes, those who are, as the saying goes, “married to the military” are not recognized for the support they provide and sacrifice they endure during the time of their spouses’ active duty service. Certainly when a member is deployed, but throughout a military member’s career, the strength and support of a wife or husband can make the difference between success or failure for that individual and that family. Military spouses endure the hardship of separation from loved ones, frequently take on the role of a single parent, and move more often than most civilians throughout the course of a military career. They receive no commendation medals and few accolades, save the gratitude of an exhausted spouse who comes home to a warm embrace and nurturing bond after a long deployment or simply another late night at work. Military spouses are truly war’s unsung heroes. In addition to a job they may have outside the home, they are teacher, chief consoler, housekeeper, accountant, taxi driver, cook,

referee and nurse. They encounter their own battles bravely, with efficiency, expertise and stubborn persistence supporting our Nation in their daily challenges every bit as valiantly as our military members do.

I commend the over 1,000 military spouses in or from Idaho and U.S. military spouses worldwide and thank them for their service to our Nation, sacrifice and patriotism. Our country, but most importantly their families, need their strength. We all depend on it.●

TRIBUTE TO CLAUD R. JUDD

• Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, on April 13, 2007, Idaho grieved at the passing of one of her great men, Claud R. Judd. Claud lived most all of his life in Fraser, ID, and left behind his wife Elvita, 2 sisters, 3 sons, 1 daughter, 12 grandchildren and 11 great-grandchildren. A lifelong farmer, Claud is perhaps best known to Idahoans for his many years of public service. From local cemetery, park, school, hospital and county fair boards to Clearwater County commissioner and member of the Idaho State Legislature in both houses, he exemplified public service. His legacy is a model of civic duty and commitment to family and community.

Claud found the time in his busy schedule to write a book about his family, and compile a scrapbook about the Clearwater County Extension and 4-H spanning seven decades. He was a hard, honest worker, and committed himself fully to whatever endeavor he undertook. I had the honor and privilege of serving in the Idaho State Legislature with Claud. Fellow lawmakers and staff could always count on him to be honest, kind and thorough. Claud was known as a consensus-builder who put the needs of his constituents first. He focused on results and was known to care little for the politics that cause party line divisions. He represented the Idahoans of Clearwater County with integrity and common sense, reflecting his deep Idaho agriculture roots.

My wife and I join other Idahoans in mourning this great loss to our State, and we offer our most sincere condolences to Elvita and the family.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2082. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2206. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural