

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 575, S. 2633, safe redeployment of U.S. troops.

Russell D. Feingold, Edward M. Kennedy, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Ron Wyden, Sherrod Brown, Richard Durbin, Bernard Sanders, Patty Murray, Frank R. Lautenberg, Christopher J. Dodd, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Amy Klobuchar, Charles E. Schumer, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion pursuant to the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

REQUIRING A REPORT SETTING FORTH THE GLOBAL STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES TO COMBAT AND DEFEAT AL QAEDA AND ITS AFFILIATES—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of February 14, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 576, S. 2634, and I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 576, S. 2634, global strategy report.

Russell D. Feingold, Edward M. Kennedy, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Ron Wyden, Sherrod Brown, Richard Durbin, Bernard Sanders, Patty Murray, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Frank R. Lautenberg, Christopher J. Dodd, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Amy Klobuchar, Charles E. Schumer, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion pursuant to the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

AUTHORIZING LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 460.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 460) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of National Association of Manufacturers v. Taylor, et al.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 460) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 460

Whereas, in the case of National Association of Manufacturers v. Taylor, et al., Case No. 08-CV-208-CKK (D.D.C.), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the plaintiff is asserting that the reporting requirements of section 4(b)(3) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(3), as amended by section 207 of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-81, 121 Stat. 735, 747, are unconstitutional;

Whereas, the plaintiff has named the Secretary of the Senate, Nancy Erickson, as a defendant in her capacity as the officer of the Senate responsible for the receipt of lobbying disclosure registrations and reports;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend officers of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Secretary of the Senate in the case of National Association of Manufacturers v. Taylor, et al.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2663, S. 2664, AND S. 2665

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2663) to reform the Consumer Product Safety Commission to provide greater protection for children's products, to improve the effectiveness of consumer product recall programs, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2664) to extend the provisions of the Protect America Act of 2007.

A bill (S. 2665) to extend the provisions of the Protect America Act of 2007 until July 1, 2009.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for the second reading en bloc and object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would say that S. 2663 is a bipartisan piece of legislation, the Consumer Product Safety Act. We have been working for months to get this going. It is my understanding now that Senators PRYOR and STEVENS asked that this matter move forward.

The other matter related to the FISA bill, we are trying to work something out with the House, and hopefully we can get something done on that soon.

Mr. President, tonight I am introducing and beginning the rule XIV process on two bills related to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. One bill would extend the Protect America Act, the PAA, for 30 days, while the other would extend that law until July 1, 2009.

Earlier this year I introduced S. 2556 which would have extended the PAA for 30 days, and S. 2257, which would have extended the PAA until July 1, 2009. The bills I am introducing tonight would extend the PAA for the same periods of time, but they are drafted to take account of the fact that the PAA has expired. In addition, they contain a post hoc effective date that is intended to eliminate any potentially adverse legal effect resulting from the expiration of the PAA.

My purpose in introducing bills with two different extension lengths is to demonstrate once again that I am willing to extend the PAA for as long a time, or as short a time, as is needed to finalize a strong final bill.

Now that the House and Senate have both passed bills—H.R. 3773 and S. 2248—to strengthen the PAA, the right way to get to a final bill is through bipartisan negotiations. Unfortunately, my Republican friends appear unwilling to negotiate. We convened two negotiating sessions last week, but Republican staff members and administration lawyers declined to attend.

Meanwhile, President Bush says that the expiration of the Protect America Act has made America less safe, but he threatened to veto a bill extending that law while negotiators work on a final bill. The President's position is inexplicable and reckless.

The bottom line for Senate Democrats is clear: We want to give our intelligence professionals all needed tools while protecting the privacy of law-abiding Americans. We are willing to extend the Protect America Act for as long as it takes to get a final bill.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be agreed to, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1200, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, as under the previous order. Further, I ask that the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:30 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus luncheons.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there could be as many as five rollcall votes beginning as early as 10 tomorrow morning.

The first votes will be on Indian health care. In addition, there are other votes, as I have outlined.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we return to the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and that the Senator from South Dakota be allowed to speak for whatever time he may consume, and that following his remarks, the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

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

INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2007—Continued

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to pick up where I left off regarding the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, which is the pending business before the Senate. As I stated earlier, we will be having a series of votes tomorrow on a number of amendments. One, I think, improves this bill and addresses an issue which is important to me and a number of my colleagues. The amendment is offered by our colleague from Louisiana, Senator VITTER, amendment No. 3896.

If the amendment is adopted, it would codify Federal Indian health care service funds. I hope that is an amendment that will be adopted to the bill. I think that is important to have.

Also, as we consider these final amendments, I hope we can also see action in the other body, the House of Representatives, because the Senate acting on this is long overdue. It is critically important to the tribes I represent that we get an Indian Health Care Improvement Act reauthorization in place. But the fact that the Senate has acted won't amount to much if in fact the other body doesn't also take up this legislation and pass it and enable us to go into conference and get a bill we can put on the President's desk that he can sign into law.

I wish to speak specifically to one amendment that was adopted. Again, I thank my colleagues Senators MURKOWSKI and DORGAN for working with me to have it adopted. It has to do with tribal justice in the Dakotas.

One of the amendments I offered to this bill, No. 4021, goes a long way toward attempting to improve the issue that, in my view, is at the core fundamentally to a lot of issues we are having in Indian country, and that is law enforcement. The amendment simply attempts to help with the process, the analysis of what is happening with regard to justice and law enforcement in Indian Country by having the GAO complete a study within 1 year of the tribal justice systems within North Dakota and South Dakota, two States that have a high incidence of crime on our reservations.

Specifically, I am asking the study to focus, one, on how tribal courts cur-

rently function and how they are supposed to function; second, an analysis of the components of tribal justice systems; third, a review of the origins and development of tribal justice systems; fourth, an analysis of the weakness of the tribal justice systems; five, an analysis of tribal leader suggestions to the current problems.

This is where I think it is important that we listen to the elected leadership on the reservations. Last week during the congressional break, I happened to have had the opportunity to travel across my State. I stopped at a couple different reservations. I was up on the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe's reservation and also at the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate reservation with the tribal chairmen. The chairman of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is Ron His Horse Is Thunder, and the chairman of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate tribe is Michael Selvage.

One of the issues that came up in the meetings was this issue of law enforcement. There is, of course, in the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe a good example of what I am talking about in terms of the dimensions of this problem. You have 2.4 million acres of land on the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe reservation. Yet you have about 10,000 people and you only have about 9 policemen, law enforcement personnel out there, who are committed to that large geographic area. At any given time, you are only going to have a couple of them on duty. So you have all kinds of issues that come up relating to being able to respond in a timely way to calls and to make arrests. I think it is a very difficult challenge that we face on the reservations partly because of the geography but also because of the sparsity that we have today of law enforcement personnel.

I think the GAO study will look at a lot of issues and that will be one component. It will look at the tribal court system, which is also something we need to look at and determine what, if anything, can be done to improve the workings of the system. We clearly have a problem that, if you look at the data, needs to be addressed.

If you don't contemplate or understand the need for this amendment, let me give you a couple of pieces of information. Studies show that one out of every three Native American women will be raped in their lifetime. The Department of Justice has found that American Indian women are 2½ times more likely to be raped or sexually assaulted than women throughout the rest of the country. Remote reservations in North Dakota and South Dakota have an average of 10 times as much crime as the rest of the Nation.

What this GAO study would do is it would assist the tribes not only in North Dakota and South Dakota but I think assist policymakers in Congress concerning possible solutions that could be used to reduce the higher rates of crime on reservations. Having met numerous times with members of

the tribal government, tribal councils, and the chairmen on these reservations, and having listened to the stories of people who live there, there isn't anything we can do that is more important, in my view, than to provide security.

We are talking about the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. This is a health and public safety issue. If you don't have that, you cannot have economic development; you cannot have kids learning in a safe and secure environment. They are not going to be able to learn at the very fastest rate possible if they are worried about their security. This is an important issue, one that I think needs to be addressed.

Again, I appreciate the willingness on behalf of the managers of the bill to accept this amendment. I hope as the process moves forward, we will see action by the House of Representatives that will allow us to get a bill passed through the Congress and on the President's desk, signed into law, which will address the serious health care needs on the reservations, but also this important amendment, the GAO study, will allow us to take a close look—for the first time, a sort of outside objective third-party look at tribal justice in the Dakotas.

As I mentioned, it is a very serious need and challenge we face. I got lots of good information during my visit last week from members of the tribal council and the chairmen regarding that subject. I think they are all anxious to get the study under way and anxious to get the results so we can move forward with policies that make sense and that will keep our reservations safe for young people to learn and for those who want to come there and start businesses and have a safe environment in which to do that.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:35 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 26, 2008, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SCOT A. MARCEL, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EAST ASIAN AND ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN) AFFAIRS.

DONALD E. BOOTH, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA.

NANCY E. MCLEOD-OWNEY, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA.

STEPHEN GEORGE MCFARLAND, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.