

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 sup-

porting 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:

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1640. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the definitions of a hull and a deck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a small but important piece of intellectual property legislation today with my friends from Texas, Wisconsin, and Rhode Island. Our recent collaborations have been fruitful and important. The OPEN Government Act with Senator CORNYN, NOPEC with Senator KOHL, and patent reform with Senator WHITEHOUSE. Today, we are joining together to reintroduce the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments of 2007.

Designs of boat vessel hulls are often the result of a great deal of time, effort, and financial investment. They are afforded intellectual property protection under the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act that Congress passed in 1998. This law exists for the same reason that other works enjoy intellectual property rights: to encourage continued innovation, to protect the works that emerge from the creative process, and to reward the creators. Recent courtroom experience has made it clear that the protections Congress passed 7 years ago need some statutory refinement to ensure they meet the purposes we envisioned. The Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments shore up the law, making an important clarification about the scope of the protections available to boat designs.

We continue to be fascinated with, and in so many ways dependent on, bodies of water, both for recreation and commerce. More than 50 percent of Americans live on or near the coastline in this country. We seem always to be drawn to the water, whether it is the beautiful Lake Champlain in my home State of Vermont or the world's large oceans. As anyone who has visited our seaports can attest, much of our commerce involves sea travel. Protecting boat designs and encouraging innovation in those designs are worthy aims, and I hope we can move quickly to pass this bipartisan legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1640

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. VESSEL HULL DESIGN PROTECTION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Vessel Hull Design Protection Amendments of 2007”.

(b) DESIGNS PROTECTED.—Section 1301(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) VESSEL FEATURES.—The design of a vessel hull, deck, or combination of a hull and deck, including a plug or mold, is subject to protection under this chapter, notwithstanding section 1302(4).”.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1301(b) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “vessel hull, including a plug or mold,” and inserting “vessel hull or deck, including a plug or mold,”;

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) A ‘hull’ is the exterior frame or body of a vessel, exclusive of the deck, superstructure, masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) A ‘deck’ is the horizontal surface of a vessel that covers the hull, including exterior cabin and cockpit surfaces, and exclusive of masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments.”.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today along with the senior Senator from Vermont to introduce the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments of 2007. This is another significant piece of legislation on which I proudly have teamed with Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Most recently, we have worked together on important reforms to the Freedom of Information Act, and also introduced comprehensive patent reform legislation. I am glad to continue our work by introducing this legislation which, though seemingly technical and minor, offers very important clarifications about the scope of protections available to boat designers.

Boat designs, like any technical designs, are complex and are the result of a great deal of hard work and contribution of intellectual property. Accordingly, Congress enacted the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act in 1998 to provide necessary protections that were not present among copyright statutes prior to that time. The act has been instrumental for the continued development and protection of boat designs but unfortunately recently has encountered a few hurdles.

A recent court decision raised questions about the scope of protections available to various boat designs. Justifiably or not, this interpretation under the VHDPA unfortunately has led many in the boat manufacturing industry to conclude that the act's provisions are not effective at protecting vessel designs. Intellectual property protection of those designs is critical to these manufacturers in order to encourage innovative design, and a clarification of the law is needed.

The legislation we offer will clarify that the protections accorded to a vessel design can be used to separately protect a vessel's hull and/or deck as well as a plug or mold of either the hull or deck. The proposed amendments would make clear that it remains possible for boat designers to seek protection for both the hull and the deck, and plug or mold of both, of a single vessel, and many designers no doubt will continue to do so. However, these amendments are intended to clarify that protection under the VHDPA for these vessel elements may be analyzed separately.

This bipartisan legislation provides the necessary assurance to boat manufacturers that the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act will remain a vital intellectual property protection statute. The bill offers very important clarifications about the scope of protections available to boat designs and will be welcome news to boat makers across the Nation and in Texas. The thousands of miles of coastline in Texas, and all the lakes and rivers in between, provide significant opportunities for recreational and commercial boating throughout the state. This legislation will ensure that there will be continued innovation in the design and manufacture of boats for many years to come.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 1643. A bill to establish the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, one unresolved issue that is of grave concern to many in the west is unresolved Indian water rights claims. Over the past century, many parties have sought to determine the extent of Indian water rights in the courts. However, litigation to determine Indian water rights has failed in many respects for both Indians and non-Indians. Unresolved Indian water rights claims are of particular concern in New Mexico which has 23 Indian tribes.

As with all litigation, the outcome is uncertain and one party generally loses. If the Indian nations were to receive a large award by the courts and those water rights were exercised, the senior priority date of many Indian water rights claims have the potential to displace existing users. This means that non-Indian towns, farmers, and industry could ultimately have their water supply cut off. However, in many instances, even if an Indian nation were to receive a water windfall from the courts, many of the Indian nations lack the water infrastructure to make use of the water awarded by the courts. Additionally, Indian water rights litigation often takes decades. For example, the Aamodt litigation in New Mexico was filed in 1966 and is the longest standing litigation in the federal judiciary. Finally, the numerous unresolved Indian water rights claims in many western states such as New Mexico impair our ability to effectively un-

dertake water rights planning as we are unsure of the award that the Indian nations will receive.

Over the past two decades, many parties have pursued negotiated settlements in lieu of litigation, an approach beneficial to all parties involved. In negotiated settlements, multiple parties get together and determine how best to allocate water among Indians and non-Indians in a way that does not curtail existing uses. Many of the settlements also contain authorization for the Federal Government to provide funding to the Indian nations so that the Indian nations involved can make use of the water they are awarded under the terms of the settlement, resulting in economic development and health benefits on the Indian nation.

Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne and his staff deserve a great deal of credit for trying to advance the New Mexico Indian water rights settlements. However, current Federal budgets cannot accommodate the upcoming New Mexico settlements. This is troublesome for several reasons. First, it impairs Congress's ability to resolve Indian water rights claims in a way that keeps all water users whole. Additionally, many of the settlements require the construction of water infrastructure benefiting an Indian nation. Lack of a steady stream of Federal money results in water projects that take far longer to construct, costing taxpayers significantly more money in the long run.

Today I introduce the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund Act of 2007. This bill would establish a reliable source of Federal funding to resolve Indian water rights claims in New Mexico. The bill provides that, over the next 10 years, 30 percent of the revenues generated in New Mexico that would otherwise be deposited in the reclamation fund would instead be used to fund Indian water rights settlements. The amounts deposited in this fund could be used to pay for the Aamodt, Abeyta, and Navajo Indian water rights settlements after the parties resolve outstanding issues and the settlements are signed into law. It is important to note that the fund created by this legislation would allow us to fund New Mexico Indian water rights settlements without compromising the sustainability of the reclamation fund.

The consequences of not settling outstanding Indian water rights claims in New Mexico are dire. The legislation I introduce today would remove the main impediment to the resolution of Indian water rights settlement.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1643

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reclamation Water Settlements Fund Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FUND.—The term "Fund" means the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund established by section 3(a).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of New Mexico.

#### SEC. 3. RECLAMATION WATER SETTLEMENTS FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the "Reclamation Water Settlements Fund", consisting of—

(1) such amounts as are deposited to the Fund under subsection (b); and

(2) any interest earned on investment of amounts in the Fund under subsection (d).

#### (b) DEPOSITS TO FUND.

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of the 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the Fund an amount equal to 30 percent of the revenues generated within the external boundaries of the State of New Mexico that would otherwise be deposited for the fiscal year in the fund established by the first section of the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—On deposit, the amounts in the Fund under subsection (a)(1), and on accrual, any interest earned under subsection (d), shall be available annually, without further appropriation, to carry out subsection (c).

#### (c) USE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—On request of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary such amounts in the Fund as are necessary to fund any activities of the Bureau of Reclamation relating to Indian water rights settlements in the State that are approved by Congress and are associated with the planning, designing, or construction of—

(A) water supply infrastructure; or

(B) a project to rehabilitate a water delivery system to conserve water.

#### (2) PRIORITY.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts shall be transferred under paragraph (1) in the order in which the Indian water rights settlements are approved by Congress.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Amounts may be made simultaneously available under paragraph (1) to fund activities relating to multiple approved Indian water rights settlements in the State if the Secretary determines that—

(i) sufficient amounts are available in the Fund to carry out activities relating to more than 1 Indian water rights settlement simultaneously; and

(ii) deviation from the priority order required under subparagraph (A) would not adversely affect the timely completion of the activities that would otherwise have priority under that subparagraph.

#### (d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, required to meet current withdrawals.

(2) INTEREST-BEARING OBLIGATIONS.—Investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

(3) ACQUISITION OF OBLIGATIONS.—For the purpose of investments under paragraph (1), obligations may be acquired—

(A) on original issue at the issue price; or

(B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(4) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(5) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

(e) TRANSFERS OF AMOUNTS.—The amounts required to be transferred to the Fund under this section shall be transferred at least annually.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 1646. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make cost-share and incentive payments for innovative fuels management conservation practices, including prescribed grazing management on private grazing land and practices that complement commensurate public land, to prevent the occurrence and spread of, and damages caused by, wildfires fueled by invasive species; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. REID, Mr. President, today my colleague from Nevada, Senator ENSIGN and I, are introducing The Wildfire Presuppression Fuels Management Act of 2007. This bill establishes a USDA conservation program that helps to prevent the occurrence, spread of, and damages caused by wildfire to rangeland.

Since 1999, approximately 5.8 million acres of Nevada rangeland has been destroyed by wildfire, 3 million of which burned in 2005 and 2006. According to the Nevada Department of Wildlife, prior to the 1980's burned lands averaged less than 25,000 acres per year. Nevada's current acres burned per year have now climbed to 24 times that to 600,000 acres burned per year.

This legislation would allow private land owners to receive annual incentive payments for implementing innovative conservation practices on rangeland that is vulnerable to wildfire or has suffered the consequences of wildfire. Conservation efforts funded through this program would protect unburned areas rich in plant diversity and high resources from the threat of wildfire and restore areas impacted by wildfire and degraded by invasive weeds through reseeding and establishment of native plants.

By creating incentives for private ranchers to manage strips of land that border public lands, we are acknowledging the importance of private land in restoring rangeland health, acknowledging the costs involved to producers and their businesses and equally important, encouraging partnerships between private land and public lands in our efforts to prevent wildfires and improve the environment.

Nevada, along with other Western States, is facing unprecedented threats to the environmental health of its rangeland. Working hand in hand, wildfires and invasive species, such as cheat grass and red brome, are destroying native ecosystems, such as sagebrush habitat, and severely compro-

mising the value of rangeland for livestock production.

According to USDA's Pacific Northwest Research Station more than 50 percent of existing sagebrush habitat has been invaded by cheat grass. That is more than 10 million acres. They predict that cheat grass will displace existing sagebrush and other native plants in much of Nevada over the next 30 years. That is why this bill has the support and endorsement of the Nevada Cattlemen's Association, The Nevada Association of Counties, and the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife. They understand the importance and economic value of healthy rangeland and welcome opportunities to partner with the Federal Government on finding solutions to these problems.

This program is one small step forward in addressing these important issues. I intend to work to see this legislation included in the farm bill being considered by Congress this year. It is one step forward in addressing the conservation and environmental concerns of Nevada and the Great Basin.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1646

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Wildfire Presuppression Fuels Management Pilot Program Act of 2007".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) private grazing land in the United States has experienced dramatic increases in the levels of cheatgrass and other invasive or noxious weed species following wildfires; and

(2) to address the needs of private landowners with respect to the protection and management of grazing land, the Secretary of Agriculture should provide cost-share and incentive payments to the landowners to develop fuels management plans and practices and to promote activities—

(A) to protect areas of grazing land and wildlife habitat that have not been negatively affected by wildfire; and

(B) to manage the risks of wildfires that occur—

(i) on public land and rights-of-way from moving onto private grazing land; and

(ii) on private land from moving onto public land and right-of-way.

**SEC. 3. FIRE PRESUPPRESSION CONSERVATION PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1240B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "2010" and inserting "2012"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";" and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) a producer that develops a fuels management conservation plan, approved by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and subsequently implements a structural prac-

tice or a land management practice relating to fire suppression on private grazing land as described in the approved conservation plan, shall be eligible to receive cost-share payments and annual incentive payments in accordance with subsection (i)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(i) WILDFIRE PRESUPPRESSION CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the Secretary shall provide cost-share payments under subsection (d) and annual incentive payments under subsection (e) to producers that enter into contracts as described in paragraph (2) for activities described in paragraph (3).

"(2) TERM OF CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(2)(A), a contract entered into under this subsection shall have a term of—

"(A) not less than 5 years; and

"(B) not more than 10 years.

"(3) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—In addition to grants under section 1240H, the Secretary may provide cost-share payments and incentive payments under this subsection to producers for planning and carrying out innovative fuels management conservation plans on private grazing land to help prevent the occurrence and spread of, and damages caused by, wildfires fueled by invasive or noxious weed species, including activities relating to—

"(A) managed fuel breaks along a boundary between public and private land to reduce fuel load, including—

"(i) managed grazing practices and the technology required to implement such a practice; and

"(ii) the use of brush strips or mosaic patches;

"(B) restoration of fire-damaged areas using adapted plant material, with an emphasis on using native and adapted grasses and forbs to vegetate or revegetate the fire-damaged areas;

"(C) projects that receive expanded conservation innovation grants for technology transfer training programs relating to fuels management techniques;

"(D) protection or restoration of critical wildlife habitat; and

"(E) conservation practices designed to reduce and manage high fuel loads associated with woody plant species.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1240H(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-8(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) implement projects or activities, such as—

"(A) market systems for pollution reduction;

"(B) innovative conservation practices, including the storing of carbon in the soil; and

"(C) innovative grazing management activities described in section 1240B(i)(3); and".

NEVADA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

June 18, 2007.

Hon. HARRY REID,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: The Nevada Cattlemen's Association (NCA) represents public and private land ranchers throughout Nevada. We seek to create a stable business climate for our members in which they can run environmentally sustainable and economically viable operations.

Over the past several years fire has played a large role in the Great Basin. As you know, the State of Nevada can be a harsh environment for those who work the land. Cattlemen are susceptible to wildfire on public and private grazing lands. When fire moves

through rangelands across the west vegetation communities change from shrub dominated, to annual cheatgrass dominated landscapes. Not only do the vegetation communities change, but the fire cycle increase, habitat for wildlife is decreased, and forage for both domestic livestock and wildlife is greatly reduced throughout the grazing year.

Reducing fuels before the fire season using prescriptive grazing, brush thinning, green strips, and spring grazing on already cheatgrass dominated areas will help reduce the catastrophic fires that have moved through Nevada over the past few summers. The Nevada Cattlemen's Association would like to Thank You for realizing working on landscapes before the fires start is the best method not only for the landscape but for Ranchers across the state. Fire not only hurts the rancher during the fire, but for the years after when the federal land is closed off. Your recognition of the role that fire plays in these lives of rural Nevadans is greatly appreciated. We hope that you continue to support pre-fire management by ranchers and the federal land agencies. Your support on a national level shows your constituents that you care, and sets a national precedence that fire management should happen just as much before the fire burns as after. We Thank You for your support of pre-suppression fuels reduction on both public and private ground. Your recent legislation shows strong support for ranchers and the landscape they utilize.

The Nevada Cattlemen's Association works to protect ranchers and the landscapes they help to manage. Please help that tradition, value, and future continue.

Best Regards,

BOYD M. SPRATLING,  
President.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 237—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR MURDER VICTIMS

Mr. CORNYN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 237

Whereas the death of a loved one is a devastating experience, and the murder of a loved one is exceptionally difficult;

Whereas the friends and families of murder victims cope with grief through a variety of support services, including counseling, crisis intervention, professional referrals, and assistance in dealing with the criminal justice system; and

Whereas the designation of a National Day of Remembrance For Murder Victims on September 25 of each year provides an opportunity for the people of the United States to honor the memories of murder victims and to recognize the impact on surviving family members. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of a National Day of Remembrance for Murder Victims; and

(2) recognizes the significant benefits offered by the organizations that provide services to the loved ones of murder victims.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 238—AMENDING SENATE RESOLUTION 458 (98TH CONGRESS) TO ALLOW THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO ADJUST THE SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PLACED ON THE PAYROLL OF THE SENATE, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SECRETARY, AS A RESULT OF THE DEATH OR RESIGNATION OF A SENATOR

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 238

*Resolved*, That (a) subsection (a)(1) of the first section of Senate Resolution 458 (98th Congress) is amended by inserting after “respective salaries” the following: “, unless adjusted by the Secretary of the Senate with the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.”.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect January 1, 2007.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 38—RECOGNIZING THAT THE PLIGHT OF KASHMIRI PANDITS HAS BEEN AN ONGOING CONCERN SINCE 1989 AND THAT THEIR PHYSICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC SECURITY SHOULD BE SAFEGUARDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

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

S. CON RES. 38

Whereas Jammu and Kashmir has an ancient culture of religious tolerance and pluralism, and Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Buddhists, and Christians were able to practice their faith in an atmosphere of mutual respect and peace until 1989;

Whereas Kashmiri Pandits are the original inhabitants of Kashmir, tracing their heritage and culture back several millennia;

Whereas Kashmiri Pandits have been the victims of a sustained ethnic cleansing campaign initiated in 1989 by Pakistan-based terrorist groups, which forced a mass exodus of Pandits from Jammu and Kashmir, many of whom now live in Indian refugee camps;

Whereas the Kashmiri Pandit population has declined from 400,000 in 1989 to a current level of only 8,000;

Whereas international human rights organizations have failed to accurately report the campaign of intimidation and violence directed against Kashmiri Pandits;

Whereas hundreds of Kashmiri Pandit civilians, elected officials, and military personnel have been killed in terrorist attacks; and

Whereas Harakat ul-Mujahidin, Jaish-e-Mohammed, and Lashkar-e Tayyiba, which are Pakistan-based terrorist groups and have been designated by the Department of State as foreign terrorist organizations, are seeking to drive out Kashmiri Pandits from Jammu and Kashmir and fight the security forces of the Government of the Republic of India; Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) condemns the human rights violations committed against Kashmiri Pandits;

(2) urges the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to end cross-border terrorism by dismantling the infrastructure for terrorist activities in territory under its control, so that all Kashmiris can live, work, and worship in peace; and

(3) encourages the Government of the Republic of India and the state government of Jammu and Kashmir to ensure that Kashmiri Pandits are treated with respect and dignity and are able to safely return to Kashmir.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1623. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID 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 1624. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. CARPER) 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 1625. Mrs. DOLE 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 1626. Mrs. DOLE 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 1627. Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. BURR) 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 1628. Mr. BUNNING (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 6, supra.

SA 1629. Mr. KYL 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 1630. Mr. CASEY 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 1631. Mrs. McCASKILL 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 1632. Mr. FEINGOLD 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 1633. Mr. FEINGOLD 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 1634. Mr. FEINGOLD 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 1635. Mr. FEINGOLD 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.