

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means a State or local government, nonprofit corporation, educational agency, community development organization, or other entity that agrees to comply with the conditions established under this section.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the department or agency on whose authority a vessel is conveyed to an eligible entity.

(4) UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT VESSEL.—The term “United States government vessel” means a vessel owned by the United States Government.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REID, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN:)

S.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, while the Senate was resuming its business in a new Congress, two dozen families on the other side of the world were fleeing their homes. Ninety-four men and women, some young some old, grabbed whatever belongings they could carry and headed north along the eastern Burmese border to escape the torment of a brutal regime.

Human rights officials tell us what happened next. Late last month, these families were forced to move again. And as I stand here today, they are cramped inside the homes of other refugees. We are looking forward to summer vacations. They are looking ahead at the bitter work of building new homes in the rain, with their hands, in a remote corner of a stark, isolated wasteland the world seems to have forgotten.

Mr. President, I am here to report that the United States has not forgotten. We will continue to shine a light

on the oppressive and illegitimate military regime that drove these families from their homes. And I will rise every year, as I do today, with my good friend the senior Senator from California, to reintroduce a bill that extends for another year a ban on imports from Burma.

Republicans and Democrats work together proudly on some things in the Senate. The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act is one of them. I am pleased to say that even though the control of Congress has changed, its commitment to the people of Burma has not. Senator FEINSTEIN and I are joined this year by 57 cosponsors, more than last year and the year before that. On the Republican side, for example, the people of Burma have no better friend than the senior Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

Support for the people of Burma is growing on Capitol Hill. Senator FEINSTEIN and the senior Senator from Texas recently formed the Women's Caucus on Burma. The First Lady attended its first meeting last month, adding her voice to a growing chorus of those opposed to the Burmese regime. The voices are not just coming from Washington. But the words and actions of Washington are beginning to cause others to take note of this dire situation.

Last year, the United Nations Security Council agreed for the first time to put Burma on its agenda. In January, a U.N. Security Council resolution that enjoyed the support of a majority of the Council's member nations was unfortunately blocked by Russian and Chinese vetoes. We remain encouraged by the fact that nine countries agreed to hold the regime accountable. We urge Russia and China to reconsider their stance.

We know others are beginning to notice Burma because 3 years ago the Association of Southeast Asian nations called the sufferings in Burma “an internal matter.” Yet today ASEAN recognizes that the “Burma problem” is its problem, too.

Southeast Asian leaders have spoken out more frequently and forcefully over the last year in calling for democratic reforms. They join the United States and other freedom-loving people who have demanded for years that the military thugs who control Burma loosen their grip.

We know others are starting taking notice because earlier this year the United Nations Secretary General, Ban Ki-Moon, urged the release of Burma's roughly 1,300 political prisoners, including the world's only imprisoned Nobel Laureate, Aung San Suu Kyi.

And we know others are starting to take notice because that effort was followed by a letter signed by 59 former heads of state.

The Burmese military regime, the State Peace and Development Council, is on notice: the wider international community, including its neighbors, are increasingly aware and increasingly outraged by its behavior.

Mr. President, The purpose of sanctions is to change behavior. And the changes we seek, in partnership with the Burmese people, are these: concrete, irreversible steps toward reconciliation and democratization that include the full, unfettered participation of the National League for Democracy and ethnic minorities; ending attacks on ethnic minorities; and the immediate, unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience, including Suu Kyi. The regime also needs to know that a sham constitutional process and token prisoner releases will not be regarded by anyone as progress toward these goals.

The argument against sanctions—that they are most harmful to those they are meant to help—is well known. But it does not apply to Burma. It has long been the policy of the NLD, the winner of Burma's last democratic election, to seek reform through sanctions against the current regime.

And for good reason. Burma's military junta has maintained an iron grip on every aspect of the country's economy. Its leaders flaunt and squander whatever wealth they can squeeze from Burmese workers, leaving the country's economy in ruins—but leaving enough aside for its current leader, GEN Than Shwe, to impulsively relocate the Burmese capital from Rangoon at a cost of millions, or to throw a wedding for his daughter that is reported to have cost millions more.

The military junta has complete control over the flow of goods and money in and out of Burma. And every dollar that is spent on Burmese products is money spent on financing the regime. It is the SPDC, not the allies of the Burmese people, who are responsible for Burma's economic woes.

As diplomatic pressure intensifies, as the rest of the international community undertakes the kind of change we have seen in ASEAN, the supporters of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act are confident this regime will be forced to change its ways.

The situation is urgent. Burma's military regime has become increasingly reckless. And the humanitarian situation is grave and deteriorating: the junta has intensified its abuse of minority groups through rape and forced labor. It continues to harass and detain a new generation of peaceful activists, activists like a young woman named Su Su Nway, who has inspired the world with her resolute defiance of forced labor practices.

In standing up to the Burmese regime, Su Su Nway drew inspiration from Suu Kyi. Now she is inspiring another generation of Burmese activists who are willing to defend their rights and, despite the danger to themselves, refuse to remain silent in the face of the abuses they see.

According to the Los Angeles Times, Su Su Nway was asked by a radio reporter last year whether she feared imprisonment. Her simple but eloquent response should give us hope in the determination of this new generation of

activists. "I will stand for the truth," she said.

The crimes of the Burmese government are well documented. Here is what we know: nearly 70,000 children have been taken from their homes and forcibly conscripted—that's more children than live in all of Lexington, the second-largest city in my State.

Forced labor is a daily threat in the southeastern Karen State, where military personnel force villagers to build roads and shelters, without food or pay, and to leave their homes and farms to do the work. Some are used as human shields against democratic insurgents.

These are the lucky ones. Others are forced to walk ahead of military convoys to act as human minesweepers. If there is a landmine, they blow up. It is from diabolical thugs like these that desperate, exhausted families are fleeing their homes.

Drugs and disease are spreading across Burma's borders along with its people, and it is no secret why. According to the World Health Organization, Burma is home to one of the worst AIDS epidemics in Southeast Asia. Yet it spent just \$137,000 last year on the care and treatment of people with HIV/AIDS, even as it spends countless millions on Chinese and Russian tanks and jets.

You can tell a lot about a man from the company he keeps. We could say the same about governments. In late April, Burma established diplomatic relations with the government of North Korea for the first time in two decades. It was reported last month that a North Korean cargo ship docked in Burma. This is a disturbing development to those of us on the outside looking in. It can only be discouraging to democratic reformers inside Burma.

News of North Korea's presence on the Burmese coast came shortly after another troubling piece of news. In early April, Burma's second in command led a delegation on the nation's first-ever high-level trip to Russia. And last month, the Burmese government announced an agreement with Russia to build a nuclear research reactor in Burma.

This should send a chill up the spine of every one of us. Even peaceful nations that lack the proper legal and regulatory framework should not be allowed to have a nuclear program. Those that torture and abuse their own people and consort with rogue regimes such as North Korea should not be allowed to even contemplate it.

And this is how this rogue regime has held onto its power: Internal efforts at reform are violently stamped out, as they were when thousands of peaceful prodemocracy protesters were slaughtered in 1988. In response to a national election in 1990, in which Suu Kyi's party, the NLD, won 80 percent of the seats in a new parliament, the regime simply threw out the results.

By refusing to accept imports from a regime that terrorizes people like Suu

Kyi, Su Su Nway, and so many others, we are standing up and facing these tyrants at our own borders and turning them back—until they release these prisoners and begin the process of democratization and reconciliation. Every dollar we keep out of the hands of this junta is one less dollar it can use to fund the conscription of children, its nuclear program, and the war it has waged against its own people for nearly two decades.

Later this month, Suu Kyi will celebrate her 62nd birthday, alone. I urge my colleagues to stand with her as that day approaches. By denying support for those who imprison her, we will pressure them to change.

There are fresh signs that these sanctions have begun to do their work. But we need to keep the pressure on. So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator MCCONNELL and 54 of our colleagues to introduce a joint resolution renewing the ban on all imports from Burma for another year.

Simply put, the ruling State Peace and Development Council—SPDC—has not taken the necessary actions to warrant a lifting of the sanctions at this time.

Indeed, Burma represents one of the most critical human rights situations in the world today.

Aung San Suu Kyi, Nobel Peace Prize recipient and leader of the National League for Democracy, is confined to her home by orders of the military junta.

She has spent the better part of the past 17 years imprisoned or under house arrest and on May 25, 2003 her sentence was extended for another year.

There is no indication that the regime will free her anytime soon.

This is simply unacceptable. She should be released immediately and unconditionally and the regime should begin real and substantive national reconciliation talks with Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy—NLD.

The NLD, the winning party in Burma's last free elections in 1990 with 82 percent of the seats in parliament, is forbidden from participating in public life. For over 20 years, the military junta has been unwilling to take meaningful steps towards political reconciliation.

And let us not forget: 4 years ago government sponsored thugs attempted

to assassinate Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy by attacking her motorcade in northern Burma.

Indeed, the human rights situation in Burma is deplorable and demands a clear, unified response from the international community: 1,300 political prisoners are still in jail; according to the U.N. Special Rapporteur, over 3,000 villages have been destroyed by the military junta; 70,000 child soldiers have been forcibly recruited; over 500,000 people are internally displaced in Burma today, and over 1 million people have fled Burma over the past two decades, destabilizing Burma's neighbors. Also, the practice of rape as a form of repression has been sanctioned by the Burmese military; use of forced labor is widespread; human trafficking is rampant; Burma is the world's second-largest opium producer after Afghanistan and increasingly a source of trafficking of synthetic narcotics.

Some may argue that while the human rights situation is indeed deplorable, sanctions are not the proper solution and we should try a new course.

I agree that sanctions are not a panacea for every foreign policy concern. I am disappointed that Aung San Suu Kyi remains under house arrest and we still have not realized our goal of a free and democratic Burma.

Yet now is not the time to lift the import ban on Burma. First, the military junta has not fulfilled any of the obligations of the "Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003" that would allow a lifting of the ban. It has not made "substantial and measurable progress" towards: ending violations of internationally recognized human rights; releasing all political prisoners; allowing freedom of speech and press; allowing freedom of association; permitting the peaceful exercise of religion and; bringing to a conclusion an agreement between the SPDC and the National League for Democracy and Burma's ethnic nationalities on the restoration of a democratic government.

If we were to allow the import ban to expire, we would reward the military junta for its inaction, its failure to fulfill these basic obligations, and its continued brutal crackdown on the human rights of the citizens of Burma.

We simply cannot afford to send that message to those who bravely stand up to the SPDC and reject their abuses.

I remind my colleagues that we are not voting to enact the import ban in perpetuity.

We are renewing it for one more year and we will have another opportunity to review its effectiveness next year.

Second, Aung San Suu Kyi and the democratic opposition continue to support the import ban.

They recognize that it is not directed at the people of Burma, but at the military junta that dominates economic and political activity in their country and denies them their rights.

Third, we are seeing progress in the international community in putting additional pressure on Burma.

In a recent letter addressed to the State Peace and Development Council, a distinguished group of 59 former heads of state—including former Filipino president Corazon Aquino, former Czech president Vaclav Havel, former British prime minister John Major and former Presidents Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, and George H.W. Bush—called for the regime to release Aung San Suu Kyi.

They correctly noted that “Aung San Suu Kyi is not calling for revolution in Burma, but rather peaceful, nonviolent dialogue between the military, National League for Democracy, and Burma’s ethnic groups.”

The calls for Suu Kyi’s release are also coming from Burma’s neighbors.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations—ASEAN—now recognizes that Burma’s actions are not an “internal matter” but a significant threat to peace and stability in the region.

At a meeting of senior diplomats last month, ASEAN made a clear call for Aung San Suu Kyi’s release.

As Philippine foreign under secretary Erlinda Basilio said: “It’s a consensus that we want to see her early release.”

An editorial in the Jakarta Post recently commented that the regime’s refusal to heed these calls “shows its complete disregard for the growing values of ASEAN.” That is from the Jakarta Post, May 29, 2007.

We are also seeing progress at the United Nations. In January, for the first time, the United Nations debated a binding, non-punitive resolution on Burma.

Among other things that resolution called on the military junta:

... to take concrete steps to allow full freedom of expression, association, and movement by unconditionally releasing Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and all political prisoners, lifting all constraints on all political leaders and citizens, and allowing the National League for Democracy (NLD) and other political parties to operate freely.

While nine countries voted in favor of the resolution, I am extremely disappointed that China and Russia exercised their veto.

A report by former Czech President Vaclav Havel and retired archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa—“Threat to Peace: A Call for the U.N. Security Council to Act on Burma”—confirms the need for U.N. intervention. It details how the situation in Burma fulfills each of the criteria used for past intervention by the Security Council: overthrow of an elected government; armed conflicts with ethnic minorities; widespread human rights violations; outflow of refugees—over 700,000; and drug production and trafficking and the spread of HIV/AIDS.

I firmly believe that momentum for United Nations Security Council action is on our side and I am confident that body will revisit this resolution again this year.

I am also hopeful that the new United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon will personally get involved in putting pressure on the military junta to respect the wishes of the people of Burma and the international community by releasing Aung San Suu Kyi and restoring democratic government.

In a letter signed by myself, Senator MCCONNELL and a bipartisan group of 43 other U.S. Senators we wrote:

We urge you to personally intervene with the regime on a regular basis to establish concrete benchmarks and timetables for democratic progress in Burma. We also urge you to hold the Burmese government accountable for achieving those goals. The Burmese people deserve more than talk—they deserve action.

We can demonstrate to the Secretary General that we too are committed to action by passing this joint resolution promptly.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe the women of the U.S. Senate have a special obligation to speak out on this issue. Last month we came together to form the United States Senate Women’s Caucus on Burma and hold our inaugural event with First Lady Laura Bush. I am proud to co-chair that caucus with my friend and colleague from Texas, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON. Together we expressed our solidarity with Aung San Suu Kyi and called for her immediate and unconditional release so that a peaceful transition to a democratic government may begin.

It is my great hope that one day the United States Senate Women’s Caucus on Burma will welcome Aung San Suu Kyi to Washington, DC, as the woman who led her nation from repression to freedom.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu has rightly said, “As long as [Suu Kyi] remains under house arrest, not one of us is truly free.”

Today, I urge the State Peace and Development Council to release Aung San Suu Kyi immediately and unconditionally.

I urge the United Nations Security Council to pass a binding resolution on Burma.

And I urge the U.S. Senate to pass this joint resolution to renew the import ban on Burma for another year.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 235—DESIGNATING JULY 1, 2007, AS “NATIONAL BOATING DAY”

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

S. RES. 235

Whereas the United States boating population exceeds 73,000,000 individuals utilizing and enjoying nearly 18,000,000 recreational watercraft;

Whereas the recreational boating industry provides more than \$39,000,000,000 in sales and services to the United States economy

and provides nearly 380,000 manufacturing jobs;

Whereas there are approximately 1,400 active boat builders in the United States with parts and materials being contributed from all fifty States;

Whereas boating appeals to all age groups and is a haven for relaxation that includes sailing, diving, fishing, water skiing, tubing, sightseeing, swimming, and more;

Whereas boaters serve as monitors and stewards of the environment, educating future generations in the value of this country’s abundant water and other natural resources; and

Whereas Congress passed the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 and later created the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund in 1984, both of these actions having resulted in a decline in the rate of boating injuries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 1, 2007, as “National Boating Day”;

(2) recognizes the value of recreational boating and commemorates the boating industry of the United States for its environmental stewardship and innumerable contributions to the economy and to the mental and physical health of those who enjoy boats; and

(3) urges citizens, policy makers, and elected officials to celebrate National Boating Day and to become more aware of the overall contributions of boating to the lives of the people of the United States and to the Nation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 236—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE NATIONAL ANTHEM PROJECT, WHICH HAS WORKED TO RESTORE AMERICA’S VOICE BY RE-TEACHING AMERICANS TO SING THE NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 236

Whereas a Harris Interactive Survey discovered that of men and women 18 years of age and older, 61 percent of those surveyed did not know all the lyrics of the first stanza of the national anthem, and of those who answered the question affirmatively, 58 percent had received at least 5 years of music education while growing up;

Whereas an ABC News poll revealed that more than 1 in 3 Americans (38 percent) do not know that the official name of the national anthem is “The Star-Spangled Banner”, less than 35 percent of American teenagers can name Francis Scott Key as the author of the national anthem, and as few as 15 percent of American youth can sing the words to the anthem from memory;

Whereas the national anthem, “The Star-Spangled Banner”, holds a special place in the hearts and minds of the American people as a symbol of national unity, resolve, and willingness to sacrifice in order to preserve the Nation’s sacred heritage of freedom;

Whereas the National Anthem Project has inspired the American people to have a greater appreciation of their patriotic musical heritage while learning American history;

Whereas music educators are the among the leading caretakers of this important piece of our Nation's heritage, in that many students learn the national anthem in music class;

Whereas our Nation's future is enhanced by the quality of the historic knowledge and awareness provided to children of all ages through learning about the national anthem, and that high-quality music education represents a worthy commitment to our children and our Nation's future; and

Whereas, the national anthem is the symbol of American ideals and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the National Anthem Project;

(2) commends the American citizens who have participated in this project; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to learn the national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner", and its proud history.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1562. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. CRAIG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1563. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1564. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1565. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1566. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1567. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1568. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1569. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1570. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CRAIG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1571. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1572. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr.

COLEMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1573. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SALAZAR)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1537 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. DURBIN)) to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1574. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1575. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1576. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1577. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1578. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mrs. DOLE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1579. Mr. OBAMA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1580. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1581. Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. KYL, and Mr. ENSIGN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1582. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1583. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1584. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1585. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1566 proposed by Mr. WARNER to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1586. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REID, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1587. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R.

6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1588. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1589. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1590. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1591. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1592. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1593. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1594. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1595. Mr. KOHL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1596. Mr. KOHL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1597. Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1598. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1599. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1600. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1601. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1602. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1603. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1604. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1605. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to